UC Berkeley
UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Ritual and Authority in Early Athens

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1x43j2wn

Author
Laughy, Michael Harold

Publication Date
2010

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Ritual and Authority in Early Athens

By

Michael Harold Laughy, Jr.

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Ancient History and Mediterranean Archaeology

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in Charge:

Prof. Emily Mackil, Co-Chair
Prof. John Camp, Co-Chair
Prof. Ron Stroud
Prof. Anthony Bulloch

Spring 2010

© Michael Harold Laughy, Jr., 2010.
All rights reserved.

Abstract

Ritual and Authority in Early Athens

by

Michael Harold Laughy, Jr.

Doctor of Philosophy in Ancient History and Mediterranean Archaeology

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Emily Mackil, Co-Chair

Professor John Camp, Co-Chair

The present study is an examination of our evidence for religious authority in Early Athens, i.e., Geometric, Archaic, and Early Classical Athens and Attica, ca. 1000-450 B.C.E., with a particular focus on the authority that the leading families of Early Athens held as the principal sponsors of sanctuary and ritual life. This study examines the religious authority of these leading families in the context of another emerging source of religious authority, the state. This examination provides a corrective to current polis-centric approaches to the study of early Athenian Religion. It is not the state that defined and constituted religious life in Early Athens. The reverse is true: elite and powerful families were the principal authorities over the religious life of Athens and Attica, both within and outside of state institutions. Their possession of this authority shaped and influenced the way in which the Athenian state emerged, and the relationship of the state to existing religious practice and power structures. The religious authority that the emerging state attained did not come at the expense of families; the possession of religious authority is not a zero-sum game. Rather, as the state came to sponsor and oversee certain sanctuaries and festivals, what the families lost was their exclusivity.

Parentibus Carissimis

Table of Contents

Table of Contents ii
Acknowledgements vi

Chapter One: Methods and Approaches 1
1. The Limits of State Authority
2. An Athenian Definition of Religious Authority 8
3. Ritual and Order 13
4. Polis, State, and Ethnos 14
5. State and Power 18
6. Ritual Authority and the State 19

PART ONE: 23
Chapter Two: Mortuary Ritual in the Iron Age 24
1. Introduction 24
2. Summary of the Mortuary Record 25
2.1. Submycenaean 25
2.2. Protogeometric 26
2.3. Early Geometric to Middle Geometric I 27
2.4. Middle Geometric II and Late Geometric I 30
2.5. Late Geometric II 31
2.6. Seventh Century 35
3. Previous Interpretations: Population and the State 39
4. Fashion and Burial in Attica 43
5. Status, Authority, and Funerary Ritual 50

Chapter Three: Status and the Gods of Geometric Athens 54
1. Introduction 54
2. Men, Religious Authority, and the Gods in the Geometric Period 54
2.1. Men: Religious Authority in Homer 54
2.2. Men: The Basileis of Early Attica 60
3. Women and Power in the Geometric Period 61
3.1. Female Authority in Homer 63
3.2. The Phenomenon of the Wealthy Female Burial 69

Chapter Four: The Rise of the Attic Sanctuary 79
1. Introduction 79

2. Protogeometric Period through the Middle Geometric 79
3. Late Geometric Period 81
4. Seventh Century 82

Concluding Remarks: The Ritual Continuum from Graves to Sanctuaries 84

PART TWO: 87
Chapter Five: The Age of Drakon and Solon 88
1. Introduction 88
2. Kylonian conspiracy: political and religious crisis 88
3. Drakon and the Trial of the Alkmaionidai 91
4. Epimenides 96
5. Solon's Religious Reforms 98
5.1. "Solon's Calendar" 99
5.2. "Solonian" festivals 105
6. Conclusion 107

Chapter Six: The Age of the Peisistratidai 109
1. Introduction 109
2. Athena and the Acropolis 111
3. Artemis Brauronia 119
4. Demeter, Athens, and Eleusis 122
5. Dionysos of Eleutherai 126
6. The Peisistratidai and Athens 129
7. Herms, Athens, and Attica 135
8. The Peisistratidai and Oracles 137
9. Conclusion 140

Chapter Seven: From Kleisthenes to Perikles 141
1. Introduction 141
2. Athens and the Athenian Acropolis 142
2.1. Temples and Sanctuaries 142
2.2. Festivals 152
3. Eleusis and City Eleusinion 154
4. Attica outside of Eleusis and Athens 160
5. Conclusion 161

Concluding Remarks: Private Initiative and the State 163

Works Cited 170

Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Attic Sanctuaries and Shrines for Deities 210
1. Thriasian Plain 210
1.1. Eleusis: Demeter 210
1.2. Eleusis: Artemis and Poseidon? 213
2. Athenian Plain 213
2.1. Athens: Apollo? 213
2.2. Athens: Athena Polias 215
2.3. Athens: Athena Nike? 221
2.4. Athens: Nymphe 222
2.5. Athens: Nymphs 224
2.6. Athens: Demeter 225
2.7. Athens: Zeus Meilichios 227
2.8. Tourkovounia: Zeus? 227
2.9. Mt. Hymettos: Zeus 229
2.10. Mounychia: Artemis 232
2.11. Trachones: Goddess? 233
3. Vari Plain 233
3.1. Lathouriza: Goddess? 233
3.2. Kiapha Thiti: Goddess? 236
3.3. Panagia Thiti: Goddess? 237
3.4. Varkiza: Zeus? 238
4. Anavyssos Plain 238
4.1. Mt. Kastela: Nymphs? 238
4.2. Mt. Profitis Elias: Zeus? 239
5. Charaka 239
5.1. Kassidis Peak: Zeus? 239
6. Cape Sounion 239
6.1. Sounion: Athena 239
6.2. Sounion: Poseidon 242
7. Mesogeion Plain 244
7.1. Pallini: Athena 244
7.2. Brauron: Artemis 245
7.3. Loutsa: Artemis 249
7.4. Prasiai: Apollo 249
7.5. Mt. Pani, Peak: Zeus? 250
7.6. Merenda Peak: Zeus 250
7.7. Mt. Pani, Keratovouni Peak: Zeus? 250
7.8. Charvati Peak: Zeus? 251
8. Mt. Penteli, Mavrovouni Peak: Zeus? 251
9. Marathon Plain 251
9.1. Marathon: Athena? 251

9.2. Agrieliki Height: Zeus? 251
10. Northern Attica 252
10.1. Mt. Parnes: Zeus? 252
10.2. Mt. Kithairon: Cave of Antiope? 253

Appendix 2: "Hero" and "Ancestor" Shrines Reconsidered 254
1. Introduction 254
2. Areopagus Oval Building 255
2.1. The Evidence 255
2.2. Previous Interpretations 257
2.3. Reexamination 258
2.3.1. Architecture 258
2.3.2. Chronology 261
2.3.3. "Sacred House"? 264
2.3.3.1. Eleusis: "Sacred House" 265
2.3.3.2. Academy: "Sacred House" 267
2.3.3.3. Anavyssos: "Chthonic Shrine" 270
2.3.3.4. Thorikos: "Sacred Houses" 272
2.3.3.5. Sacred Houses: Interpretation 274
2.4. Interpretation 275
3. Protoattic Votive Deposit 276
3.1. The Evidence 277
3.2. Previous Interpretations 280
3.3. Reexamination 282
3.3.1. Relationship with Areopagus Oval Building 282
3.3.2. Location of Shrine 284
3.3.3. Identity of Cult 285
4. Conclusions 289

Appendix 3: Sanctuaries and Agriculture 291

Appendix 4: Votive Charts 296
1. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: Female Deities 297
2. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: Male Deities 299
3. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: "Hero" or "Ancestor" Shrines 301
4. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: "Sacred Houses" 302
5. Votive Offerings from the Athenian Agora: Late Geometric Wells/Pits 303
6. Votive Offerings from the Athenian Agora: Protoattic Wells/Pits 305

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the support that I have received from a number of institutions. First, I would like to thank the faculty and staff of the Classics Department at Washington University in St. Louis, and in particular Susan Rotroff, for introducing me to the study of Athens. The faculty and staff of the Graduate Group in Ancient History and Mediterranean Archaeology at the University of California, Berkeley, have been extraordinary in their support and encouragement. I am thankful to have received additional support, both as a student and while writing this dissertation, from the Sara B. Aleshire Center for the Study of Greek Epigraphy. It is a pleasure to acknowledge also the generous support that I have received from the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, where I conducted most of the research and writing presented here. Finally, I have been fortunate to have worked for many years with a wonderful and engaging group of scholars and staff at the Athenian Agora Excavations, an experience that has been personally and professionally formative.

This study is the result of the help and guidance of a great number of faculty and peers. My debt to John Camp is immeasurable, and his generosity and support has been invaluable. I am also thankful for all the patience and tireless energy that Emily Mackil shared with me as I wrote draft after draft. I wish also to thank Ron Stroud for his mentorship and advice both on this project, and throughout my years at Cal Berkeley. I have benefited greatly from my many conversations with Floris van den Eijnde, whose interests closely match my own. I wish to extend a special note of appreciation to Judith Binder, who on several occasions in Athens pulled me aside and generously shared her expertise with me.

Finally, I am indebted to my wife, Amber for reasons too many to enumerate. She and my son Harry, born as I was writing this work, teach me love, patience, and perspective every day.

Berkeley, CA
May 2010

Chapter One: Methods and Approaches

1. The Limits of State Authority

All ancient Greek social and political communities could be identified by the specific festivals they celebrated, and sanctuaries they maintained. Herodotus, for example, identified Ionian communities as those who celebrated the Apatouria festival.[1] On an individual level, associations with certain shrines provided evidence for political membership and rights. Candidates for archonship in Classical Athens had to attest to possession of shrines of Apollo Patroos and Zeus Herkeios.[2] Religious affiliations, in other words, provided a fundamental basis for both communal and individual identity.

The degree to which civic and religious organization was related has been argued and analyzed ever since Fustel de Coulanges advanced his theory that Greek and Roman political institutions evolved from earlier religious institutions.[3] Today many of his conclusions have largely been abandoned.[4] What is more, Fustel de Coulanges' general view that religious practice shaped political practice has recently been inverted. The overwhelming tendency in recent scholarship, particularly in discussions of Athenian religion, has been to analyze the degree to which the political apparatus of the polis shaped or determined religious practice. In the last few decades, the ultimate expression of the polis-centric approach, the "polis religion" model, has come to dominate interpretations

---

1. Herodotus, 1.147.2, lists two exceptions, Ephesus and Kolophon, which no longer celebrated the festival due to some pretense of murder.

2. Arist. *Ath.* 55.2. Cf. Dem. 57.54, for the tale of Euxitheos, who defended himself against the charge that he was not an Athenian citizen by telling the jury that as a child his father brought him to the temple of Apollo Patroos and other shrines of his local phratry.

3. Fustel de Coulanges 1864, esp. pp. 5, 112-113. A number of conference proceedings illustrate the interest in the polis and religion, e.g. Alcock and Osborne 1994; Hellström and Alroth 1996. More recently, a project group has been formed at the University of Utrecht entitled "Citizenship in Classical Athens," which is currently funding four soon-to-be-published studies that each seek to "understand how political structures in ancient Athens were interwoven with religious activity and the forming of groups." The political and social role of supra-regional sanctuaries has also generated recent interest, as seen in Peter Funke's Kult-Politik-Ethnos project, which has produced one volume of conference papers to date, Freitag et al. 2006; more are planned.

4. For a critical view of Fustel de Coulanges, see especially Humphreys 1980, 1983.

of Athenian religion today. The basic tenet of the model, as described by Sourvinou-Inwood, is that the "polis anchored, legitimated, and mediated all religious activity" and "provided the fundamental, basic framework in which Greek religion operated".[5] In other words, just as the polis provided the institutional structure and legitimizing authority for the various social groups that made up the polis, so too did it provide the structure and possess the authority over the sanctuaries and shrines that articulated and established these groupings.[6] Though the model is applied to ancient Greek religion as a whole, the polis of Classical Athens is considered the paradigmatic example of this theory.

Not all scholars of Athenian religion embrace this model.[7] It is undeniable, however, that the concept of "polis religion" has enjoyed significant support among scholars of Greek religion, particularly in the Anglo-American scholarly community. In the recently published *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*, for example, we find the following sentence: "to find religious authority in Greece we must look for secular authority... [I]nsofar as an organizing body, a "church" existed, that body was the polis. We see this

---

5. Sourvinou-Inwood 1988a, p. 297, 1990b, p. 259. For other formulations of "polis religion," see Yunis 1988, pp. 19-28; Burkert 1995.

6. As Sourvinou-Inwood 1990b, p. 302, suggests, the polis possessed "the responsibility and authority to set a religious system into place, to mediate human relationships with the divine world."

7. Others argue that religious authority was decentralized and shared by a number of individuals and corporate groups, both within and outside the political apparatus of the polis. Garland 1984, p. 120: "[R]eligious authority in archaic and classical Athens was the monopoly neither of the citizen body as a whole, nor of any particular group of individuals within it." Cf. 1996; Humphreys 1978, pp. 254-257; Frost 1996, writing primarily on the Archaic period. Kindt 2009, agrees with some aspects of "polis religion," but argues that the model fails to account for all religious practices, such as Orphism. The religious authority of priests has been a topic of particular interest. See, e.g., Feaver 1957; Garland 1990; Connelly 2007, pp. 197-221. Kearns 1995, pp. 520-525, provides an emic account, arguing that Greek religion possessed its own authority by virtue of its language, mythology, repeated rituals, and presumed divine origin.

principle in operation most clearly in the society that we know best, democratic Athens."[8]

The initial appeal of the "polis religion" model is understandable. All civic institutions dealt in some way with religious matters. By the Classical period, for example, three of the most prestigious positions in the state, the eponymous archon, archon basileus, and polemarch counted among their duties the organization of some of the city's most important festivals, including the Dionysia, Eleusinian Mysteries, and funerary games for the war dead.[9] Meetings of the *ekklesia* were opened by a sacrifice, and sacred matters were always the first topic of discussion.[10] Priests and priestesses were sometimes paid from state coffers, and subject to audit at the conclusion of their duties.[11] Boards such as ταμίαι, ἐπιστάται, and ἱεροποιοί, officials accountable only to the *demos*, were assigned to oversee the finances and organization of some of Athens' most important sanctuaries and festivals, including those of Athena Polias, Artemis Brauronia, and the Eleusinian Mysteries. Regulations and sacrificial calendars were inscribed by the state, further attesting to the authority and involvement of the polis in religious matters.[12] For adherents of the "polis religion" model, such evidence leaves little doubt that by the fifth century, the Athenian polis not only was intimately involved in the religious life, it was the paramount religious authority.

A fundamental problem with this model is one of evidence-bias. Most of the evidence gathered in support of "polis religion" dates to the fifth and, more often, later centuries, and either comes from the state itself, e.g. official decrees, or from accounts that focus upon state responsibilities, e.g. Aristotle's *Athenian Constitution*. A family shrine

---

8. Parker 2004a, p. 571. Cf. also 2004b, p. 556: "The dominant current model for understanding Greek religion, the polis model…defines the principal context for Greek religious life as the polis (city-state), which had the authority to establish and run religious systems that organized the relationships between humans and gods (in some sense it could be said that the polis played the role played in Christianity by the church). The polis had the ultimate authority over all religious matters." For recent general books on religion with similar sentiments, cf. Zaidman and Pantel 1992, pp. 46-49, 92-101; Larson 2007, p. 12.

9. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56-58; cf. 54.6-8, for other boards who are selected to oversee festivals and rites.

10. Aeschin. *In Tim.* 23: ἐπειδὰν τὸ καθάρσιον περιενεχθῇ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ τὰς πατρίους εὐχὰς εὔξηται, προχειροτονεῖν κελεύει τοὺς προέδρους περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων καὶ κήρυξι καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ ὁσίων, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπερωτᾷ ὁ κῆρυξ: "τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται τῶν ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων;"

11. Aeschin. 3.18.

12. E.g., *IG* i^3 230-235; Sokolowski 1962, no. 10; Sokolowski 1969, no. 17 B, C.

was much less likely to have inscribed its activities, or have Aristotle record its practices. As a result, the nature of the surviving evidence has led to a polis-centric, and indeed Atheno-centric approach that has often led to exaggerating the religious authority of the state.

A common assumption found among polis-centric accounts, for example, is that the religious authority of the state was clearest in its management and control over so-called "state," "civic," or "polis" cults.[13] While use of such terms is in fact rampant in most every discussion of Athenian religion, defining exactly what constitutes a civic or state cult is elusive.[14] One reason for the difficulty is that no Greek conceived of their religious practices in such general or abstract terms. All epigraphic and literary evidence indicates that the various manifestations of ritual exhibited for a specific deity–sacrifices, festivals, dedications, temples, and other such activities–were considered separate activities in the ancient Greek mind, and never unified under the umbrella term "cult."[15] We must instead consider specific rites and festivals on a case by case basis. When we do so, we often find that rights and responsibilities to conduct particular sacred activities on behalf of a deity were held or shared by several groups.[16]

That said, the closest we get to an ancient concept of a civic or state sponsored religious activity is the use of the term δημοτελής, "publicly funded."[17] In each case, the word is found associated only with specific festivals or sacrifices. This concern with finances is one that pervades many of the so-called "sacred laws" that have survived to our day, including inventories, calendars, religious regulations, and contracts. Such laws were primarily concerned with the proper administration and accounting of funds provided by the polis for specific festivals, sacrifices, and priesthoods. This is why when a

---

13. See, e.g., Sourvinou-Inwood 1990b, pp. 307-310.

14. A handful of excellent studies have shown the difficulties in identifying or even defining a state or civic cult; see Aleshire 1994; Burkert 1995; Cole 1995. Others have defined "civic cult" not in terms of a particular shrine or patron divinity, but as the totality of religious practices within a polis; see, e.g., Zaidman and Pantel 1992, p. 101.

15. Edmonson 1964.

16. A fourth century decree, for example, records the decision of arbitrators concerning a dispute over the cultic rights of two branches of the *genos* of the Salaminioi (*SEG* 21.527). The two branches shared control of priesthoods, including that of Athena Skiras. However, the festival for Athena Skiras, the *Oschophoria*, was funded by both the *genos* and the state. Clearly religious rights and privileges over religious activities often were complex, and shared among groups.

17. Thuc. 2.15.2; Pl. *Leg*. 935b; Dem. 21.53; 59.85-86; Aeschin. 1.183, 3.176. Cf. Hdt. 6.57, who uses the term to describe Spartan sacrifices.

board of inscribers was commissioned at the end of the fifth century to revise and inscribe the city's official calendar of sacrifices, debate centered not only on which rites were dropped or added, but also on the financial impact on the city's coffers.[18]

It is clear that the state held direct authority and oversight only over rites and practices that it funded; boards of ταμίαι, ἐπιστάται, and ἱεροποιοί, were never set up to oversee festivals or sanctuaries that did not derive financial support from the polis. Similarly, while Classical Athens possessed the right to subject priests and priestesses to an audit, the law only applied to priesthoods that received at least some of their pay from public funds.[19] The extent to which the polis held authority and demanded accountability over specific festivals, rites, or priesthoods, in other words, was determined by whether or not such activity received funds from the city's coffers. Any search for a "polis festival" or rite, in other words, must begin with a search for public expenditures.

Even in the cases where state funding of a festival or sacrifice is certain, there are limits to the authority of the polis. While many surviving inscriptions detail financial and administrative concerns over ritual practice, few are concerned with how the actual sacrificial rites are to be performed.[20] A decree may be passed to finance and oversee the games of the Herakleia of the Tetrapolis, yet the form of the games is not legislated; a priesthood for Athena Nike may be established and funded by the Demos, yet her exact duties, including how to perform the sacrifices, are left unrecorded.[21] In other words, while state decrees did address the "external" authority over some ritual practices, they did little to regulate the "internal" authority over the content of ritual practice, e.g. the manner in which a certain sacrifice was to be performed.[22] The actual practice of ritual,

---

18. Lys. 30.19. For more on the calendar, also known as the Law Code of Nikomachos, or Solon's Calendar, see Chapter Five.

19. Aeschin. 3.18: διδάξω δ' ὑμᾶς πρῶτον ἐπὶ τῶν παραδόξων. οἷον τοὺς ἱερέας καὶ τὰς ἱερείας ὑπευθύνους εἶναι κελεύει ὁ νόμος, καὶ συλλήβδην ἅπαντας καὶ χωρὶς ἑκάστους κατὰ σῶμα, τοὺς τὰ γέρα μόνον λαμβάνοντας καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐχομένους, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἰδίᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ κοινῇ τὰ γένη, Εὐμολπίδας καὶ Κήρυκας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας.

20. Aleshire 1994, p. 14; Henrichs 2003, p. 57.

21. Herakleia games: *IG* i^3 3; Priestess of Nike: *IG* i^3 34, 35.

22. Aleshire 1994, p. 16; Thomas 1996, p. 26.

in other words, was left to the collective memory and tradition preserved by the priests themselves, and not subject to state involvement.[23]

In addition, the fact that the festivals and sanctuaries that the polis funded and oversaw by the end of the fifth century ranked among the most important and ostentatious has obscured the much greater number of religious practices not funded by the polis. At present, we know of fewer than fifty festivals or sacrifices that received full or partial funding and oversight from the polis by the end of the fifth century.[24] This is at a time when the number of sanctuaries and shrines in Attica may have tallied at least two thousand, and probably many more.[25] In other words, it appears that less than three percent of all priesthoods and sanctuaries received money from state coffers, or were subject to state boards. The true tally of individual shrines, sanctuaries, and festivals, local and polis-wide, will never be known, nor are we fully informed of all religious practices directly funded and overseen by the polis. We can be confident, however, in the general picture that emerges; the vast majority of sanctuaries and shrines little felt the direct involvement of the state.[26]

Outside of overseeing its financial investments, there is one another realm in which the state held religious authority: protecting the ancestral ritual practices of the land, which it did, in part, by mediating conflicts. The archon basileus, for example, was responsible for resolving disputes of religious privilege among hereditary priesthoods and

---

23. Harris 1989, p. 83; Parker 1996, pp. 52-54. An important, if rare, exception from outside Attica is the lex sacra inscribed on a lead tablet from Selinous, dating to ca. 450. This inscription contains detailed instructions for the performance of sacrifices and libations to Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides, Zeus Meilichios, and other ancestral spirits. See Jameson et al. 1993, and the recently revised text and discussion in Robertson 2009.

24. Cf. Zaidman and Pantel 1992, p. 103; Parke 1977, pp. 26-27, 171-182.

25. Garland 1996, p. 91: "I would put their total number [i.e., all cults in Attica] at a conservative estimate at around 2,000." This number is indeed conservative. Sacrifices by the one hundred twenty-eight demes, alone, would have numbered well into the thousands. One of these demes, Erchia, records over fifty sacrifices; cf. Dow 1965; Jameson 1965; Parke 1977, pp. 175-180.

26. On this point, I am reminded of the charge today by American conservatives that the 2009 Stimulus Package promoted by President Barack Obama has turned the United States into a socialist country. In response, Connor Clark, in a June 3, 2009 online article for *The Atlantic* ("What Socialism Looks Like": http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2009/06/what-socialism-looks-like/18675/), noted that "99.79% of the American corporate assets that existed at the start of the Obama administration [remained] in private hands. The differences of degree are so small that they aren't worth mentioning. And yet, somehow, they keep getting mentioned."

gene, and, at least by the beginning of the fourth century, for conducting court cases involving charges of ἀσέβεια, "impiety."[27] Also by the fourth century, questions of misconduct at certain festivals could be brought to the Assembly for a preliminary hearing to decide whether the charges warranted court procedings.[28] Theft of temple property was considered an act equivalent to treason, and incurred the same penalties: loss of life, property, and prohibition of burial with Attica.[29]

While the state could, of course, pass laws addressing such transgressions, the interpretation and implementation of these laws was subject to fervent debate within the law courts. Such debate rarely was about religious practice, alone. While Nikomachos and his colleagues held the official authority and right to draw up the state calendar, their decisions were clearly subject to debate and challenge, based in part on political and financial concerns as much as religious ones.[30] In another famous example, a decree against religious transgressions was passed in the 430's, and members of Perikles' inner circle were brought to court on charges of ἀσέβεια, both actions clearly conducted for political gain.[31] These courtroom debates over religious matters were common in the late fifth century, and should be seen in the context of similar political and religious debates performed in plays on the stage, and in debates before the Assembly.

At any rate, it is clear that the political authority of the polis cannot be considered the sole font of religious authority. The religious discourse of the polis, as well as the

---

27. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 57.2. Ἀσέβεια, often translated as "impiety," was usually not a charge of atheism, but rather a transgression against ancestral religious customs, τὰ πάτρια; see Humphreys 1978, p. 188, and compare with the concept of εὐσέβεια in Lys. 30.19. Contemporary accounts of Athenian trials of ἀσέβεια are rare before the fourth century, and may not have been a punishable transgression before the Peloponnesian War. The only examples before the trial of Socrates in 399 are the prosecution of the profaners of the Eleusinian Mysteries and mutilators of the Herms, and the ἀσέβεια trials against Perikles' associates during the 430's. Cf. Garland 1996; Yunis 1988, pp. 59-72.

28. Dem. 21.8-11, 147, 175.

29. Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.22; *Mem.* 1.2.62; Isoc. 20.6.

30. Henrichs 2003, p. 56.

31. Plutarch, *Per.* 32.1, records ἀσέβεια trials against Perikles' associates during the 430's, as well as a decree of Diopeithes passed around the same time which impeached those who either did not acknowledge the gods, or who taught about the heavens. The decree was drawn up in an effort to raise suspicion of Perikles by prosecuting members of his inner circle: καὶ ψήφισμα Διοπείθης ἔγραψεν εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας, ἀπερειδόμενος εἰς Περικλέα δι' Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν. Cf. Garland 1992, pp. 138-141, 205-206.

many communities and groups within the polis, was more fluid and dynamic than that expressed within a calendar of sacrifices or set of decrees or laws, or by any religious experts. More importantly, the actual practice and performance of rituals, the core of all religious activity, was generally not the subject of decrees, laws or calendars.[32]

So far I have discussed the difficulties in applying the "polis religion" model to Athenian religion of the late fifth and fourth centuries, the date of most of the evidence marshaled in support of the theory. These difficulties are compounded by the model's ahistorical stance, which little accounts for changes in the locus of authority and power during the emergence of the state in Early Athens. Finally, the model ill-suits the Archaic period, when the evidence for a strong, centralized state in control of religion is scarce to non-existent.

Instead of beginning our exploration of religious authority and agency from the vantage point of a preconceived model or false abstraction–the result of which would be to find what the model presupposes from the beginning–we will begin on a better footing with an examination of how the Athenians *themselves* conceived of religious authority.

2. An Athenian Definition of Religious Authority

For Athenians, nothing was more beneficial to the polis than shared sacrifices.[33] As we have seen, however, even by the late fifth and fourth centuries, ritual practice itself was not ultimately governed by any laws of the state, which tended to involve itself in details concerning the oversight of processions and sacrifices that were publicly funded. The sources of authority over the vast majority of religious practice in Athens must be found outside of the political machinations of the state. For the Athenians, this authority sprung mostly from two fonts: ancestral custom, and the gods themselves, particularly oracular deities.

---

32. Demosthenes, 59.116-117, records one famous incident in which a priest was punished for sacrificial malpractice. During the Haloa festival, the hierophant of Eleusis, Archias, was accused not only of having conducted a sacrifice that was the priestess' to make, but of performing the rites on the wrong day, and for a courtesan, no less. For these actions he was condemned by a court for transgressing ancestral customs concerning the sacrifices. In general, however, such cases were rare.

33. Pl. *Leg*. 5.738d-e: ...φιλοφρονῶνταί τε ἀλλήλους μετὰ θυσιῶν καὶ οἰκειῶνται [738e] καὶ γνωρίζωσιν, οὗ μεῖζον οὐδὲν πόλει ἀγαθὸν ἢ γνωρίμους αὐτοὺς αὑτοῖς εἶναι. ὅπου γὰρ μὴ φῶς ἀλλήλοις ἐστὶν ἀλλήλων ἐν τοῖς τρόποις ἀλλὰ σκότος, οὔτ' ἂν τιμῆς τῆς ἀξίας οὔτ' ἀρχῶν οὔτε δίκης ποτέ τις ἂν τῆς προσηκούσης ὀρθῶς τυγχάνοι: δεῖ δὴ πάντα ἄνδρα ἓν πρὸς ἓν τοῦτο σπεύδειν ἐν πάσαις πόλεσιν, ὅπως μήτε αὐτὸς κίβδηλός ποτε φανεῖται ὁτῳοῦν, ἁπλοῦς δὲ καὶ ἀληθὴς ἀεί, μήτε ἄλλος τοιοῦτος ὢν αὐτὸν διαπατήσει.

Discussions of religious authority to date have rarely noted the degree to which much ritual practice sustained its own authority, based on the relative antiquity of particular practices. The ancient sources repeatedly assert that the vast majority of rites and sacrifices were conducted on the basis of "ancestral practice," κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[34] In fact, this phrase, as well as τὰ νομιζόμενα, "customary practices," are the closest equivalent in the Greek language to our word "ritual," the actual content and practice of religion.[35] The rites overseen by the archon basileus and polemarch, for example, were described simply as τὰ πάτρια.[36] Lysias' blistering speech against Nikomachos' law code revision in part centers around the fact that he has not restricted himself to the sacrifices performed κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, but instead has added recently introduced sacrifices and rites.[37] Rites conducted κατὰ τὰ πάτρια and τὰ νομιζόμενα held their own authority for the Athenians, an authority reinforced with every performance, and unassailable by the state or any other body.

Oracular deities were also seen by the Athenians as playing an important, and at times leading role in providing authority and guidance for ritual practice. In Plato's ideal city, Apollo at Delphi was to be the principal authority dealing with the founding of any sacrifices, sanctuaries, or funerary rites.[38] In a remarkable example, *IG* ii² 204, dated to 352/1, records a decision by the *Demos* concerning a sacred *orgas* that lay on the border with Megara. Into one tin was placed the written decision to till and build upon a particular piece of land, in another the decision to leave the land as it is. The tins were then placed in different jars, and placed on the Acropolis. A committee was then sent to Del-

---

34. Cf. Lys. 30.19: πῶς δ' ἄν τις εὐσεβέστερος γένοιτο ἐμοῦ, ὅστις ἀξιῶ πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια θύειν, ἔπειτα ἃ μᾶλλον συμφέρει τῇ πόλει, ἔτι δὲ ἃ ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσατο καὶ δυνησόμεθα δαπανᾶν ἐκ τῶν προσιόντων χρημάτων;

35. τὰ νομιζόμενα: Dem. 59.85. Cf. Kearns 1995, p. 522; Larson 2007, p. 5. There is no equivalent Greek word for "religion."

36. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.3, who describes the newer rites overseen by the eponymous archon as τὰ ἐπίθετα, "rites added on," i.e., rites introduced only recently. Often these rites were based on another form of authority, oracular, for which see below. Cf. 21.6, 57.1.

37. Lys. 30.18-19, who speaks both of τὰ πάτρια and αἱ πατρίαι θυσίαι. The client for whom he wrote this court speech is unknown.

38. Plat. *Rep.* 4.427b: τί οὖν, ἔφη, ἔτι ἂν ἡμῖν λοιπὸν τῆς νομοθεσίας εἴη;/ καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὅτι ἡμῖν μὲν οὐδέν, τῷ μέντοι Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖς τά γε μέγιστα καὶ κάλλιστα καὶ πρῶτα τῶν νομοθετημάτων./ τὰ ποῖα; ἦ δ' ὅς./ ἱερῶν τε ἱδρύσεις καὶ θυσίαι καὶ ἄλλαι θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων καὶ ἡρώων θεραπεῖαι: τελευτησάντων αὖ θῆκαι καὶ ὅσα τοῖς ἐκεῖ δεῖ ὑπηρετοῦντας ἵλεως αὐτοὺς ἔχειν.

phi to ask which jar to choose, thus rendering the decision the oracle's to make.[39] Near the end of the sixth century, the Pythia also famously chose the ten eponymous heroes for Kleisthenes' newly created tribes.[40] In light of the Delphic oracle's manifest religious authority throughout its history, this would have come as no surprise to Plato's readers.

Such authority was not without bounds, however. Delphic and other oracles generally only provided guidance when asked. Furthermore, oracular pronouncements, while sacrosanct, posed problems of interpretation. Such problems gave rise to a class of χρησμολόγοι and μάντεις, who offered advice on prophecies, signs of the gods, and oracles; as with ἐξηγηταί, however, their advice their advice formed an important reservoir of τὰ πάτρια, it held no official sanction, and their opinion could be ignored or overturned.[41]

To sum up, it was the gods themselves, together with ancestral custom, that the Athenians believed to be the principal sources of religious authority in Archaic and Classical Athens. Custom and deity sometimes functioned together to sanction, establish, and maintain religious practices and rites. At Eleusis, for example, sacrifices to the goddesses from the first fruits had to be conducted both κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, and in accordance with the oracle at Delphi.[42] As Plato writes in his *Laws*, no one in their right mind, including the ruler of a state, would ever attempt to change whatever the oracles or ancient tradition–παλαιοὶ λόγοι–has authorized, for this is the authority upon which sacrifices and rituals are based, as well as the sanctifying of statues, altars, temples, and *temene*.[43]

---

39. In the Archaic period, non-Athenian examples include the Delphic oracle directing Lycurgus and Alyattes to build temples; Lycurgus: Plut. *Lyc.* 6. Alyattes: Hdt. 1.19.3. At the beginning of the fourth century, the Pythia chose the land on which Xenophon would build a temple to Artemis at Skillous; cf. Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9.

40. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 21.6.

41. See, for example, Hdt. 7.143, for a famous example in which Themistokles' interpretation of the famed "wooden walls" oracle from Delphi was favored over the darker interpretation of the *chresmologoi*. On *chresmologoi* and *manteis* in general, see Fontenrose 1978, pp. 152-158; Garland 1984, pp. 113-114; Maurizio 1997; Bowden 2003; Dillery 2005.

42. *IG* i^3 78.4-5.

43. Pl. *Leg.* 5.738b-d: οὐδεὶς ἐπιχειρήσει κινεῖν νοῦν ἔχων ὅσα ἐκ Δελφῶν ἢ Δωδώνης ἢ παρ' Ἄμμωνος ἤ τινες ἔπεισαν παλαιοὶ λόγοι ὁπῃδή τινας πείσαντες, φασμάτων γενομένων ἢ ἐπιπνοίας λεχθείσης θεῶν, πείσαντες δὲ θυσίας τελεταῖς συμμείκτους κατεστήσαντο...καθιέρωσαν δὲ τοῖς τοιούτοις λόγοις φήμας τε καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ βωμοὺς καὶ ναούς, τεμένη τε τούτων ἑκάστοις ἐτεμένισαν: τούτων νομοθέτῃ τὸ σμικρότατον ἁπάντων οὐδὲν κινητέον...

An examination of control and power over religious practice, therefore, is to some degree an examination of the control and power over ancestral custom and oracles. Such power could be obtained and maintained in a variety of ways. One obvious way to control τὰ πάτρια was to establish and maintain the priesthoods of a particular sanctuary. Most studies of priesthoods tend to downplay the role of priesthoods in Athenian religion, viewing them as little more than minor administrative offices, impotent in the face of the state's religious authority.[44] Yet the authority and influence of priests and priestesses as custodians of local lore and tradition has been undervalued.[45] Though our evidence is incomplete, there is little doubt that by the Archaic period, many, if not most or all of the most important priesthoods were held by *gene*.[46] The ancestral laws that governed ritual or religious action at a sanctuary had been established and then performed

---

44. Feaver 1957, p. 124, finds priests "striking in their lack of importance for the history of religion," while for Garland 1984, p. 78, the "impotence of the priesthood contrasts sharply with the power of the demos, whose religious authority accumulated steadily as time passed". For Parker 2004a, p. 571, the "priesthood was in fact a kind of magistracy." See, however, Connelly 2007, pp. 197-221, who argues that the role of priestesses as "civic leaders with civic authority" has not been appreciated enough by modern scholars. Most such discussions are addressing priesthoods dating to the fifth and fourth centuries.

45. As noted, e.g., by Frost 1996; Connelly 2007, pp. 217-221.

46. Garland 1984, p. 77. That *gene* held a number of important priesthoods is confirmed by Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 21.6, where we learn that Kleisthenes allowed the *gene* and phratries to retain their priesthoods κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. For a list of priesthoods controlled by *gene*, many of which were among the most ancient and revered in Athens and Attica, cf. Garland 1984, pp. 83-111; Parker 1996, pp. 284-327. It seems all *gene* held at least some cultic responsibilities, but the exact nature of any other privileges it provided or expressed for its members in the Archaic period is much debated, as is the origin of this institution. Complicating our picture is the fact that most of our evidence for *gene* dates to the fourth century, when they had evolved into purely religious groups. The fullest picture of the religious duties of a *genos* can be seen in a series of three inscriptions concerning the Salaminioi, dating to the fourth and third centuries; see *IG* ii^2 1232 = *SEG* 21.527; Lambert 1997; Rhodes and Osborne 2003, no. 37. The Salaminioi had split into two *gene*, had their own *archontes*, displayed their decrees in the Eurysakeion and the Temple of Athena Skiras. Their religious duties included four priesthoods, and they were in charge of the festival of *Oschophoria*, associated with Athena Skiras. For more on the Salaminioi *gene*, see Ferguson 1938; Humphreys 1990a; Parker 1996, pp. 308-316; Lambert 1997; 1999. For general discussion of *gene* in the Archaic period, see Bourriot 1976; Roussel 1976, pp. 65-78; Kearns 1985, pp. 190-192; Parker 1996, pp. 56-66, 284-327; Lambert 1993, pp. 59-74; 1999.

and transmitted for generations within the same priesthood family or *genos*.[47] This was an unassailable authority. There is no record, in fact, of any priesthood being taken from a *genos*, nor any priesthood being forced to change its rituals to accommodate the desires of the state.[48] This explains why, for example, the rites to be conducted by the priestess of Athena Nike did not need to be legislated by the state when her funding was established by the polis. Worship of Athena Nike on the Athenian Acropolis dates to at least the first half of the sixth century.[49] The rites, therefore, were long established, and the newly instituted priestess in all likelihood conducted her office κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[50]

Priests held more than a knowledge of ritual, however. Many of the earliest traditions of Athens and all Greece were held in the collective memory of priests and priestesses. As a result, they were an important source of lore and tradition for visitors such as Pausanias and Herodotus.[51] Priesthoods also probably preserved the outlines of protohistory for their own communities; the tales of sacrilege during the Kylonian affair were in all likelihood preserved by the priesthoods of Athena Polias, Zeus Meilichios, and the

---

47. In cases where the proper manner to conduct a specific ritual was at issue, ἐξηγηταί, or ritual interpreters, could be consulted. Whatever advice they offered, however, was not enforced by an outside agency, state or otherwise, and their role in Athenian religion seems to have been quite limited. On the role of ἐξηγηταί in Athens, see Jacoby 1949, p. 45; Oliver 1950; Nilsson 1967, pp. 636-637, 864; Garland 1984, pp. 114-115; Humphreys 1988, p. 466; 1996, p. 93; Jameson 1999, p. 338.

48. In Plut. *Alk*. 22.4, we learn that the polis decreed that all Eleusinian priests and priestesses should curse Alkibiades. Even in this case, however, the state's authority was not absolute; the priestess Theano refused the order, saying she was a praying, not a cursing priestess.

49. As evidenced by an inscribed poros altar dedicated to the goddess Athena Nike, *IG* i^3 596; cf. Mark 1993, pp. 20-30, 66-67, 145, with bibliography.

50. This "democratic" priesthood in all likelihood took the place of a *genos* that had overseen the rites since the Archaic period. In my opinion, it is extremely unlikely–or at least unprecedented–that the state ever forcefully took a priesthood from a *genos* or family. More likely, the *genos* was no longer able to perform its duties, and so the state stepped in to care for this important sanctuary. Perhaps the *genos* suffered catastrophic losses in members and fortune during the plagues of the 430's and 420's, necessitating the state to assume its duties?

51. Hdt. 2.52-55, for example, gives a history of the Pelasgians and the early gods of Greece based in part on information from the priests of Zeus at Egyptian Thebes and the priestess of Dodona. Priests are also an important source for Pausanias (e.g., 1.22.3).

Furies, sanctuaries which all played a role.[52] As a result of this influence, these family priesthoods could also manipulate or control traditional history. One way would be to weave the ancestral customs and history of Athenian religion within the history of their own family or *genos*. One of the clearest examples are the Eumolpidai, whose eponymous ancestor, Eumolpos, was one of the early rulers of Eleusis to whom Demeter revealed how to conduct the Eleusinian rites and mysteries.[53] In some ways, these family histories and religious associations in the Archaic period *were* the religious history and ancestral past of the Athenians. This was not always a good thing for a family. The Alkmeonidai were associated by their enemies in the sixth and fifth centuries with the sacrilegious killing of Kylon's followers in the seventh century. Whether the tale was ultimately true or not, it offered a powerful weapon to drive out the "accursed" family on two occasions.[54]

In short, the testimony of the Athenians themselves shows that ritual was governed primarily by ancestral custom and the deities, especially oracles. As we shall see in the following pages, the custodians of ancestral custom from the Geometric through the Early Classical period were often the leading families of Athens and Attica, the most powerful of whom also contended through a claimed relationship with or interpretative ability of the will of the gods. This Athenian understanding of religious authority, however, only tells how ritual practices, and the parties that administered them, were deemed legitimate. To this let us add another dimension not directly addressed by the Athenians, although it was certainly experienced by them: the role of religious rituals themselves to *create* and *maintain* authority, power, and social structure.

3. Ritual and Order

While the socio-political role of sanctuaries is now taken for granted, rarely have scholars asked why this should have been the case, or exactly how sanctuaries and rituals *worked* socio-politically. It is difficult to answer this question based solely on the archaeological record. No burials, terracotta figurines, architectural blocks, or trays of pottery can reveal the full complexity of social order and power relations in Early Athens. We would be at a disadvantage even if the material remains of ritual had survived largely intact; much of ritual consists of acts that leave no trace in the material record, such as recitations, songs, and dances. Nor can we exclusively rely upon the much later testi-

---

52. Coup of Kylon: Hdt. 5.71; Thuc. 1.126; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1; Plut. *Sol.* 12; Paus. 28.1. The differing accounts of the coup recorded in these sources may be due in part to different accounts from the various priests of the sanctuaries involved; cf. Frost 1996, p. 85.

53. *Hymn. Hom. Dem.* 470-479.

54. For discussion of the Alkmeonidai and the curse, see Chapter Five, below.

mony of the Athenians themselves, who left no all-inclusive "handbook" to religious practice. In addition, the ancient accounts of Early Athenian religion that have survived–particularly with regard to the seventh century and earlier–were sometimes mythologized or idealized traditions constructed many centuries later.

Recent sociological and anthropological studies provide a useful approach to the question of the socio-political role of rituals. These studies have shown that at critical moments in a society's history, performances of religious ritual effected, shaped, and to a degree (re)created the social order and structure of communities in a way that met present realities.[55] In an attempt show that the new emerging social order was in harmony with the unchanging and given order of the cosmos, the new order was paradoxically reinforced by the authority that ritual performances inherently held by virtue of their status as "unchanging," traditional rites. As we discussed above, for the Athenians, the authority of τὰ πάτρια transcended time and history. These claims to tradition in fact allowed for the past to be refashioned so as to accommodate the present.[56]

In theory, changes in the socio-political organization and power relations of Early Athens–such as happened when the Peisistratidai assumed control of Athens, or Kleisthenes instituted his reforms–can be "read" in ritual activities, such as processions or sacrifices. Interpreting rituals is no small task, and pitfalls abound. To begin with, we must know what we are looking for. For example, if we are to claim that a particular set of rituals are associated with the formation, power, and structure of the state, rather than, say, a kin-based or other subgroup within or outside of the state, we need to know what "the state" is.

4. Polis, State, and *Ethnos*

---

55. Cf. the work of Bell 1992, 1997; Rappaport 1999. On the Greek world in particular, see, e.g., Kavoulaki 1999, p. 293: Greek processions can be seen as "occasions in which a culture or society reflects upon and defines itself, dramatizes collective myths and history, presents itself with alternatives, and eventually changes in some ways while remaining the same in others." Cf. Larson 2007, pp. 4-5.

56. See, e.g., Kowalzig 2007, who argues that a group could establish control over a sanctuary by arguing that their authority was based on long-standing rituals and myths, as she argues happened when the Argives took control of the Heraion. This refashioning of tradition is also clearly seen in late fifth-century Athens, when succeeding regimes based their legitimacy upon τὰ πάτρια, i.e., the political and religious traditions established by their forebears, principally Solon. Τὰ πάτρια, though ostensibly static and immutable, were in fact open to negotiation and manipulation. This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

When considering the processes that led to the emergence of the Athenian polis, we have two related questions to consider. First, when did the polis first emerge? Most archaeologists today argue that, based upon changes in the burial or sanctuary record, the Athenian polis emerged by the Late Geometric period.[57] Opinion is more divided over the second question: When did this polis incorporate all of Attica? According to Athenian tradition, the so-called synoikismos occurred in the Bronze Age, when Theseus merged all of the various magistracies and councils of Attica into one political center in Athens; as a result, all inhabitants of Attica were now enfranchised Athenian citizens.[58] There are five main views among modern archaeologists and historians, four of which are at some variance with the Athenian account: 1. The unification of Attica into the Athenian polis occurred during the Bronze Age, in accordance with the Athenian tradition;[59] 2. Attica was subsumed gradually within the polis by the Late Geometric period;[60] 3. the process of unification continued into the seventh century;[61] 4. the process was only completed with the reforms of Kleisthenes in the late sixth century;[62] or 5. there was no synoikismos; Attic communities were always part of the Athenian polis.[63]

In my view, the exclusive focus of modern scholars on the Athenian *polis* has obscured the role played by the Attic *ethnos* during the formation of the Athenian *state*. Though the study of ethnicity and *ethne* has attracted much attention recently, Athens

---

57. E.g., Polignac 1995, p. 85; Parker 1996, p. 25, based upon the establishment of "rural" Attic sanctuaries; Morris 1987; based upon mortuary evidence, though the same body of evidence suggests to him that this state failed in the seventh century. Cf. the similar sentiments of Osborne 1989; Whitley 1991, p. 58. Recently a number of historians have expressed doubts that there was an efficacious, centralized Athenian state before the sixth century; see Manville 1990, pp. 76-77; Fornara and Samons 1991, pp. 52-55; Anderson 2003, pp. 16-21; Frost 2005, pp. 27-40, 133-147.

58. Principal ancient sources: Thuc. 2.15; Isoc. 10.35; Plut. *Thes*. 24-25; Diod. 4.61.8. For collections of all the ancient testimony for the synoikismos, and synopses of the modern debate, see Moggi 1976, pp. 44-81; Parker 1996, pp. 11-17; Anderson 2003, pp. 14-42.

59. Padgug 1972.

60. Snodgrass 1977; Diamant 1982; Whitehead 1986, p. 9; Hornblower 1991, pp. 263-264.

61. Hignett 1952, pp. 35-37; Moggi 1976, p. 68.

62. Manville 1990; Anderson 2003, pp. 16-21; Frost 2005, pp. 27-40, 133-147.

63. Hansen and Nielsen 2004, pp. 624-625.

has usually been excluded from such "beyond the polis" discussions.[64] This is due to the modern notion that the polis and the *ethnos* are opposing categories of social order and identity.[65] This is a mistaken assumption. Πόλις and ἔθνος are not exclusive forms of order and identity. They are inextricably interconnected.

Let us first note that although a πόλις could be a "state"–most often in the sense of the citizen body, the political community, or the state apparatus–this was not its exclusive meaning in Greek. A "state" could include a number of dependent poleis.[66] The term πόλις could also be used apolitically to refer to a settlement in the physical sense, most often a settlement's acropolis, urban core, or territory.[67] Ἔθνος was an even more fluid category, used to identify any group of animals or people.[68] When applied to an Archaic or Classical community, an *ethnos* was either 1. a regional group of independent communities that shared an extra-familial identity often constructed around the notion of shared ancestry and traditions (i.e., Βοιωτοί or Φωκῆς); or 2. the members of a particu-

---

64. On ethnicity in ancient Greece, see, e.g., Morgan 1991; Hall 1997, 2002; McInerney 2001. For recent examples of regional studies, see Morgan 2003: Achaia, Aitolia, Phokis; Behrwald 2000: Lycia; McInerney 1999: Phokis; Hall 1995: Argos. Cf. the collected papers in Freitag et al. 2006, which mostly discuss sanctuaries organized at the ethnic or Panhellenic level.

65. As pointed out by Morgan 2003, pp. 4-10, most scholars view *ethne* as precursors or alternatives to polis-states. For this view, e.g., Sakellariou 1989; Snodgrass 1980, pp. 42-47. This is often based upon a misreading of Arist. *Pol.* 1326b: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ πόλις ἡ μὲν ἐξ ὀλίγων λίαν οὐκ αὐτάρκης (ἡ δὲ πόλις αὔταρκες), ἡ δὲ ἐκ πολλῶν ἄγαν ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις αὐτάρκης ὥσπερ <δ'> ἔθνος, ἀλλ' οὐ πόλις: πολιτείαν γὰρ οὐ ῥᾴδιον ὑπάρχειν: τίς γὰρ στρατηγὸς ἔσται τοῦ λίαν ὑπερβάλλοντος πλήθους, ἢ τίς κῆρυξ μὴ Στεντόρειος; Here he states that a πόλις that has too many people is not really a πόλις, but more like an ἔθνος that has trouble not only maintaining a unified government, but finding a general to lead such a mass of people to war. This passage is a discussion not of the definitive traits of any and every *ethnos*, but a quantitative distinction between one type of *ethnos* (regional) and a polis.

66. Cf. Thuc. 2.15.1-16.2, who describes some of the Attic communities that made up the Athenian polis as themselves poleis.

67. On the various uses of the term πόλις, see Hansen and Nielsen 2004, esp. pp. 12-46; Hansen 2006, pp. 56-61

68. Groups in general: Hom. *Il.* 13.495; recognized, named groups, such as Lycians: Hom. *Il.* 12.330; people who share a condition, like "the dead:" Hom. *Od.* 10.526; animals or birds: Hom. *Il.* 2.87; cf. Morgan 2003, pp. 8-9.

lar polis (i.e., Ἀθηναῖοι or Κορίνθιοι).[69] By the Classical period in Athens, the two categories of identity–membership in a polis-state and *ethnos*–were intrinsically linked and inseparable. The same cannot be said for the Iron Age and Archaic period.

To see how this is the case, let us be clearer about our definition of "state" and "*ethnos*." A fully formed, funtional state, as understood in this study, is the apparatus of centralized, political institutions that, at a minimum, act through a structured authority to 1. make decisions for, or settle disputes among, different members or groups; 2. defend the society militarily and impose obedience through force; 3. collect and distribute wealth and subsistence; and 4. maintain the emblems of state identity and social integration, including the maintenance and support of the religious rituals of the state.[70] With this definition in mind, it will become obvious that the formation of the Athenian state, both as it emerged in the *asty* and as it came to incorporate Attica, did not happen overnight; it was a non-linear, gradual process marked by competition and conflict, successes and setbacks. In addition, the four attributes listed above may not have become centralized at the same time, resulting in what may be considered a protostate.[71] For example, while the institution of archons dates at least to the seventh century, control of the military comes much later with the reforms of Kleisthenes.[72] As a result, it is a romantic, if not quixotic notion that we can identify the one moment in which the Athenian state arose fully formed.

This concept of the Athenian state, however, remains distinct from Athenian culture and society, i.e. *ethnos*. The Attic *ethnos* or society in this study refers to the communities that share an ethnic identity based upon their perceived traditions, heritage,

---

69. City-ethnics were commonly used in instances when it was necessary to distinguish a citizen of one polis from another, such as when a citizen traveled abroad on official missions; participated in games that were open to other citizens from a variety of other poleis; put up dedications in a sanctuary frequented by citizens from a variety of poleis; or when his name was recorded on official documents or inscriptions alongside citizens from other poleis. On the distinction between city-ethnics and regional ethnics, with citations and bibliography, cf. Hansen and Nielsen 2004, pp. 58-69, who have collected attestations of the use of city-ethnics from 738 different Archaic and Classical communities. For the rare instances in which an ethnic is used of a group within a region, cf., e.g., Thuc. 3.100.1 (Ἀποωτοί in Aitolia), 5.3.1. (Παρράσιοι in Arcadia).

70. Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1328b; Mann 1986; Yoffee 2005, pp. 16-17.

71. On the notion of protostates, cf. Runciman 1982.

72. The annual office of archon is usually assigned to ca. 682/1; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.1, 3; Cadoux 1948; Rhodes 1981, pp. 77-79, 97-101. Thuc. 1.126.8, for archons at the time of the Kylonian coup in the 630's, for which see Chapter Five. For more on the military before Kleisthenes, see Chapter Six.

values, culture, and concept of social order. In the archaeological record of Early Athens and Attica, this shared culture can be identified in the shared styles of pottery, burial, and votives found throughout Attica.[73]

State and *ethnos* are inextricably connected. States do not appear in a vacuum; they arise as a re-ordering and centralization of pre-existing, differentiated social and economic relationships, including kin-based structures, territorial organizations, economic groups, and a variety of other social groups that exist in an ethnically united society. On the other hand, a number of politically independent states may be part of the same culture or *ethnos*, consisting of a network of communities that share an identity and ideological framework that is expressed through a distinct literary, material, and ritual culture.

While most of the Attic communities of the Geometric or Archaic period shared the burial practices and pottery styles of Athenian culture and society, we will show in our study of rituals that not all Attic communities were initially part of the emerging "Athenian state," which arose first among the communities that made up the *asty* of Athens and its surrounding plain. Though there is no ancient testimony that speaks of an Attic *ethnos*, *per se*, such a picture accords with the Athenian tradition that before the synoikismos, Attica consisted of a number of independent poleis.[74] These independent poleis were ethnically united through a common ancestor, Kekrops, who, according to tradition, founded the twelve original Attic poleis.[75] As our study will show, this distinction between state and *ethnos* began to blur at an increased rate in the sixth century, when powerful families such as the Peisistratidai fused the political power of the state with social power within the *ethnos*, a process that in turn gradually created a stronger sense of unity and communal identity among the communities of Athens and Attica. This new socio-political reality set the stage for the Kleisthenic reforms and full, *de jure* integration of Attica within the Athenian polis-state.

5. State and Power

---

73. Though I call the *ethnos* "Attic," "Athenian" is just as appropriate, given the preeminent cultural role that Athens played in the *ethnos*.

74. In truth, the vast majority of Attic communities may not have even been evolved states with centralized institutions, but rather little more than small agricultural communities dominated by local aristocracies.

75. Str. *Geo*. 9.1.19-20. Cf. Hdt. 8.44.2; Thuc. 2.15.1; Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.14.1; Clem. Al. *Protr*. 3. The twelve original poleis are Kekropia (=Athens), Tetrapolis, Epakria, Dekeleia, Eleusis, Aphidna, Thorikos, Brauron, Kytheros, Sphettos, Kephisia.

Even when we are able to see a clear state apparatus over part or all of a society or *ethnos*, such as was the case after the reforms of Kleisthenes, the state was never the sole source of power and authority in society.[76] Athenian society was comprised of a complex network of hierarchies and power relationships, not all of which were incorporated or subsumed into the state apparatus. The three main forms of power we consider in this study are 1. economic, i.e., the possession and control of sources and distribution of wealth; 2. social, i.e., the prestige, honor, and status that a group of retainers or followers bestows upon an individual or family; and 3. political, which includes the command of an organizational order of any size that can be enforced through arms.[77] In order for the state to emerge, it had to assume these powers from local sources.

Athenian society consisted of a complex web of differentiated social roles and sources of authority and power, originally based largely on kinship and family groups. Lower-level, traditional arrangements that characterized the social and economic organization of local communities, such as systems of kinship ties in local production and distribution, did not disappear with the formation of the state; often, they were simply incorporated into the larger state institutions. Leaders of these groups could simultaneously hold political power in the form of offices of the state, while maintaining a social power, in the sense of social status, outside of the apparatus of state, attained by virtue of their authority and influence over local groups, as well as relations with distant relatives or peers outside of their local group. Wealth, as well, provided another form of power held by which different families or groups could gain primarily through agricultural or mercantile activity. All three sources of power–political, social, and economic–reinforced one another, and were often interlocking. The centralized order of the state does not emerge in a vacuum; it arises through the reformulation and reordering of the pre-existing, constitutive elements of a particular society's social order–i.e., the political, social, and economic power held by a great variety of differentiated groups within society.

6. Ritual Authority and the State

Religious power and authority is an expression of all three related sources of power. For the purposes of the present study, I define religious authority as the possession of recognized rights and prerogatives to 1) found a shrine or sanctuary; 2) hold a priest-

---

76. The distinction between the (governmental) state and American society and culture is often made today. "It is not Americans we hate," I have heard in my travels, "just the government and its foreign policy."

77. Runciman 1982, p. 361; Donlan 1997; Yoffee 2005, pp. 34-38. Mann 1986, distinguishes four decisive sources of power: ideological, economic, military, and political.

hood; 3) oversee the possessions of a sanctuary, such as sacred property and treasuries; 4) host ritual feasts; or 5) fund and lead communal performances, such as processions, games, and other competitive activities. This present study is particularly interested in *ritual* authority, that is, the authority over the "doing" or "performing" of religious activity.[78] Ritual was a means of performing the social order both within a community, and between the human and divine world in what amounted to a dramaturgy of power.[79] When successful, the actor could shape ritual performances to transform what might be a conventional or arbitrary claim to power–or prestige, influence, status, patronage–into what would now appear to be a sanctified power that fits naturally and necessarily into the group's perceived social order.[80] For example, the funding and conducting of a procession and festival both created and communicated the social power that a family or group held as the community's representative in sacred affairs, while simultaneously displaying their wealth. Authority established through ritual is difficult to threaten, for in the end any challenge to an actor's authority is ultimately a challenge of the social and even divine order.[81]

This approach to ritual, power, and authority leads to a few points of caution. The first is that while ritual activities may provide a clue to the social and power structures of a particular community at a particular time, we are denied access to the full range of ritual activity that took place in Early Athens. The content of rituals, as discussed above, often was not detailed in inscriptions or in any surviving testimony. As a result, though we may examine Early Athenian ritual as seen, for example, in the games and processions depicted on the prothesis pots of the Geometric period, our evidence will only provide but a glimpse into the full range of the ritual life of Early Athens. Second, while we accept as a fundamental principle that ritual performances reveal *social structure*, they

---

78. Throughout this study I use ritual exclusively in the sense of *religious* ritual. Ritual and religion are, of course, not the same. Modern graduation ceremonies, parades, and presidential inaugurations are just some examples of the many non-religious activities that have rituals associated with them; cf. Bell 1997, pp. 91-137, who discusses the many genres of ritual activities, religious and otherwise.

79. On the "dramaturgy of power," see Cohen 1981; Bell 1997, p. 130. For a summary of the intellectual history of performance theory, see especially Goldhill and Osborne 1999.

80. Rappaport 1976; Bell 1997, pp. 128-135.

81. In the words of Pocock 1964, p. 6, rituals, being non-verbal, "have no contraries. They can therefore be used to produce a harmony of wills and actions without provoking recalcitrance." As a result, "[w]hen one is playing one's role in a ritual, disturbing the harmony is nearly unthinkable, as unthinkable as a dancer suddenly deciding to move to a rhythm other than the one being played by the orchestra." Cf. Bell 1997, p. 135, who also cites this quote.

do not reveal all of *society*. The social structure that was performed at Athenian festivals displayed an imagined model of society that the leaders and participants wanted to project to themselves and to outsiders; a society's infrastructure–e.g., the every day, on-the-ground practical interactions among all the metics, slaves, foreigners, and citizens in Athens–may at times have been at greater or lesser variance with the imagined social order of the community.[82]

On a related point, ritual performances at times expressed competing visions of social order and power. For example, Peisistratos' return to Athens from his first exile in the 550's was famously accomplished through a ritual procession to the Acropolis.[83] The procession, led also by Peisistratos' then ally Megakles, displayed and reinforced a new power dynamic in Athens, reinforced by the participation and support of Peisistratos' powerful ally Megakles, as well as the goddess herself, "Athena." We should suspect, however, that this performance, alone, did not sufficiently convince all the citizens that Peisistratos belonged in Athens; although the ritual drama was a success, Peisistratos' return from exile was short-lived.[84]

With these caveats in mind, it is possible, however, to discern milestones and significant events that paved the way for the eventual emergence of a new, larger structure and idealogy of order: the Athenian state. In this study, we examine the accomplishment and expression of these milestones in ritual performances, which served to fashion a coherent and ordered community, and allowed those claiming power to demonstrate how their interests accord with this imagined community.

The evidence is discussed in chronological order. Part One focuses upon the Geometric Period and seventh century in Early Athens. In Chapter Two, we explore the ways in which the games and processions that accompanied the ostentatious burials of the wealthy of this period were one of the principal ways in which a community formed its identity, and a family reinforced its status in the Geometric period. In Chapter Three, we examine the locus of religious authority outside of the world of the dead during the Geometric period. In Chapter Four, we discuss the relationship between the decline of funerary ritual and the rise of sanctuary activity in the seventh century. Here it will be shown that the rituals that formed communal and familial identity at funerals, such as games and processions, were transferred to sanctuaries, as was the authority over religious practice that powerful families possessed.

Part Two examines our evidence for private initiative in the historical period of Early Athens. In Chapter Five, we explore the location of religious authority in the period

---

82. On this point, see especially Bloch 1977.

83. Hdt. 1.60.2-5; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14.4; Clidemus *FGrH* 323; Polyaenus *Strat.* 1.21.1; Athen. 13.609.

84. For more on this episode, see Chapter Six.

ca. 640-594, a period that begins with the coup of Kylon and ends with the reforms of Solon. Our discussion in Chapter Six examines our evidence for aristocratic control of religious practice under the Peisistratid tyranny of the sixth century. In Chapter Seven we analyze the role of private initiative as the state began to assume more authority over religious practice with the rise of the early democracy. In support of the arguments laid out in these chapters, a series of appendices have been provided. Appendix 1 provides a detailed catalogue of Attic sanctuaries and shrines; Appendix 2 explores our evidence for "hero" and "ancestor" shrines; Appendix 3 discusses the relationship of the first deity sanctuaries with agrarian concerns. Finally, a series of detailed charts of votive types found at sanctuaries of the Geometric period and seventh century is provided in Appendix 4.

PART ONE:
RITUAL AND AUTHORITY IN EARLY ATHENS, CA. 1000-640

Chapter Two: Mortuary Ritual in the Iron Age

1. Introduction

Athenian writers of later periods had little sense of the religious practices of their pre-Archaic ancestors; nor do we have much in the way of contemporary accounts aside from brief dedicatory inscriptions. Any current account of Athenian religious practice in the Geometric period is therefore of necessity based mostly on archaeological evidence. For the last several decades, the prevailing narrative among archaeologists has tended to privilege the Athenian state's role in the founding of sanctuaries. This theory arises from a general tendency to attribute any dramatic changes in the archaeological record to the "rise of the polis". It is commonly thought, for example, that the increase in Attic sanctuaries and shrines during the Late Geometric period was part of a wider phenomenon during the Late Geometric period of nascent poleis strengthening or establishing their territory claims through the establishment of "rural" sanctuaries.[85] Such a model is difficult to apply universally, and has encountered many objections.[86] Changes in the burial record, our primary source of information on the Geometric period, are similarly interpreted within the context of this purported rise or dissolution of the Athenian polis.[87] Locating exactly when the polis was rising, so to speak, depends on which body of evidence archaeologists choose to follow. The burial record, for example, reaches its Iron Age peak in the Late Geometric period, a phenomenon interpreted as evidence for the formation of the polis; it is its bleakest in the seventh century, a change interpreted as a sign of depopulation and a return to a pre-political world in the seventh century.[88] At just the moment that the burial record becomes particularly bleak, however, there is a dramatic increase in activity at sanctuaries and shrines, a sign for some of polis expan-

---

85. Polignac 1995, p. 85; Parker 1996, p. 25.

86. For criticisms of this approach, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1993; the collected papers of Alcock and Osborne 1994; Hall 1995.

87. E.g., Morris 1987.

88. This theory, advocated by Morris 1987, known as the Saxe-Binford approach, basically states that as a community's socio-political organization becomes more complex, so too does its mortuary practice; see Saxe 1970; Binford 1971; Goldstein 1980; Rakita and Buikstra 2005.

sion into the countryside. The two phenomena, considered on their own, seem to indicate different trajectories of the Athenian polis.

The archaeological record is not to blame for this contradiction. It is, rather, the insistence on finding within the archaeological record the "polis," and according agency to this mythical entity. Both bodies of archaeological evidence, the mortuary and the sanctuary, must be read together to construct a coherent backdrop to the ritual life of early Athens and Attica. Both phenomena reveal much about collective ritual, recording aspects of not only how communities formed their identities, but how authority over those communities was created and maintained by powerful families in the same ritual act. In this chapter, I argue that these rituals were most prominent at the side of wealthy burials during most of the Geometric period. In Chapter Three, we follow up this discussion with a review the evidence for the religious authority of community leaders in Geometric Athens.

2. Summary of the Mortuary Record

2.1. Submycenaean (1100-1050)

A large Submycenaean burial ground is located at the Pompeion in the Kerameikos, where over one hundred burials have been discovered. Smaller groups of around ten or less have been found in the Athenian Agora and a handful of other locations around Athens, including on the Acropolis.[89] On the nearby island of Salamis, a cemetery of around one hundred burials has been excavated. Both the size of the Salamis cemetery and the published pottery closely parallels the contemporary cemetery at the Kerameikos.[90] Outside of Athens and Salamis, Attica appears a blank in this period.[91]

---

89. Whitley 1991, pp. 87-97, 201; Morris 1987, p. 64, 218, fig. 17a.

90. Wide 1910; Styrenius 1962; Morris 1987, pp. 76-78. The similarities between the cemeteries at Salamis and Athens indicate for some that Salamis was "Athenian"; see, for example, Whitley 1991, p. 55; Osborne 1994, pp. 156-157. Though generally similar, there are some distinctions between the cemeteries. At the Kerameikos, for example, inhumations are usually supine, those at Salamis flexed.

91. It is interesting to note that some ancient sources (e.g., Diog. 1.46; Diod. Sic. 9.1.1; Paus 1.40.5) record that Athenians had once lived on the island, and had abandoned it at some point before Solon–who himself was rumored to have been born there–reopened hostilities with Megara for control.

Typical burial practice consisted of inhumations within cist graves, with few grave goods.[92] A full age range is represented in the burials, from adult to child, though there is a tendency for adults and children to be buried separately.[93] In Athens, the wealthiest graves are marked with modest numbers of metal items, mostly jewelry or pins of gold, bronze and iron. The wealthier graves, both in terms of metal objects and number of objects per graves, tend to be female.[94]

2.2. Protogeometric (1050-900)

In the Protogeometric period, graves appear in numerous areas around Athens, including at the Kerameikos, the Athenian Agora, and south of the Acropolis.[95] In Attica, graves appear in Anavyssos, Eleusis, Marathon, Merenda, Menidhi, and Nea Ionia.[96] Graves disappear, however, from the Athenian Acropolis and Salamis.

In addition to greater visibility of the dead outside of Athens, the Protogeometric period marks a dramatic change in burial practice. Inhumation is replaced with secondary cremation burials for adults. The cremated remains are now usually deposited within neck-handled amphorae for men, belly-handled amphorae for women. Burial architecture changes to accommodate this new practice. Funerary urns are now placed within a cutting in the middle of a trench, which are then filled in by pyre debris and earth. By Late Protogeometric, the earliest surviving grave markers begin to appear.[97]

---

92. Morris 1987, p. 18.

93. Morris 1987, pp. 77, 218. Burials groups found at Kriezi Street and Erechtheiou Street consist of twelve and nine adults, respectively. On the Athenian Acropolis, there are twelve children's graves but only one adult; cf. the burial plot on the Kolonos Agoraios, where two-thirds of burials are children.

94. Strömberg 1993, pp. 41-43, 52-53, 60-63, who calculates an average of two items per male burial, 5.3 per female burial. Cf. Whitley 1991, pp. 85-97; Ruppenstein 1999.

95. Whitley 1991, pp. 201-202, for grave index and bibliography; cf. Morris 1987, p. 64, fig. 17b.

96. Morris 1987, pp. 68-69; Whitley 1991, pp. 55, 199; Lemos 2002, pp. 135, 152-135, 157.

97. E.g., Kerameikos graves P37 and P38, both female, appear to have been marked by a belly-handled amphora. See Kübler 1943, pp. 38-39. By the Late Protogeometric period, there is a tendency for the funerary urn to be placed within a cutting at one end of the trench, rather than at the center; cf. Morris 1987, pp. 18-20, fig. 7. For cross-sections of typical Submycenaean, Protogeometric, and Geometric grave types, see Snodgrass 1971, p. 149, fig. 59.

A full age range is still apparent among Protogeometric burials, though there is a tendency to bury adults and children in separate areas.[98] Items included within Protogeometric graves become more numerous and diverse than seen in the Submycenaean period. Though rare, depictions of horses are found on some amphorae, the earliest figures on Iron Age pottery found to date.[99]

A gendered distribution of grave goods now becomes more pronounced among some of the more extravagant burials. Ostentatious male graves now sometimes include weapons, such as arrowheads, knives, spearheads, swords, and shield buckles. Extravagant female graves are marked by the inclusion of clay tripods, cauldrons, clay chests, spindle whorls, terracotta figurines, pins, and a number of pottery shapes found only or primarily with women, such as kalathoi and Handmade Attic Dark Age incised ware.[100] The wealthiest graves, both in terms of quantity and quality of the burial package, continue to be female, who receive almost three times the number of items as men do.[101]

2.3. Early Geometric (900-850) to Middle Geometric I (850-800)

During the ninth century, Early Geometric and Middle Geometric I, burials are found at a similar number and distribution of sites as found in the Protogeometric period. The major cemeteries in Athens are found at the Kerameikos, and the north slope of the Areopagus. In Attica, Early and Middle Geometric I burials are found together at Anavyssos, Eleusis, Marathon, Merenda, Palaia Kokkinia, and Thorikos.[102]

---

98. This practice is not uniform. Burials from the Kerameikos and Erechthiou Street are mostly adult, while those on Kolonos Agoraios and the Nymphaeum are mostly children. Burials from the Athenian Agora, however, remain mixed in age groups; Morris 1987, p. 218.

99. Kübler 1943, pl. 27. The images are usually individual horses in profile.

100. Handmade Attic Dark Age (ADA) incised ware appear almost exclusively in wealthy adult female cremation burials, the only exception being a handful of graves of children of unknown gender. Shapes include dolls, pyxides, bowls, beads, and whorls in the Protogeometric period. In the Early Geometric period pointed pyxides, tripods, and granaries also appear. Their shape is influenced by similar items in more perishable material, such as wood or woven baskets. Smithson 1961, pp. 170-172; Bouzek 1974; Reber 1991, pp. 118-139; Strömberg 1993, pp. 97-99, fig. 15; Coldstream 2003, pp. 29-30.

101. 9.1 to 3.9 items per burial on average, respectively; see Strömberg 1993, pp. 44-46, 54-55; Whitley 1991, pp. 112-113. For two particularly wealthy female graves from the Kerameikos, each with over fifty items deposited within the grave, see Kübler 1943, pp. 39-41, 46-47, graves 39, 48; cf. Whitley 1991, p. 155.

102. Morris 1987, pp. 64, 79-81, 218-219, fig. 17c; Whitley 1991, pp. 55, 199, 202-55, 199, 203.

Burial architecture remains essentially as it was in the Late Protogeometric period.[103] Some families, however, experimented with alternative burial practices beginning in the Middle Geometric I period. One family in Athens, for example, practiced primary cremation, in which the remains are cremated *in situ*, the remains of which were swept directly into the trench.[104] This family plot also held the first inhumation found since the Submycenaean period.[105]

A more dramatic shift can be seen in who receives formal—or at least archaeologically visible—burials. Burials of children become rare in the archaeological record beginning in the Early Geometric period.[106] Poor adult burials, at least as defined as graves few or no grave offerings, disappear altogether.[107] Indeed, the wealthiest graves ever recovered in Athens and Attica date to the Early and Middle Geometric periods. For males, the Early Geometric period marks the rise in the so-called "Warrior Grave," in which an array of weapons is buried along with the cremated remains of a male, including swords, knives, or spearheads. In some cases, the sword was "killed," or curled before interment. The "Areopagus Warrior's Grave," for example, held a "killed sword,"

---

103. There are some minor differences in grave architecture, such as the depth at which the funerary urn was sunk into its pit at the bottom of the trench. For these and other minor differences, see Krause 1975, pp. 87-93.

104. This family buried their kin along the north slope of the Areopagus in the so-called Areopagus Geometric Lot. For primary cremations, see graves I 18:2 and 18:3, Smithson 1974, pp. 332-333, 359-363. She dates both burials to Middle Geometric I. Cf. Coldstream 2003, p. 81. Other primary cremations are near this plot, also along the north slope of the Areopagus; see Graves AR II, III/IV, and V in Smithson 1974, pp. 330-349.

105. Grave I 18:1, Smithson 1974, pp. 331, 352-331, 359. Though only partially preserved, it appears to have been a female, and among the richest burials of the period.

106. On the rarity of child burials beginning in the Early Geometric period, see Burr 1933, pp. 552-554; Smithson 1974, pp. 372-374; Morris 1987, pp. 61-62, 218-219, figs. 16, 21; Whitley 1991, p. 116; Coldstream 2003, p. 30.

107. In contrast with the previous periods, all undisturbed ninth century graves have at least some offerings. Krause 1975, p. 86.

two knives, two spearheads, a whetstone, and an axe or chisel; other metal objects included horse bits and a chisel.[108]

The most ostentatious graves were female, whose burial package now commonly included model granaries, clay boots, and seals, all items absent from male burials.[109] Perhaps the richest of all burials in Athens or Attica, that of the so-called "Rich Athenian Lady," dates to ca. 850, the transition from the Early Geometric into the Middle Geometric.[110]

Markers become more routinely placed over graves in the Early and Middle Geometric I, usually in the form of stone stelai or clay vessels. These pots were usually a krater for men, an amphora for a woman, which were usually aligned directly above the ash urn below.[111] The monumentality of some of the kraters of these periods precludes the possibility of a previous domestic function, suggesting that for the first time, potters were now fashioning vessels for specific use as graves markers.[112] Some of the kraters have been found pierced at the bottom. For some, these holes facilitated libations

---

108. Athenian Agora deposit D 16:4; Blegen 1952. For similar burials, see Kerameikos graves G2, G38, and G74, in Kübler 1954, pp. 210-212, 234-235, 260-261; Coldstream 2003, pp. 30-32. "Killed swords" are often thought to have been bent to prohibit its use after interment. We should note, however, that all "killed swords" have been found within urn holes, which Smithson 1974, p. 341, believes "suggests the obvious, that only by breaking or bending a meter-long sword could it be fitted into such cramped quarters." The inclusion of weapons often draws the attention of modern scholarship, though it should be noted that they were never a common burial item during the Iron Age. Weapons are found in only about five percent of male graves dating to the Protogeometric and Geometric periods, and no body armor or helmets have ever been found in Athens or Attica; see Strömberg 1993, pp. 81-83.

109. Whitley 1991, p. 131.

110. Grave deposit H 16:6; Smithson 1968; Liston and Papadopoulos 2004. Her burial is close to other notable Middle Geometric female burials on the Areopagus slope, such as Grave I 18:1, and grave deposit D 16:2 ("The Boots Graves"); see Smithson 1974, pp. 352-359 and Young 1949, respectively. In the Kerameikos, cf. graves G41-G43, Kübler 1954, pp. 235-239.

111. Strömberg 1993, p. 81.

112. Krause 1975, p. 88; Morris 1987, p. 151; Whitley 1991, pp. 116-117, 141; Houby-Nielson 1996, p. 42; Coldstream 2003, p. 33.

poured from above to pass through to the grave.[113] More likely, the holes allowed either for the krater to be more securely set within the ground, or allowed for rain water to drain out of the krater.[114]

2.4. Middle Geometric II (800-760) and Late Geometric I (760-735)

In the first half of the eighth century, Middle Geometric II to Late Geometric I, the general distribution of grave sites remains the same, with a slight increase in the number of sites in Attica. Burials are now found at Athens, Eleusis, Marathon, Thorikos, Anavyssos, Merenda, Menidhi, Markopoulo, Kallithea, and Argyropoulis.[115]

Though cremation remains the norm, adult inhumations—all apparently wealthy females—are now found among Middle Geometric II cemeteries in Attica.[116] Along with the re-introduction of inhumation, burial architecture also changes. Trench-and-hole graves disappear, replaced by a simple rectangular trench for both cremations and inhumations, covered with stone slabs. Variations with cremation graves, themselves, include the occasional use of bronze cauldrons or lebes in place of a clay ash urn.[117] Funerary gifts are essentially identical in cremation and inhumation burials. Amphorae, covered with a drinking vessel, on analogy with cremation urn burials, are placed with the inhumed.[118] The graves continue to be marked by stone stele, as well as amphorae for women, or kraters for men.

---

113. The earliest pierced krater designed specifically as a grave memorial is grave G2 in the Kerameikos, Kübler 1954, pp. 210-212, pl. 17, dated Early Geometric II. Pierced kraters are often interpreted as offering our earliest secure evidence for repeated ritual or cultic activity at the site of individual graves. Kübler 1954, pp. 19-36, for example, dates the advent of *Totenkult* to the Early Geometric period; cf. Coldstream 1968, pp. 349-350, who refers to monumental grave markers as "libation vases".

114. Kurtz and Boardman 1971, pp. 57-58; Boardman 1988, p. 176.

115. Morris 1987, pp. 79-80, 218-219; Whitley 1991, pp. 55-57, 199-200, 203-204.

116. Grave Alpha and the Isis grave from Eleusis, both female, are usually dated to the Middle Geometric II, for which see Skias 1898, pp. 103-107; Whitley 1991, p. 199; Coldstream 2003, pp. 80-81. Young 1939, pp. 234-236, prefers a Late Geometric date for these Eleusis burials. On the re-introduction of inhumations in the Middle Geometric period, see Kübler 1954, p. 8; Cavanagh 1977, p. 345; Smithson 1974, p. 331; Whitley 1991, pp. 137-138.

117. See, for example, Kerameikos graves G 71 and G 72, Kübler 1954, pp. 258-260.

118. Smithson 1974, p. 331; Whitley 1991, pp. 137-138.

Middle Geometric II marks the introduction of the prothesis scene on krater.[119] By Late Geometric I, workshops, most notably that of the Dipylon Master, specialized in monumental amphorae and kraters that marked wealthy burials in the Kerameikos, often painted with prothesis and ekphora scenes.[120] These monumental figured kraters are rarely found outside the Kerameikos in the Late Geometric I period.[121]

Beginning in the Middle Geometric II period and continuing into Late Geometric I, however, the wealthiest burials in terms of both the quality and quantity of grave goods are found not in Athens, but in Attica, at sites such as Eleusis and Anavyssos.[122] This is particularly true of wealthy female graves, which contain a vast array of offerings, including jewelry of gold and other metals, kalathoi, clay balls, and the last appearance of model granaries, ADA incised ware, and seals.

2.5. Late Geometric II (735-700)

In the late eighth century, there is a striking rise in sites with mortuary evidence. In addition to the continued activity at the sites that date to the first half of the eighth century, there is evidence for burials at nearly twenty more sites, resulting in a nearly threefold increase in sites with graves.[123] The total number of graves in Attic now outnumber graves in Athens for the first time. In addition, while a few of these new sites can be

---

119. New York 34.11.2; Ahlberg 1971, pp. 23-25, fig. 1.

120. Davison 1961, pp. 21-34; Coldstream 1968, pp. 29-41; 2003, pp. 110-114; Ahlberg 1971, pp. 25-26. More than half of all surviving monumental pots that served as grave markers date to Late Geometric I; see Coldstream 1968, p. 350.

121. Coldstream 2003, p. 133. Fragments of a monumental prothesis amphora attributed to the Dipylon Master have been found within an Archaic storage pit or well south of Kolonos Agoraios in the Athenian Agora. See Brann 1962, p. 31, 59, nos. 1, 245, pls. 1, 14, who believes that the vessel must have been transported from some other location, likely the Kerameikos.

122. For example, see at Eleusis, see the Isis graves and Grave Alpha, Skias 1898, pp. 103-107. At Anavyssos, see graves 2 and 51; Davaras and Verdeles 1966, pp. 97-98; Themelis 1973, pp. 109-110.

123. Snodgrass 1980, p. 23, estimates that "in the space of two thirty-four year generations, between about 780 and 720 BC, the population may have multiplied itself by a factor of approximately seven"; cf. 1977 1983. In calculating his numbers, Snodgrass combines Late Geometric I and II. While there is a slight increase in burial visibility in Late Geometric I, the dramatic rise in burials is a Late Geometric II phenomenon, which has double the graves of Late Geometric I, and a four-fold increase in Attica. Cf. Morris 1987, pp. 219.

found along the Attic coastline, where the majority of new sites were found in previous periods, the majority of new Late Geometric II sites are located inland, specifically in the Athenian and Mesogeion plains.[124] At least half of these sites are located at the outskirts of these plains, along routes that led into and out of agricultural plains.[125]

The Late Geometric II period marks a nearly complete transition from cremation to inhumation.[126] Children's graves, generally absent from the archaeological record since the Early Geometric period, reappear in large numbers, usually as inhumations within amphorae, hydriae, and other such large vessels. By the end of the Late Geometric period, some cemeteries in Attica transition from adult or mixed burials to almost exclusively children's burials.[127]

Another tendency of this period is the abandonment of grave markers, a process that appears to begin in Athens, followed closely by other sites in Attica.[128] The latest kraters to be used as grave markers at the end of the Late Geometric II period come from Trachones, Thorikos, Merenda and Brauron.[129] Prothesis and ekphora scenes remain popular on funerary pottery within the Kerameikos, and for the first time begin to appear out of the cemetery, both in Athens and at other sites in Attica, such as Thorikos and Myrrhinous.[130] With the abandonment of grave markers, these prothesis and ekpho-

---

124. New sites along the western coast: Phaleron, Trachones, Helleniko, Aliki Glyphada, Vouliagmeni. New sites within the Athenian plain: Aigaleos, Analatos, Boyati (Oion), Kephissia, Ayia Paraskeve, Liossia, and Koukouvaones. New sites within the Mesogeia plain: Draphi, Spata, Koropi, Kalyvia. The remaining new sites include Vari, located south of the Athenian plain; Nea Makri, located north of the Mesogeion plain; and Keratea and Kaki Thalassa in southeastern Attica. Coldstream 1968, pp. 360, 399-360, 403; Morris 1987, p. 66, fig. 18b, pp. 156-158, fig. 54; Whitley 1991, pp. 57-61, 199, 200-201, 204-205.

125. New settlements located at or near points of entry and exit into agricultural plains: Aigaleos, Ayia Paraskeve, Liossia, Koukouvaones in the west; Nea Makri, Draphi, Koropi, and Kalyvia in the east; and Vari and Keratea to the south. The sites of Markopoulo and Menidhi, the earliest burials of which are dated Late Geometric I, may also be part of the same settlement pattern.

126. The few cremations that do continue are now exclusively placed within bronze cauldrons; see Whitley 1991, p. 163.

127. Morris 1987, pp. 82-85, 122-129, 219.

128. Coldstream 1968, p. 86; Whitley 1991, p. 163; Morris 1987, pp. 151-152.

129. Coldstream 2003, p. 133.

130. Thorikos: Bingen et al. 1967b, p. 43, fig. 49; Ahlberg 1971, no. 30. Myrrhinous: Orlandini 1960, pp. 35-37, fig. 48; Ahlberg 1971, no. 35.

ra scenes now decorate smaller vessels, typically amphorae, oinochoai, and pitchers, that are interred with the body out of public view.[131] Chariot scenes and lines of warriors are still common on prothesis vessels of this period, though scenes of active battles on land, and all images of ships, common in Late Geometric I monumental funerary markers, are now absent.[132] By Late Geometric IIb, it is common for plastic snakes to be applied to the rims, bodies, and handles of funerary amphorae with prothesis and ekphora scenes.[133] The snakes around the rim effectively render the amphorae useless outside of funerary ritual, again an indication that they were produced specifically for the grave.

Weapons such as swords and spearheads are altogether absent from Late Geometric II burials.[134] Metal in general is less commonly placed with the dead, and generally restricted to common domestic items, such as rings and fibulae. Interred pottery follows much the same pattern, tending to represent varied household vessels primarily associated with drinking, such as oinochoai, jugs, kantharoi, and skyphoi.[135] On the whole, the quality and quantity of grave goods diminishes. As with previous periods, the most elab-

---

131. Ahlberg 1971, pp. 27-28; Whitley 1991, pp. 164-165. For a prothesis amphora smashed on an offering pyre, see Grave XII in the Tholos Cemetery; Young 1939, pp. 55-57, no. XII 1, figs. 37-38.

132. Coldstream 1968, p. 350; 2003, p. 135.

133. Coldstream 2003, pp. 117-118, 133; cf. 1968, pp. 44, 56-57, 60, 68, 79, 82. The application of plastic snakes is anticipated in rare examples from the Late Geometric Ib period, when snakes are occasionally found on the handles of funerary amphorae (Davison 1961, figs. 17, 28), and the Late Geometric IIa period, where a snake along the rim of an amphora is first found (Ahlberg 1971, no. 31, fig. 31). In Late Geometric IIb, however, plastic snakes are common on funerary amphorae with prothesis and ekphora scenes. See, for example, Ahlberg 1971, no. 33, fig. 33, no. 36, fig. 36, no. 37, fig. 37, no. 40, fig. 40, no. 41, fig. 41, no. 43, fig. 43, no. 46, fig. 46, fig. 58-60. Snakes also occasionally appear on the lips of bowls; see, for example, the Late Geometric IIb remains from the offerings pyres for Graves XI and XII, from the Tholos Cemetery in the Athenian Agora; Young 1939, p. 52, no. XI 10, fig. 35, pp. 56-58, nos. XII 1-3, figs. 37-39.

134. Morris 1987, pp. 147-151, figs. 52-53; Whitley 1991, pp. 165-166, 183, table 11.

135. Outside of prothesis pots, the only interred wares made especially for the grave, based on their absence in other contexts, are pyxides, pitchers, and high-rimmed bowls. As a whole, Late Geometric II graves include less wares made especially for the graves. See Whitley 1991, pp. 178.

orate graves, in terms of the number of items interred with the deceased, remains female.[136]

Although these new tendencies in burial practice are fairly widespread, Late Geometric II burials exhibit a greater level of variation among contemporary burial practice than found in previous periods. In the Athenian Agora, pit and cist inhumations occur side-by-side; on Erechtheiou Street primary and secondary cremation burials occur side-by-side; cremation burials placed within amphorae, now laid on their side, are found at Eleusis, Anavyssos, the Academy, and Trachones; at Merenda, inhumations within both pits and cists, and cremations, both primary and secondary, are all found to be contemporary.[137] In other words, burial customs appear to have been less restrictive in Late Geometric II than at any other time in the Iron Age.

Some of these variations anticipated practices that would become more widespread in the seventh century. For example, *Opferrinnen*, or offering trenches, a common feature in seventh-century burials, first appear in Late Geometric II.[138] An associated feature is the "sacrificial pyre," found with two inhumations dating to the end of the Late Geometric in the Athenian Agora, and with one inhumation in the Kerameikos.[139] Included among the Athenian Agora pyre deposits were a number of free-standing terracotta figurines, both human and animal, objects rare within Iron Age graves.[140]

---

136. Whitley 1991, pp. 170, 179. See, for example, "Dipylon" grave 13, which held numerous pottery vessels, faience figurines, and five ivory figurines, representing the Syrian goddess Astarte; cf. Brückner and Pernice 1893, pp. 127-131; Coldstream 2003, pp. 130-132. Among the twenty Late Geometric burials interred within the "Tholos Cemetery," the wealthiest grave, Grave XVII, is female. It contains twenty-two pots, iron jewelry, and bits of bronze. See Young 1939, pp. 6-138; Brann 1962, pp. 111-112; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 11, 15-11, 16; Morris 1987, pp. 126-127; Whitley 1991, p. 65. Other examples of wealthy female burials include grave Vdak1 from the Kerameikos, Freytag 1974; and a wealthy grave from Erechtheion Street, Brouskari 1979.

137. Morris 1995.

138. Cf. *Ofperrinnen* 1 and 2 in the Kerameikos, and a *Brandschicht* over Grave 51; Kübler 1954, pls. 39-40, 132-138.

139. "Pyre deposits" from Graves XI and XII in the "Tholos Cemetery" from the Athenian Agora, are dated to ca. 700, or the Subgeometric period, by Young 1939, pp. 44-67; dated to the last quarter of the eighth century by Brann 1962, p. 128, deposits G 12:19, G 12:24; and dated to the end of the Late Geometric by Whitley 1991, pp. 178, 204, who considers both *Ofperrinne* deposits.

140. Graves XI has two mourning figures. Grave XII has an unparalleled array of terracotta figurines, which include at least four seated figures, three dogs, a charioteer, a bird, and a horse. See Young 1939, figs. 35-36, 40-42.

2.6. Seventh Century

With the close of the Late Geometric II period, the number of sites with burial evidence drops dramatically, reaching approximately the same number as was seen in the Middle Geometric and Late Geometric I periods.[141] Within Athens, seventh-century burials at the Athenian Agora are restricted to two urn burials of children within the "Tholos Cemetery."[142] At the Kerameikos, burials drop by half compared with the Late Geometric period.[143] Outside of Athens, the reduction in the number of sites with burials is accompanied by a marked decrease in the number and size of cemetery or grave plots within a given site.[144]

---

141. Secure cemetery evidence is found at at least thirteen sites outside of Athens; about half of all sites with burial evidence are located in the Mesogeion plain. West coast: Phaleron, Trachones. Athenian plain: Tavros. Mesogeion Plain: Draphi, Spata, Kalyvia, Vourva, Valenidesa, and Merenda. Other sites: Eleusis, Marathon, Thorikos, and Vari. Of these sites, only Vourva and Valenidesa are new. For more, see Morris 1987, pp. 73, 85-86, 128-131, 134-137, 157, 220, figs. 18b, 22, 54; 1995; Osborne 1989; Houby-Nielson 1992. For a catalogue and bibliography of sites in Athens and Attica with seventh-century material, see Whitley 1994a, pp. 68-70; D'Onofrio 1997, pp. 79-84.

142. Young 1939, pp. 11, 21-44. An early seventh-century adult inhumation has also been identified within the Agora Archaic Cemetery, less than two hundred meters to the south; see Young 1951, pp. 85-86, grave no. 2. Brann 1962, p. 125, deposit B 21:10, however, dates the burial to the late eighth century.

143. Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 345, table 1, records seventy graves for the entire Late Geometric period; thirty five for the first half of the seventh century; twenty-nine for the second half of the seventh.

144. While problems plague the identification of grave sites in the Geometric period, the identification of seventh-century grave sites has been particularly contentious. One reason is that many sites are identified on the basis of scant pottery recovered from a site and presumed by some to be funerary, though they are found away from any grave. In addition, a number of graves presumed to date to the seventh century contain no burial goods at all, leading to debates over identification. As a result, no two researchers ever seem to have the same list of sites of burial sites, with the greatest differences occurring in lists of seventh-century sites. Osborne 1989, p. 300, n. 6, for example, finds Late Geometric burials at twenty-five sites outside of Athens, and seventh-century burials at eleven; Whitley 1991, pp. 200-201, 1994a, p. 52, table 3.1, finds twenty-seven sites outside of Athens with burials dated more specifically Late Geometric II, and seven sites with seventh-century burials.

The reduction in burial numbers is more striking when we examine their chronological distribution. At Vari, for instance, one burial dates to the first quarter of the century, two to the second quarter, three to the middle of the century, and seven to the last quarter. At Thorikos, most of the seventh-century graves date to the second half of the century. Of the nine seventh-century children's graves found in the Southwest Cemetery at Eleusis, six date to the end of the century. At Vourva and Velanidesa, burials date only to the end of the century.[145] The two Athenian Agora burials date to the late seventh- or possibly even early sixth-century.[146] The drop in burial visibility, in other words, from Late Geometric II to the first quarter of the seventh-century is even sharper than the numbers from the seventh-century as a whole indicate.[147]

In addition to a precipitous drop in mortuary visibility, burial practices also shift dramatically after 700. Adult cremations once again replace inhumations as the customary burial practice.[148] At this point, however, primary cremation becomes the norm.[149] In the first quarter of the seventh century, it becomes common for small mounds to be placed over primary cremations in the Kerameikos. In the second quarter of the century, some mounds become more monumental, to the degree that earth must be brought in from elsewhere. In the third quarter of the century, mounds again become smaller, perhaps due in part to lack of space in the cemetery. By the end of the seventh, mudbrick

---

145. Osborne 1989, p. 303, with bibliography. The date of the graves at Vourva and Velanidesa are controversial. For example, both are dated early sixth-century by Humphreys 1980, p. 110. Whitley 1994a, p. 70, dates the Vourva mounds to the late seventh-century, but does not include Velanidesa is his list of seventh-century sites. The Vourva burials are dated 7th/6th by D'Onofrio 1997, p. 84, who also excludes Velenadesa from her list of seventh-century sites. Osborne 1989, pp. 300, 303, dates the graves of both sites to the late seventh-century. A seventh-century date for the Vourva is secured, however, by a Middle Protoattic krater recovered from the cemetery; see Cook 1934, p. 199, pl. 55.

146. Young 1939, pp. 11, 21-44.

147. There are some exceptions. The child cemetery at Phaleron seems to have a fairly even distribution of burials throughout the Late Geometric and into the seventh century; Young 1942; Morris 1987, pp. 219-220; Osborne 1989, p. 303. The grave distribution at the Kerameikos is also fairly consistent across the seventh century, for which see Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 345, table 1.

148. Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 346, table 3.

149. At the Kerameikos, for example, primary cremations account for over eighty percent of seventh-century adult burials; Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 346, table 3. Note that this practice can first be found in the Middle Geometric Areopagus Geometric Lot; see Graves AR II, III/IV, V, I 18:2, I 18:3 in Smithson 1974, pp. 330-362; cf. Coldstream 2003, p. 81.

house-tombs temporarily replace mounds, though in the early sixth century there is a re-emergence of mound building at the cemetery.[150] By the late seventh-century, the practice of mound-building can also found at Vari, Vourva, and Velanidesa.[151]

Another feature of seventh-century burial practice is the paucity of grave goods interred with the deceased. The average number of items found within each burial plummet, from nearly five items per burial in Late Geometric II to less than two items in the seventh century.[152] Metal objects are rarely found at all. At some sites in Athens and Attica, this paucity is due to the fact that most grave goods were set not within the grave, but in *Opferrinnen*, or offering trenches, set alongside graves.[153] These trenches, varying in size from three to twelve meters long, and nearly a meter wide, were designed to hold stacks of wood, over which were placed long tables. Once pottery and other small items, including birds, were placed on the tables, the objects were deliberately smashed and the wood ignited, burning all of the funerary gifts.[154] The body within the trench was also cremated at this time, after which the scattered remains of the offering trench pyres were swept into the grave. A small mound often covered both the grave and part or all of

150. The mound phenomenon is especially well documented in the Agia Triada area of the Kerameikos. See Humphreys 1980, pp. 106-108; Knigge 1980, pp. 57-98; Morris 1987, pp. 128-134.

151. Humphreys 1980, pp. 108-110; Morris 1987, p. 136; Osborne 1989, pp. 300, 303.

152. Morris 1987, pp. 103-104, fig. 32.

153. At the Kerameikos, for example, the number of grave goods in the offering-trenches outnumber those deposited within the grave two-to-one. Cf. Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 347, table 4. Evidence for offering trenches or places have also been reported at Athenian Agora, Vari, Vourva, Marathon, and more doubtfully, at the Academy; see Houby-Nielson 1996, p. 44, n. 16, for discussion and bibliography.

154. Houby-Nielson 1996, p. 44, notes that not only pottery, but small birds and shells were placed upon the offering tables over the trenches.

the offering trench.[155] Grave markers, rarely seen during the Late Geometric period, once more become common, usually in the form of Protoattic kraters.[156]

The pottery from the offering trenches represents a much wider range of shapes than those found buried directly with the deceased, and included the most developed of Protoattic shapes and decorative motifs.[157] In contrast to "Protoattic" pottery from Aegina, mythological scenes are generally absent from Protoattic pottery produced in Athens or Attica.[158] In the first half of the seventh century, and particularly in the Early Protoattic period, ca. 700-675, chariot processions, horsemen, parading warriors, and mourning women remain a common decorative motif, carrying on the tradition of prothesis pot iconography.[159] Tripods are also occasionally found painted on pots.[160] Pottery from offering trenches also displays an increase in the application of plastic ornaments around the rim or body of vessels, usually snakes, mourning women, griffins, and plants.[161]

---

155. Houby-Nielson 1996, pp. 44-47, figs. 1, 2; Houby-Nielson 1996.

156. Morris 1987, p. 152. Seven vase markers were found in kerameikos. Of these, three kraters and one louterion each marked a mound with an offering-trench; Kübler 1959, p. 447, no. 35, pl. 29, p. 471, no. 62, pl. 60-61, p. 485, no. 78, pl. 74-75, p. 488, no. 90, pl. 76; two kraters marked a primary cremation with no offering-trench; Kübler 1959, p. 499, no. 104, pl. 8, p. 505, no. 115, pl. 87-88; and an amphora marked an adolescent inhumation; Kübler 1959, p. 506, no. 116, pl. 89-91; cf. Houby-Nielson 1992, pp. 357-359; 1996, pp. 43-44. We should note, of course, that the large burial mounds common in this period were themselves monumental grave markers.

157. Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 348, table 5; Whitley 1994a, pp. 56-57, table 3.5.

158. Morris 1984, pp. 30-33. Mythological scenes do not become a significant part of Attic schools of painting until the advent of Black Figure painting by the Nessos Painter at the end of the seventh century.

159. Cook 1934; Brann 1962, pp. 18-21; Houby-Nielson 1992, p. 358, table 7; Whitley 1994a, pp. 62-65, table 3.6. Prothesis and ekphora scenes themselves are rarely depicted in the seventh century. See discussion in Kübler 1959, pp. 34-35; Houby-Nielson 1992, pp. 357-359, table 7.

160. Kübler 1959, no. 1267, pl. 58, dated Early Protoattic. Cf. the tripod painted on an olpe, recovered from a well in the Athenian Agora, dated to the second or third quarter of the seventh century; Brann 1962, no. 513, pl. 52.

161. One extraordinary example from an offering trench in the Kerameikos is a jug with a series of plastic snakes and mourning women applied around and within the vessel's neck; see Kübler 1959, p. 456, pls. 38-40.

Children, usually inhumed within pithoi or amphorae, continue to be buried in large numbers.[162] There is an increased tendency in the seventh century to bury children in a separate area of a cemetery or burial plot, or bury them within their own reserved cemeteries.[163]

The phenomenon of the rich female grave, prevalent since the Protogeometric period, ceases altogether. In fact, it is possible that female burials, as a whole, are nearly absent from the mortuary record. While there are "male" indicators within the burial package, such as the use of kraters as grave markers, or chariot and warrior iconography on pots, there are no definitive grave attributes that indicate that any seventh-century grave was necessarily female.[164] We must be cautious on this point; the paucity of seventh-century burials, as well as the practice of primary cremation, has made definitive conclusions concerning gender differentiation difficult. Nevertheless, it may be possible that the vast majority of burials visible in the archaeological record in the Protoattic period in Attica are male.[165] If so, the general exclusion of females from archaeologically visible burials would account for part of the precipitous drops in burial numbers across Athens and Attica.

3. Previous Interpretations: Population and the State

It has long been thought that the increase of burial visibility and the number of sites with burials dating to the Late Geometric period marks a period of striking population increase.[166] Likewise, the dramatic contraction of burials and sites after ca. 700 has been interpreted as an equally dramatic reverse in the population and prosperity of

---

162. By one count, children's graves outnumber adult graves in Athens and Attica by two-to-one; see Whitley 1994a, p. 52, table 3.1. According to Morris 1998, p. 22, however, two-thirds of seventh-century burials are adult.

163. Primarily adult cemeteries are located at the Kerameikos, Votanikos, and Vari; children's cemeteries are found at Phaleron, the Academy, and Eleusis. Thorikos has both a mixed cemetery and a children's cemetery; see Morris 1987, p. 61, fig. 16, pp. 67-69, 71, fig. 21, p. 220.

164. Houby-Nielson 1992, pp. 357-359; Whitley 1996, p. 230.

165. As Boardman 1988, p. 175, notes: "In the seventh century we lack adequate evidence from Attic cemeteries to determine sex differentiation in vase shapes, and scenes of *prothesis*, which proved so useful in the eighth century, are almost entirely lacking."

166. Snodgrass 1977, pp. 10-16, suggests that the increase in the number of burials in the Late Geometric indicate an approximately seven-fold increase in population during this period. Cf. 1980, pp. 22-24, 1983, pp. 169-171; Coldstream 1968, pp. 360-362.

Athens and Attica. Drought or war are the two most commonly suggested reasons suggested for this reversal.[167] While the population may have indeed fluctuated from the Late Geometric to the seventh century, it is doubtful that the population swings were as exaggerated as these models suggest.

It is difficult to assess parallels between the number of burials and overall population unless burial practice remains static. In other words, if burial practice remains the same over time, and we are able to determine that the same sorts of people are being buried in the same manner, then changes in burial numbers would be fairly indicative of population change. Yet as we have seen, Attic burial practice is not static. While there are certainly changes in mortuary practice from the Early to Late Geometric I periods, overall practice remains fairly consistent: adult cremation, rich female burials, and the relative absence of children from the burial record. I suspect that it is no coincidence that in these periods, burial visibility, and the number of sites with burials, remains fairly consistent.[168] In the Late Geometric II period, however, when a large spike in the number of both the sites and burials are found, funerary practice has shifted considerably: inhumation for adults, the reemergence of child burials, and a general state of more varied mortuary practice across all Attic cemeteries. In the seventh century, burial practice shifts once more, with the return of cremation for adults, and a dramatic increase of child burials, and the possible reduction or even exclusion of adult female burials. These changes in the number of burials are best explained not in terms of shifts in population, but in terms of changes in funerary practice. In other words, what changed

---

167. For the theory of a drought, see Camp 1979, who argues that the increase in burial visibility in the Late Geometric is due not to a population boom, but rather to deaths resulting from the drought; cf. Brann 1962, p. 108; Binder 1998, pp. 138-139. The drought theory rests in part on evidence from wells in the Athenian Agora. There are eleven Protogeometric wells, three Early Geometric, seven Middle Geometric, and sixteen Late Geometric wells; see Brann 1961a; Brann 1962, plate 45. The bulk of the pottery from the Late Geometric wells dates more specifically to Late Geometric II; cf. Brann 1961a, pp. 97-98. Eleven of the Late Geometric wells are reported as filled in at roughly the same time, towards the end of the Late Geometric period, while the other five are filled in a bit earlier in the Late Geometric period. Based in part on this phenomenon, a drought is suspected. At least four of these wells, however, do have some evidence for continued use early in the seventh period. In addition, though the number of Late Geometric filled is notable, four new wells were dug in the first half of the seventh, seven in the second half; see Brann 1961b; Brann 1962, plate 45. When the data from wells across the entire Geometric and Protoattic period is reviewed, what is most striking is not the drop in the number of wells from the Late Geometric to the seventh century, but rather the spike in Late Geometric II wells, compared with the periods preceding and after.

168. Morris 1987, p. 61, fig. 16, p. 71, fig. 21, pp. 218-219.

was not the number who died, but which members of the population considered a particular form of burial appropriate or desirable.

Another common interpretation of the mortuary evidence is that the increase in burial visibility in Attic, particularly in the Late Geometric period, indicates a program of state "colonization."[169] This theory operates on the assumption that the relative stylistic homogeneity of the graves of Athens and Attica indicates a politically organized people, with its "capital" located in Athens.[170] Material homogeneity indeed reflects a degree of cultural or ethnic homogeneity. Geometric and Protoattic pottery styles, however, are silent on the issue of political union or agency. To be sure there may have been movements of people from the Athenian plain into other areas of Attica.[171] Yet even if we are able to demonstrate that a number of Attic settlements were founded by families and groups emigrating from the *asty* of Athens, this does not necessarily mean that these movements were "state-sanctioned."[172] It is a leap of faith, alone, which equates archaeological homogeneity with the centralized, political machinations of the polis.

Another often cited theory suggests that the rise in Late Geometric II burials, along with the increase in complexity and variations among contemporary burials, indicates

---

169. Supporters for a theory of an internal colonization of Attica are many. See, e.g., Morris 1984, p. 104; Osborne 1987, pp. 128-130; 1994, p. 148; Whitley 1991, pp. 57-58; Van Gelder 1991; D'Onofrio 1997; Coldstream 2003, pp. 133-135.

170. Whitley 1991, p. 58; Osborne 1994, pp. 152-154.

171. In addition, our current view of the archaeological record may be distorted by continued excavations of Classical urban centers. The Attic countryside has seen comparatively little attention, and survey work in Attica is almost absent. A notable exception is the survey conducted in the area of Atene, for which see Lohmann 1993; this area was not settled, however, until the Classical period. As a result, we are missing a large piece of the puzzle when we are considering Geometric and Archaic life in Athens and Attica. Ancient testimony reports that the population of Attica during the Archaic period was essentially a rural one. We are told, for example, that one of Peisistratos' goals was to keep people in the countryside, where they had been residing when he became tyrant (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 16.2-3; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 5.1305a19-21). For Thucydides, 1.126.6-7, 2.14-16, living in the countryside was an especially Athenian custom until the Peloponnesian War.

172. For doubts that there was an established, centralized Athenian state authority before the sixth century, see, for example, Manville 1990, pp. 76-77; Fornara and Samons 1991, pp. 52-55; Anderson 2003, pp. 16-21; Frost 2005, pp. 27-40, 133-147. Some assert that Athens was advancing towards polis-dom by the end of the eighth century, only to retreat to a pre-political condition once more in the seventh century; see, for example, Morris 1987, pp. 8-9; Whitley 1991, p. 58. Cf. Osborne 1989; Morris 1984, pp. 104-115.

an increasingly complex society on the order of an emerging polis.[173] In this view, the lower numbers of burials in previous periods was due to a restriction of burial for the wealthiest families, a system that was overthrown in the Late Geometric period during a social revolution. Now upper and lower classes were buried in much the same manner, representing a formal community consisting of recognized adult male citizens of an emerging polis. The drop in burials during the seventh century, according to this model, indicates that the wealthy families turned back this social experiment in polis-formation, reclaiming their role and turning Attica to its old order.[174]

A central basis for this claim lies in the idea that the increase in mortuary visibility indicates more of the population was now included in the rites of burial, marking the formation of the "citizen cemetery" in the Late Geometric period.[175] Such a claim rests on the assumption that burials were a privilege of citizens, alone.[176] While citizens in the fourth century had to demonstrate they possessed family tombs, there is no evidence that burial was restricted to citizens, or that a "citizen cemetery" was a common or em-

---

173. This theory, advocated by Morris 1987, is known as the Saxe-Binford approach, basically states that as a community's socio-political organization becomes more complex, so too does its mortuary practice; see Saxe 1970; Binford 1971; Goldstein 1980; Rakita and Buikstra 2005.

174. Morris 1987. Cf. Whitley 1991, p. 58, who believes that by Late Geometric II, Attica was politically united, though throughout the seventh century, "the institutions which characterised the archaic *polis*, were as yet poorly developed. Quite simply, Athens did not yet need these institutions." Osborne 1989, who finds that the seventh century marks a period of social instability and cults outside the community. For criticism of Morris' thesis as a whole, see Osborne 1989, p. 315; Garland 1989; Humphreys 1990b; Bintliff 1992; D'Agostino and D'Onofrio 1993; Papadopoulos 1993; Patterson 2006; cf. Houby-Nielson 1995. For response, see especially Morris 1993, 1998, where he modifies minor points, but defends his overall thesis.

175. Morris 1987, pp. 52-54, 210; cf. Morris 1991, pp. 157-158.

176. This idea has now made it into the *Oxford Classical Dictionary's* third edition entry on 'cemeteries', written by none other than Morris. Particularly vexed by Morris' conception of the "citizen cemetery" are Humphreys 1990b, p. 263, who finds his "thesis...complicated unnecessarily by some very sloppy and confused thinking about kinship"; and Patterson 2006, p. 48, who argues "that Morris has misinformed his readers by persistently misreading Athenian evidence on family burial and citizenship and by dismissing contrary evidence as 'cultural subversion', 'competing construction', and the like."

braced phenomenon at any point in time in ancient Athens and Attica.[177] In fact, there is ample evidence to the contrary.[178]

In addition, this model provides a strange picture of a society ruled by elites, who are overturned in a social transformation that results in the enfranchisement of all eligible males in Attica, only to be overturned once more. These back-and-forth revolutions are difficult to fathom, and no explanations are offered as to how or why such dramatic reversals took place.

4. Fashion and Burial in Attica

We have seen that theories of population flux, polis formation, and state colonization fail to account for the mortuary variability we find in the archaeological record. The mortuary record indicates, rather, the normal cycles of ostentation and moderation among the burial practices of wealthy families. Burial practice, after all, is a fashion of its own. To see how this is case, let us first consider similar cycles of ostentation and privation in dress among wealthy families.

According to Thucydides, 1.6.1-4, Athenians were the first Greeks to leave weapons out of their everyday dress and adopt more luxurious fashions. By Thucydides' day, however, the tendency to use linen undergarments and "golden grasshoppers" for hair ties were in the process of being abandoned, associated now as they were with the effete connotations of Ionian and eastern wealth.[179] The new vogue among the wealthy class

177. Citizens possessing family plots: Arist. *Ath.* 55.3; Dem. 43.79-80. Cf. Dem. 55.13-14; 57.28.

178. Dem. 43.57-58, quotes a law marking out the Demarch's responsibilities in burials, including slaves and freedmen. Epigraphic evidence for foreigners buried in Athens and Attica is manifest and numerous. Cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 50.2.

179. Geddes 1987; Connor 1993.

was now to dress much more modestly, assimilating, in effect, the fashions of the average citizen. Such tales recording changes in clothing are not rare among our sources.[180]

Were an archaeologist to judge relative wealth only upon a deposit of clothing, ranging in time from the Archaic period down to Thucydides' time, no doubt he or she would be tempted to interpret the fifth century as a time of poverty relative to the Archaic period. Or perhaps the changes in clothing would be interpreted as the rise of the polis, or the rise of the democracy, which deprived ostentatious dress from the wealthy in an effort to curtail their power. Yet at the start of the Peloponnesian War, when the Athenians ranked among the wealthiest states in Greece, clothing privation among the wealthy was adopted by the wealthy of their own volition.[181] The change in clothing fashion recorded by Thucydides should be a cautionary tale for archaeologists. Large-scale changes in fashion were not unusual, nor tied to changes in social organization.

Early twentieth century studies of burial practices among peoples of native Californian, African, and South American societies have shown that burial practices are re-

---

180. Note, for example, Herodotus, 5.87-88, who records how the seventh-century war between Athens and Aigina ended up changing the fashions of dress for women in Athens, Argos, and Aigina. According to the stories he was told, the lone Athenian to survive a disastrous seventh-century expedition against Aigina arrived back in Athens, only to be stabbed to death by the wives of his fellow slain soldiers, who killed him with their brooch-pins. The incident so shocked the Athenians that they mandated women, who were accustomed to dressing in a Doric fashion, to now assume the fashion of Ionian linen tunics, which required no brooch-pins. The Argives and Aiginetans, upon hearing the story, mandated the use of shorter pins for their women, which thereafter became the principal dedication to the goddesses Damia and Auxesia. Cf. Dunbabin 1936; Morris 1984, pp. 107-114; Figueira 1985.

181. The iconography of weapons and dress fashions on Athenian vase painting supports Thucydides' account. During the Late Geometric period, males are commonly depicted wearing a tunic and cloak, along with a sword and sometimes a spear, even in so-called "civilian" scenes, such as mourning or boarding a ship. After around 650, there is a noticeable change in attire; male civilian dress now changes from the tunic and cloak to the himation; while these figures often carry a spear or staff, swords disappear from the repertoire of male fashion. Towards the end of the sixth century, spears also begin to disappear, and the staff becomes a support for leaning, a symbol of leisure and luxury, a fashion that lasted until the middle of the fifth century. See, especially, Van Wees 1998.

flections of political organization, but a fashion on par with that of clothing.[182] More recent cross-cultural studies in anthropology have shown that, as is the case with many arenas of fashion, mortuary practice serves as a medium for expressions of actual or desired status. As such, the result are cycles of ostentatious burials, followed by periods of relative privation or modesty in burial displays.[183]

The cycles commonly found in many cultures begin with elaborate or ostentatious mortuary practices by the leading families of a community. The less well-off, who have the wealth or aspiration to attain similar status, begin to emulate the burial practices of the leading families. In a sense, they use the occasion of death to advance or claim their status or station in life. As a result, the venue and the mortuary symbols and rituals through which the aristocracy expressed their status is lost, having been adopted, emulated, and co-opted by lower classes. The result has become predictable; the wealthy return to reduced ostentation and restraint in burial practice, and move their competitive displays of status to another arena. The adoption of mortuary restraint is followed in descending order of status by the rest of the community over a period of time.

This burial cycle can be seen clearly, for example, in Victorian to modern England.[184] During the second half of the eighteenth century, mortuary restraint was the norm. Beginning in the Victorian period, however, the wealthiest of society began a cycle of unprecedented ostentation and pageantry. The innovative tomb designs and funeral pageants began to be emulated by lower classes, which initially caused the wealthy to introduce further innovations in burial practice, so as to differentiate themselves from the rest of society. Once the emulation of elaborate funerals became sufficiently widespread, however, the wealthiest families began to adopt funerary restraint as a way to differentiate themselves.

A parliamentary report on English funerary practices and expenses, dated to 1843, shows these processes in action. The poorer of society, according to the report, were em-

---

182. In a still influential study of Californian, African, and South American burial practices, Kroeber 1927, p. 304, came to the following conclusion: "In their relative isolation or detachment from the remainder of culture, their rather high degree of entry into consciousness, and their tendency to strong emotional toning, social practices of disposing of the dead are of a kind with fashions of dress, luxury, and etiquette".

183. See especially Cannon 1989, who based his theory on comparative mortuary evidence from Victorian to modern England, historic Iroquoia, and ancient Greece. His treatment of ancient Athens, however, is limited to a discussion of the cycles of inclusions of metal and grave markers as signs of status. For a more recent discussion, see also Cannon 2005, pp. 41-43.

184. Cannon 1989, pp. 438-442.

ulating the wealthier mortuary practices, even if it meant their financial ruin.[185] The overall number of ostentatious graves had in general dramatically increased; this was partly spurred by the growing wealth and affluence of large-scale farmers in rural England.[186] Their improved station in life was expressed not just in emulating the homes and fashions of the wealthy, including the funerary displays the wealthy were now in the process of abandoning. It is at just this time, however, that the leading families of England had recently begun to employ fewer mourners and less ostentation at their burials.[187] Funerary ostentation reached its height in late nineteenth century England, in other words, without the participation of the wealthy families, who had moved on to other arenas of display, such as church-building. In fact, the period following the move to funerary restraint by the wealthiest families, 1860-1880, was the greatest in terms of church building and restorations in England.[188] In time, the restraint instigated by the wealthy was followed by the rest of society, inaugurating in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century the funerary restraint now found throughout England.

This model of competitive status displays applies well to the surviving Attic mortuary pattern. From the Protogeometric through the Late Geometric I period, changes in burial fashion, such as the inclusion or exclusion of grave markers, cycles of cremation or inhumation preferences, and types of objects sought fit for inclusion within a burial were all subject to the prevailing tastes of the leading families, who at that time were defined not just by wealth, but by birth.[189] Significant changes in funerary practice–e.g., the introduction and proliferation of monumental funerary markers, the depictions of prothesis and ekphora scenes, moves from inhumation to cremation, and then inhumation to primary cremations–were not indications of changes in the structure of society. Rather, these innovations were fashions in burial practice initially introduced by a small number of leading families to distinguish themselves from the common practices of the day, and only later adopted by other families. The wealthy family burials of the Areopagus Geometric Lot serve as a prime example of innovative practices that were later adopted. This family, in Middle Geometric I, was the first since the Submycenaean peri-

185. Chadwick 1843, pp. 52, 55, 77-52,78, 197.

186. Cannon 1989, p. 439.

187. Chadwick 1843, pp. 78-79, 107, 163.

188. Other building projects also benefitted; Chadwick 1843, p. 79, records the tale of one wealthy man who found the current style of burial ostentation so distasteful he decided instead to build a small school in memory of his deceased daughter.

189. Cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.1, for the fourth century belief that before Solon, wealth and birth were the principal traits that defined the leaders of communities.

od to practice inhumation, a practice adopted by other wealthy burials in the Middle Geometric II period at Eleusis. By the Late Geometric period, the fashion prevailed.[190]

We suggest that the dramatic rise in visible burial in Late Geometric II was a sign not of polis creation, but rather evidence that the non-aristocrats had begun to adopt and emulate the burial rites of the leading families. This would account both for the rise in mortuary visibility in Athens and Attica, as well as the increased variation seen in burial practice within cemeteries throughout the region in Late Geometric II. The co-opting of the funerary arena by the non-aristocratic classes produced two simultaneous reactions from the elite during the Late Geometric II mortuary burst. The first would have been a change in funerary customs, so as to distinguish their status once more. The appearance of offering-trenches by the end of the Late Geometric II in Athens may be such an innovation, anticipating what would become a more common practice in the seventh century. By the seventh century, mounds became another innovation in the form of mortuary ostentation, and a demonstration that the family was able to control a certain amount of resources and manpower to construct such mounds as arose in the Kerameikos and elsewhere in Attica.[191]

A second reaction would have been a move towards funerary restraint. The considerable drop in graves and sites, particularly in the first half of the seventh century, attest to a preference for burial restraint. In fact, it is likely that this restraint became the fashionable trend among the leading families beginning in the Late Geometric II period; if this is the case, the burial record of Late Geometric II Athens and Attica mostly docu-

190. This family also anticipated the fashion of primary cremation by several generations. On the burials of this lot, see Smithson 1974; cf. Coldstream 2003, p. 81.

191. For notions that the construction of mounds in the seventh-century was intended to evoke comparisons with burials in Homer, see Humphreys 1980, pp. 102-103.

ments the emulation of aristocratic society, and a claim of aristocratic status, in a medium that the aristocracy has mostly abandoned.[192]

What happened in the Late Geometric II period to have led so many non-aristocratic families to emulate the wealthy burial practices? The answer to this question lies in the rise of wealth among non-aristocratic families in Athens and Attica during the Late Geometric period. During the ninth century, Early Geometric and Middle Geometric I, graves possess a wealth so ostentatious that this period has been called the age of the "princely" tombs.[193] Landed wealth is evident from the model granaries found in the wealthiest of female graves of this period.[194] At least some of the wealth, however, exhibited within these ninth-century burials must have been gained through trade and shipping. During this period, not only are the majority of sites with mortuary evidence located near easy access of the sea, but there is good evidence for regular trade of wares between Attica and the Near East.[195] By the second half of the ninth century, Middle

---

192. As we saw above, there have been many examples in other cultures that indicate that after a period of particular ostentation within the burial record, restraint in burial practice is usually practiced first by the elite, followed by other classes in descending order. In these situations, it has been observed that laws–or at least widespread ridicule or societal pressure–against elaborate funerals are passed only after the elite have moved to restraint, but the lower classes have not, leading to a poor people becoming even more desititute as they spend precious resources on elaborate funerals. Cf. Chadwick 1843, p. 197, who speaks during the heyday of Victorian mortuary ostentation of the "difficulty of raising the expenses of funerals, which in this country press grievously on the labouring and middle classes of the community, and are extravagant and wasteful to all classes, and occasion severe suffering and moral evil." Like Chadwick, others felt the ostentation wasteful, but it was not until the 1870's that organizations were formed to combat funerary extravagance. On this model, it is possible that by ca. 700, *de facto* funerary restrictions were in place, enforced probably by societal pressure more than law. Something of a memory of some sort of restrictions may have been handed down through tradition (e.g. Plut. *Sol.* 21; Dem. 43.62; Cic. *De Leg*. 2.59), and mistakenly assigned to Solon in later sources as an attempt to limit the extravagant displays of the wealthy or control women.

193. Morris 1999, who notes parallels in both Latium and Lefkandi.

194. Twenty-seven models have been found in Greece to date, all but one from Attica. All date from Middle Geometric II-Late Geometric I. These models are associated almost exclusively in wealthier female burials from the Kerameikos in Athens, Phaleron, Eleusis and Kallithea; cf. Strömberg 1993, p. 58, table 2.7. For a catalogue of granaries, see Smithson 1968; Cherici 1989; Williams 2000. For discussions of a "twin granary" found at Phaleron, see Smithson 1969; Padgett 1993, pp. 72-73, fig. 14.

195. On ninth-century Athenian exports to the Near East, and Near Eastern imports within Attica, see Coldstream 1968, pp. 344-345; 2003, pp. 55-63.

Geometric I, the first images of ships appear on funerary pottery, perhaps a hint of the centrality of shipping at this time.[196] The wealth obtained through shipping would have enriched the few leading families who could afford to build and man a ship. During the Middle Geometric II period trade of Attic wares was at the highest point it would be before the sixth century.[197]

In Late Geometric I, the influence of Attic styles upon their neighbors, and the trade of its wares near and abroad, was beginning to decline. Beginning in Late Geometric Ib, all ship iconography disappears from Attic pots, a development that may suggest waning interest in seafaring.[198] By the Late Geometric II period—at the very moment of the profusion of graves and newly visible sites in Athens and Attica—only a handful of Attic exports could be found outside Attica. Attic innovations in pottery shape and design not only made little impression on their neighbors during this period, but Athens itself more often than not now looked to Corinth for its inspiration.[199]

At this point, the topography of sites with burials in Late Geometric is illuminating. As noted above, pp. 31-35, sites with burials of the Late Geometric II period now tended to be situated inland, near agricultural plains. As trade died, in other words, agricultural wealth was on the rise, which in turn enriched a number of families, at least some of whom were not members of the aristocracy.[200]

---

196. Kirk 1949, pp. 95-97, who dates the earliest ship images to the second half of the ninth century, or Middle Geometric I. For ship imagery in Protogeometric and Geometric art, see also Williams 1953; Morrison 1968, pp. 12-42; Basch 1987, pp. 156-204; Wallinga 1995. Most images of ships are found on burial pottery; cf. for example, Skias 1898, p. 100, pl. 5; Ahlberg 1971, pp. 23-25, fig. 1. Most if not all of the images seem to portray warships, rather than simply merchant ships, though what was a warship one day could have been a ship of pirates and privateers the next.

197. Coldstream 1968, pp. 348-349.

198. For views that a war with Aegina, as reported by Hdt. 5.81-86, disrupted Attic sea-faring, see Dunbabin 1936; Coldstream 1968, p. 361; 2003, p. 135; Morris 1984, pp. 107-115. Contra, Camp 1979, p. 397. While a war may have disrupted Attic sea interests, it is difficult to believe this alone would account for such an abrupt ceasing of trade. Other factors may well have contributed, such as superior products from Corinth, as well as the attraction to landed wealth at a time farmland may have been abundant.

199. As noted by Coldstream 1968, p. 361, "[o]n the eve of the 'Orientalizing' movement in Attic pottery, the Athenians no longer had any direct contact with Oriental art. New ideas from the Levant now reached them at second hand, whether through Corinthan vase-painting, or through imitations of Oriental bronze cauldrons made by other Greeks". Cf. Coldstream 2003, pp. 132-133.

200. Dunbabin 1950, pp. 201-202; Coldstream 1968, pp. 361-362.

It was in part the desire for this newly wealthy class of families of the Late Geometric II period to emulate or lay claim to aristocratic status that led to their adopting of aristocratic fashions, including mortuary practices. The sudden spike in burials and burial sites near the agricultural plains of Attica reveals not an increase in new sites, necessarily, but rather the adoption of aristocratic practices, themselves archaeologically visible, by a greater number of families living in Athens and Attica.[201] Status rivalry, at least as seen in funerary ritual, in other words, now included more of the population than ever before.

The seventh century decline in burials reflects a period of widespread mortuary restraint, initiated by the leading families perhaps by the Late Geometric II. For the leading families of Athens and Attica, funerary rituals would have ceased to become a way to differentiate themselves from the masses. It is at this point that the leading families needed another venue in which to display their religious and social authority. It is no coincidence that the boom of Attic sanctuary life begins just as the funerary traditions bust. The proliferation of sanctuaries at this time, in other words, was intimately related to the need to provide a new arena for these ritual activities.

5. Status, Authority, and Funerary Ritual

By the seventh century, funerary displays and ostentation were dramatically reduced, lessening the centrality such rituals held for competitive displays of status and authority, as well as the shared rites around which a community could be formed. In the following pages, we take a closer look at what exactly these funerary rituals were, and the centrality they were held for the formation of both the community and the authority of that community's leading families.

In Homer, status is constantly threatened and questioned; opportunities for competitive status displays include the battlefield, competitive games, banquets, hospitality rites, and the council house.[202] The Homeric account of the funerary games and processions for Patroklos exemplify these contests for status. Patroklos' funeral is often interpreted as the ritual vehicle through which Achilles is re-integrated into the communi-

---

201. As noted above, p. 32, funerary pottery with prothesis scenes are still numerous, though now the vessels they decorate are smaller, and either interred with the body or smashed in offering pyres; in other words, these vessels are out of sight of passers-by. It is likely, then, that by the Late Geometric II period, the prothesis scene was not a declaration of what had gone on at the funeral, but rather was a symbolic pottery motif for those who wished to attain to such status, yet could not afford quite that level of ostentation.

202. Murray 1983; Van Wees 1992; Hammer 1997.

ty.[203] No doubt this was the result. More importantly, however, is the fact that the holding funerary games and processions also allowed for the ritual rehabilitation and re-creation of the status and authority of Achilles and his family.

As host of the funerary games, Achilles exhibited his wealth by providing the prizes from his own stores. The prizes are among the most extravagant displays of wealth seen in Homer. For the chariot race, alone, he provides a woman, a tripod, a pregnant mare, a cauldron, talents of gold and an urn, divided accordingly for the winners of the chariot race.[204] Other prizes were equally ostentatious, including the use of a field for five years, and a banquet feast for the army.[205] During the games, Achilles also assumed the role of judge, and dealt with any disputes that arose during the contests.[206] Achilles came into the games on the outside of the community, aggrieved that he had been dishonored by Agamemnon. He emerged, via ritual, a community leader once more.

The games in particular also allowed for the reaffirmation of who the community's other leaders were. Winning one of the funerary games, for example, particularly the chariot race, established and displayed the excellence and status of the victor, or jeopardized the status of the losers.[207] Finally, funerary ritual also provided an arena for the reaffirmation of who is or is not a part of the community; in the case of Patroklos' funeral, the Myrmidons were admitted once more into the community. Patroklos' funeral, then, provided an arena for ritual confirmation of who was in the community, and who led the community.

Though Homer's portrayal is exaggerated for the purposes of epic, the general outlines of the funerary rituals have parallels in Geometric burials from Athens and Attica. Our earliest representation of a prothesis on an Attic funerary vessel is a krater dated to

---

203. See, for example, Whitman 1958, p. 215; Seaford 1994, pp. 159-180; Scully 1990, p. 127; Schein 1984, p. 156.

204. *Il.* 23.262-270; cf. 653-656; 700-705; 740-751; 797-800; 850-855; 884-886.

205. *Il.* 23.810, 831-835.

206. *Il.* 23.486-498, 536.

207. Menelaos is particularly aggrieved at having lost the chariot race to Antilochos, a lesser man with lesser horses; *Il.* 23.565-585. Achilles, in proclaiming that he will not take part in the race because his superiority is a foregone conclusion, *Il.* 23.276-286, in fact protected him from the potential of an unpleasant, and surprise loss.

Middle Geometric II.[208] The prothesis scene consists of a deceased male lying upon a bier, with a series of mourners painted below, all set within the handle zone. Below the prothesis are two ships, upon which there is fighting with swords, spears, and bow-and-arrow. On one ship is a woman, apparently held captive. Between the two ships are a line of armed soldiers.

The iconographic relationship between male prothesis scenes and scenes of mourners, soldiers, ships and fighting continues on monumental prothesis kraters and amphorae in the Late Geometric period. These prothesis scenes usually follow a pattern, and include the deceased upon a bier, a burial cloth above, and a set of mourners above, below, and at the sides of the bier. Secondary scenes most often include mourners of all ages, though most often female; male and female dancers; warrior parades or processions; and chariot scenes.[209] Scenes of men leading horses, tripod scenes, and fighting either on land or at sea are also occasionally found. The chariot scenes are best interpreted either as races at funerary games for the deceased, or as processions.[210] The occasional presence of tripods among the chariots encourage us to think it was the prize for the winner of such a race.[211] The many warrior parades found on prothesis vessels also provide a sense of the ritual processions that took place during funerals. In view of the close relationship between many of the auxiliary scenes and the funerary ritual, the battles depicted on land and sea are related to the death of the deceased.[212]

At any rate, it is tempting to believe that the warriors attending the funeral were part of the private army, so to speak, of the deceased, present not only to mark the passing of one of their leaders, but also to display the military might of the deceased and his

---

208. New York 34.11.2; Ahlberg 1971, pp. 23-25, fig. 1; Moore 2004, pp. 1-8. A second prothesis may have been depicted on another side of the krater, though it is too damaged to tell for sure. Note that the first depiction of a human on Attic pottery is that of a mourning woman, found just above the image of a horse, both painted under the handle of a krater that marked a wealthy Middle Geometric I male grave, G43, from the Kerameikos. See Kübler 1954, p. 238, pl. 22; Whitley 1991, pp. 138-139@138-139; Coldstream 2003, p. 61.

209. Ahlberg 1971, pp. 175-213.

210. Ahlberg 1971, pp. 184-202. The connection of chariot processions with the deceased is clear in ekphora scenes on funerary pottery. See, for example, Ahlberg 1971, figs. 53-55

211. Ahlberg 1971, figs. 13, 22, 25; cf. Graef and Langlotz 1909, no. 298, pl. 10.

212. *Contra* Kirk 1949, pp. 144-153, who believes that the ships were painted either to express the wealth of the deceased, or because pot painters of the day found ships inherently interesting to paint.

family.[213] The economic might of the family was obvious in the very act of hosting such elaborate ceremonies. The funerary rites would have also been an important opportunity for the expression of religious authority, as well. It is likely that members of the family would have been the leaders of the sacrifices and libations necessary at such an occasion, as Achilles was for the numerous sacrifices and libations for Patroklos' funeral. In addition, the funeral games would have attracted the leading members of society to compete for prizes, and thereby proclaim or solidify their standing and status before the community that attended these games. These leading members would presumably have had some ties with the deceased and his family, and could have come from Athens or other communities in Attica. During the processions and games, the spectators are drawn into the proceedings, forming a ritual community. The family hosting the funeral and games, meanwhile, displayed its status to be the community's religious, martial, and economic leader.[214]

213. For the "private" armies of leading families in the Archaic period, see Frost 1984.

214. The ritual processions, dances, and games seen on the prothesis pots remind us, however, that what a tomb holds does not necessarily indicate how ostentatious a funeral may have been. From the Protogeometric through the Late Geometric, wealthy female burials outstrip male burials in grave goods. While there are only a handful of protheses for females depicted on funerary vessels, there is no evidence on these pots that the females were accorded the games seen both in Homer and on male prothesis pots; cf. Ahlberg 1971. As a result, the extravagance of contemporary wealthy male burials may have equalled or even outstripped the female in overall expenditures and pageantry.

Chapter Three: Status and the Gods of Geometric Athens

1. Introduction

In this chapter, we offer a tentative model for religious authority and the gods away from the grave. Sanctuaries, as we discuss more fully in Chapter Four, are largely absent in Athens and Attica, and little can be gleaned from the graves of men concerning festivals or shrines for the gods. In this section, we examine the evidence for religious authority in Homer, and suggest that a similar model may have operated in Athens and Attica in the Geometric period. We have better evidence for female religious authority in wealthy graves. Though again a tentative reconstruction, we will examine the Homeric depiction of female authority, and compare this with the archaeological record in Attica.

2. Men, Religious Authority, and the Gods in the Geometric Period

2.1. Men: Religious Authority in Homer

Men dominate the religious life of various Greek communities in the lines of Homer. For example, there are nearly forty scenes involving animal sacrifice promised or performed for the gods in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. All but one are led by men.[215] The exception is Theano, the sole Homeric priestess. In response to a rout of the Trojans by the Greek army in book six of the *Iliad*, Theano lays a peplos at the knees of a statue of Athena, and promises to sacrifice to Athena twelve heifers, should she take pity on the Trojans and their families. Even this act, however, is ultimately at the urging of Hec-

215. Animal sacrifices to deities: Apollo (*Il.* 1.40-41; 64-67; 315-316; 457-466; 4.101-103, repeated 119-121; 23.863-864; 872-873; *Od.* 21.265-268); Zeus (*Il.* 2.402-403; 3.271-274; 292-294; 7.314-315; 8.238-241; 11.727; 772-775; 15.372-374; 22.170-172; *Od.* 9.550-555; 13.24-25; 22.334-336); Athena (*Il.* 6.93-94, repeated 274-275, 308-309; 10.292-293; 11.729; *Od.* 3.382-383; 4.762-764); Poseidon (*Il.* 11.728; 20.403-405; *Od.* 1.22-25; 3.4-8; 178-179; 11.130-131, repeated 23.277-278; 13.181-182); Artemis and other gods (*Il.* 2.305-307); Hermes and the Nymphs (*Od.* 14.434-436); Nymphs (*Od.* 17.240-242); Hermes (*Od.* 19.396-398); Alpheius (*Il.* 11.728); River Spercheüs (*Il.* 23.144-149); Immortal Gods (*Od.* 11.132-134). Animal sacrifices are also conducted or promised for the dead of the Underworld (*Od.* 10.521-523, repeated 11.30-31; 10.526-529, repeated 11.34-36); Teiresias (*Od.* 10.524-525, repeated 11.32-33); and at the funeral of Patroklos (*Il.* 23.166-175).

tor.[216] Similarly, bloodless offerings to the gods by males far outnumber those by females.

The majority of sacrifices and libations to a god are made for personal reasons. For example, before Odysseus and Diomedes start out on their raid of the Trojan camp, both offer prayers to Athena seeking her help in returning safely. Diomedes, *Il.* 10.292-294, additionally promises Athena that he will sacrifice to her a heifer that has yet to be broken by toil in the fields, her horns decked in gold. It would appear, then, that sacrifices and appeals made to a deity could be conducted by just about anyone, with one notable exception. When these sacrifices and appeals to the gods were conducted on behalf of an entire community, the preeminent male leaders of the particular community, the *basileis*, inevitably lead, host, or order the rites. For the Greeks at Troy, this is Agamemnon. When home, it is the local *basileus* of a community that possesses the authority to conduct communal rites.[217] *Basileis*, or more simply the leading figures of a community, are the principal intermediaries between a Homeric community and its gods.

The role of *basileis* as the religious leaders of the community stands in stark contrast to that of priests in Homer. In addition to Theano, only five other priests are named in the *Iliad*, and only one appears in the *Odyssey*.[218] Four of the six perform no priestly duties at all during their appearance; they have come to the plain of Troy as sol-

---

216. *Il.* 6.269-285. Detienne 1989, has argued that priestesses never took part in sacrifices or had a share in sacrificial meat. For convincing arguments to the contrary, see Osborne 1993; Connelly 2007, pp. 179-190, 277.

217. Sacrifices to the gods ordered or conducted on behalf of the community: Agamemnon (Apollo: *Il.* 1.313; Zeus: *Il.* 2.402-403; 3.271-274, 292-294; 7.314-315); Alcinoos (Zeus: *Od.* 13.24-25; Poseidon: *Od.* 13.181-182); Hector (Athena, performed by Theano: *Il.* 6.93-94, repeated 274-275, 308-309); Nestor (Poseidon: *Od.* 3.4-8; 177-179; cf. the communal prayer to Zeus: *Il.* 15.372-374). Two priestly sacrifices are performed by Chryses (*Il.* 1.40-41, 450-475); both are performed for his own benefit, not for the community. Once Agamemnon returns his daughter, he disappears from the epic. On the religious roles of *basileis*, cf. the discussions in Mondi 1980; Carlier 1984, pp. 162-165; Ainian 1997, pp. 369-374.

218. Priests in the *Iliad*: Chryses, priest of Apollo at Chrysa; Theano, priestess of Athena at Troy (6.94-96, 275-277, 298, 309-310); Dares, priest of Hephaistos at Troy (5.9-10); Hypsenor, priest of Scamander at Troy (5.77-78); Panthous, probably a priest of Apollo at Troy (15.522; cf. Vergil *Aen.* 2.319); Laogonos, priest of Zeus on Mt. Ida (16.604). Unnamed priests of the gods are sent on embassy by the Aetolians to Meleager (9.575). Priest in the *Odyssey*: Maron, priest of Apollo at Ismarus (9.197-200). On priests in Homer, cf. Seymour 1963, pp. 495-497.

diers, or are named as the fathers of soldiers. One trait that all the priests share is that they were wealthy.[219] Another: none are Greek.

Just as in the Archaic and Classical periods, priestly duties were generally restricted to specific sanctuaries and shrines. The paucity of sanctuaries and shrines in Homer makes it difficult to assess who built and maintained them.[220] There appears to be a tendency, however, to assume that they were built privately. At least one priest, Chryses, *Il.* 1.39, built a temple from his own resources. Odysseus' crew, *Il.* 12.346, promise to build a temple to Helios upon their return home for slaughtering his cattle, though how the sanctuary would have been maintained or a priesthood established is not recorded. Nausithoös, *Od.* 6.10, built temples as part of his founding of a new settlement on Scheria. We have, then, examples of a priest, group of Ithakans, and a *basileus* building temples. How priesthoods would have been established, or the sanctuaries maintained once built, in the last two examples is unknown. Evidence for Homeric sanctuaries built by communities is more indirect. Theano was chosen by the Trojans to be priestess of the Athena sanctuary, and Hypsenor was chosen as priest of Scamander, presumably by the Trojans, as well, though we are not told.[221] How and why they were selected is not known, nor do we know who built the sanctuaries they oversee. Perhaps the sanctuaries of Athena and Scamander were newly built from communal funds, and therefore communally appointed. At any rate, temples rarely appear in Homer. Open-air altars, and simple shrines associated with groves and streams–shrines that require far less re-

219. Wealthy priests: Chryses, Dares, and Maron. Theano is the daughter of Kisseus, king of Thrace, and wife of the Trojan elder Antenor; cf. *Il.* 5.69-71; 11.223-226. The brief mentions of Hypsenor, Panthous, and Laogonos do not record their wealth.

220. Temples: Apollo (νηός at Chrysa: *Il.* 1.39; νηός on Pergamos citadel, Troy: *Il.* 5.445-446; 7.83; *Od.* 8.79-81); Athena (νηός on Trojan Acropolis: *Il.* 6.297; πίων νηός or πυκινὸς δόμος on Athenian Acropolis: *Il.* 2.549; *Od.* 7.81). Nausithoös builds νηόι for the gods on Scheria, but no deities are named (*Od.* 6.10). Odysseus' crew promise to build a rich temple, πίων νηός, to Helios (*Il.* 12.346). The sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi is described only as having a λάινος οὐδός (*Il.* 9.404-405); whether this indicates a temenos or a stone temple is not known.

221. *Il.* 5.76-78; 6.300.

sources to found and maintain than precincts with temples–are much more common in Homer.[222]

The Homeric epics, of course, do not to document the whole of Greek society or its religious life. They relate idealized tales set primarily in foreign lands, and in male theaters of action, the battlefield and the sea. The deities that dominate the two epics are those with the most oversight over these theaters: Zeus, Athena, and Apollo in the *Iliad*; Zeus, Athena, and Poseidon in the *Odyssey*.[223] The major triad of the *Iliad*, Zeus, Athena, and Apollo, in particular, are the most prominent of Homeric deities. These gods account for the vast majority of groves, sacred fields, altars and priesthoods mentioned in the epics, as well as all of the temples. Zeus, Apollo, and Athena are also expressly linked in the same prayer four times in the *Iliad* and five times in the *Odyssey*.[224] These deities are prevalent in the epics not because they are the most important deities to society as a whole; rather, they are the most important deities to Homer's martial and seafaring society. Similarly, the higher profile of males, and *basileis* in particular, as religious leaders is due primarily to the context of the epics. Had the Homeric bards instead sang of the gods of rural farming families, Demeter would certainly warrant more than six men-

---

222. Sacred groves, springs, and altars: Apollo (ἄλσος δενδρήεν at Ismarus: *Od.* 9.200-201; ἄλσος σκιερόν on Ithaka: *Od.* 20.278); Athena (ἄλσος ἀγλαόν on Scheria: *Od.* 6. 291); Zeus (τέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις on Mt. Ida: *Il.* 8.48; cf. 22.170-172; βωμός in the Greek camp at Troy: *Il.* 8.249; numerous περικαλλέες βωμοί: *Il.* 8.238-241); Aphrodite (δέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις on Cyprus: *Od.* 8.363); River Spercheüs in Phthia (τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις: *Il.* 23.148); Artemis and other gods (ἀμφὶ περὶ κρήνην ἱεροὶ βωμοὶ καλῇ ὑπὸ πλατανίστῳ at Aulis: *Il.* 2.305-307); Nymphs (αἰγείρων ὑδατοτρεφέων ἄλσος, ὕδωρ, βωμός on Ithaka: *Od.* 17.210-211); Apollo (βωμός on Delos: *Od.* 6.162; εὔδμητος βωμός at Chrysa: *Il.* 1.440, 448). Other altars are mentioned, though not the deities to whom they belong: *Il.* 11.808; *Od.* 3.273. Odysseus (*Od.* 22.334-336), Priam (*Il.* 24.306-307), Peleus (*Il.* 11.772-775), also perform sacrifices or libations at their home altars or in their courtyard; cf. Achilles (*Il.* 16.231-232), who performs a libation in his courtyard at the Greek camp at Troy.

223. Athena's name appears 160 times in the *Iliad*, and an equal number of times in the *Odyssey*. Only Zeus is more frequently mentioned. Apollo is mentioned 155 times, mostly in the *Iliad*. Other deities appear less frequently. Hera is mentioned a total of 128 times and Ares 129 times; almost all of their references are from the *Iliad*. Poseidon, naturally, is mentioned more in the *Odyssey*, where he appears 43 times. By comparison, Demeter is mentioned in passing only five times in the *Iliad* (2.696; 5.500; 13.326; 14.326; 21.76), and once in the *Odyssey* (5.125).

224. *Il.* 2.371; 4.288; 7.132; 15.97; *Od.* 4.341; 7.311; 15.132, 235; 24.376. Each time, the prayer represented an earnest longing for something which likely would not come to pass.

tions in nearly 28,000 combined epic lines.[225] We would also see more leading women, such as Hecuba, leading communal sacrifices.

To sum up, there is a general Homeric tendency for *basileis* to possess the right to lead communal sacrifices and offerings to deities. This right and responsibility was inseparable from the other social and martial rights and responsibilities a *basileus* held in his community. This right to conduct communal sacrifices was more than a simple extension of a leader's overall societal authority, a form of power held over a community. Rituals and assertions of divine sanction provided a *basileus* with the preeminent "authority strategy," a demonstrative expression of communal authority that by its very nature was almost unassailable.

A study of Agamemnon's religious authority provides a nice example of this point. Much of the *Iliad* is concerned with questions of the legitimacy of Agamemnon's authority over the Greek army, usually brought about by his own disastrous decisions. Achilles, *Il.* 1.149-151, accuses Agamemnon of always thinking of his personal profit, and warns Agamemnon that such actions will lead to mass disobedience among the army.[226] Agamemnon, *Il.* 1.287-289, assumes Achilles is in effect trying to mount a coup to become himself the paramount *basileus* of the Greek army.[227] Right from the outset of the *Iliad*, then, the question is posed: Upon what basis does Agamemnon's authority rest? Nestor, *Il.* 1.280-281, in trying to quell the argument between the two, provides us with one source of Agamemnon's authority: his might. Nestor tells Achilles he must yield, for Agamemnon is his better, φέρτερος, because he rules over more people.[228] Agamemnon's might and power are not unassailable, however, and in fact are often challenged and contested at many points in the *Iliad*. Possession of wealth and armies alone cannot legitimize authority and status, which must constantly be reasserted and reaffirmed. Certainly Achilles held no respect for Agamemnon's might or the number of ships he brought to battle; only Athena's intervention stops him from committing regicide. Even lowly Thersites, *Il.* 2.225-242, feels brave enough to disparage his greedy and bullying behavior, having lost all fear of Agamemnon's power.

---

225. As Hirvonen 1968, p. 75, says, Demeter is "grandly ignored by the bard".

226. ὤ μοι ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένε κερδαλεόφρον/ πῶς τίς τοι πρόφρων ἔπεσιν πείθηται Ἀχαιῶν/ ἢ ὁδὸν ἐλθέμεναι ἢ ἀνδράσιν ἶφι μάχεσθαι;

227. ἀλλ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλει περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,/ πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλει, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν,/ πᾶσι δὲ σημαίνειν, ἅ τιν' οὐ πείσεσθαι ὀΐω:

228. εἰ δὲ σὺ καρτερός ἐσσι θεὰ δέ σε γείνατο μήτηρ,/ ἀλλ' ὅ γε φέρτερός ἐστιν ἐπεὶ πλεόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει. Cf. *Il.* 2.576-580: τῶν ἑκατὸν νηῶν ἦρχε κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων/ Ἀτρεΐδης: ἅμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι/ λαοὶ ἕποντ': ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἐδύσετο νώροπα χαλκὸν/ κυδιόων, πᾶσιν δὲ μετέπρεπεν ἡρώεσσιν/ οὕνεκ' ἄριστος ἔην πολὺ δὲ πλείστους ἄγε λαούς.

In the end, however, the legitimacy of Agamemnon's authority could never be seriously threatened. This is because his authority in the end did not rest upon his battlefield prowess, superior resources, or number of ships he brought to Troy; rather, Zeus himself legitimized Agamemnon's power, a legitimacy constantly on display in the form of Zeus' scepter.[229] To be sure, scepters in general were the symbol of a *basileus'* legitimate authority.[230] In addition, all *basileis* were thought to derive their authority from Zeus himself; as a class, they were called Διοτρεφεῖς, "Zeus-nurtured".[231] Agamemnon held the scepter of all scepters, fashioned by Hephaistos for Zeus himself. This scepter was given to Pelops, and passed down the family line until Agamemnon inherited it, in effect inheriting Zeus' personal backing and support to be the foremost *basileus* of the Greeks.[232]

Even possession of the scepter did not prevent challenges to Agamemnon's authority. In times of war, Diomedes told Agamemnon, *Il.* 9.38-39, leaders need more than the scepter; they need to earn and display their authority and might on the battlefield, which Agamemnon had yet to do.[233] Even so, Zeus' scepter does legitimize Agamemnon's authority and status in a way that simple expressions of might cannot. In Book 2 of the *Iliad*, troop morale is so low that a disheartened Agamemnon decided to disband the Greek army and head home. It is Odysseus who becomes the *de facto* leader of the Greek army, going to the ships to convince the army not to give up on the war. He does so bearing Agamemnon's scepter, which he occasionally uses to hit any who remain recalcitrant.[234] While this action stays an ignominious defeat and withdrawal, Agamemnon's authority is still weakened; it is at the next assembly that Thersites cast

---

229. *Il.* 1.276-281; 2.100-108; 203-206; 9.38-39; 96-99; 14.92-94.

230. Cf. the term σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς in *Il.* 1.279; 14.93; *Od.* 2.231; 5.9.

231. E.g., *Il.* 1.176; 2.196. All the known courtyard sacrifices and prayers conducted by *basileis* – Odysseus (*Od.* 22.334-336), Priam (*Il.* 24.306-307), Peleus (*Il.* 11.772-775), and Achilles (*Il.* 16.231-232) – are for Zeus. In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, 220-264, *basileis* and Zeus are linked in a different way; the god brings famine and disaster to the communities of crooked, greedy, "bribe-eating" *basileis*. Retribution for acting autocratically, against the community's interests, comes not from the community, itself. A far greater sanction is feared from the gods. When justice is followed, however, Zeus allows the community to prosper, and famine and other crises are kept at bay. Communal fecundity is secured.

232. *Il.* 2.100-108.

233. σοὶ δὲ διάνδιχα δῶκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω:/ σκήπτρῳ μέν τοι δῶκε τετιμῆσθαι περὶ πάντων,/ ἀλκὴν δ' οὔ τοι δῶκεν, ὅ τε κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον.

234. *Il.* 2.185-187, 198-199.

aspersions upon him. Odysseus again restores order, *Il.* 2.266-269, striking Thersites down with Agamemnon's scepter. It is Zeus, as represented by the scepter, that endows Odysseus with the authority–as acting supreme *basileus* of the Greek army–to rally the troops and restore respect for Agamemnon's authority. As Odysseus tells the troops, they cannot all be *basileus* of the army; that duty falls to one man alone, the one to whom Zeus gave his scepter.[235]

This source of authority is foolproof, for in the end any challenge to Agamemnon's authority is ultimately a challenge of the divine order, as laid down by Zeus himself. Agamemnon's authority was legitimated and even demonstrated every time he held his scepter. Similarly, every sacrifice Agamemnon made on behalf of the Greek army provided a display of his right to lead the community in a way that was essentially beyond criticism or rapproche. To lead the communal sacrificial rites to the gods at once proclaimed and reinforced through ritual one's legitimate right to status in that community.

2.2. Men: The Basileis of Early Attica

This interpretation finds support in Aristotle, *Pol.* 1285b1-10, who records a tradition of his day that *basileis* of the Heroic Age held both supreme command in war as well as control over all sacrifices not already routinely conducted by priests at their respective shrines.[236] The early *basileis* of Athens and Attica, in other words, were the principal holders of religious authority. But who were these *basileis* of the Geometric period?

The early history of *basileis* was only dimly known by the Classical period. By then, the tradition, as handed down to us by late sources–Aristotle, the *Marmor Parium*, and Eusebius–is that initially Athens was ruled by the Erechtheid or Kekropidai dynasty, a series of fifteen *basileis* founded by Kekrops, and dating from the sixteenth century until a few generations after the Trojan War. A second dynasty of fifteen *basileis*, founded by Malanthos of Pylos, lasted until ca. 753/2, at which time the *basileis* were replaced by a

---

235. *Il.* 2.203-206: οὐ μέν πως πάντες βασιλεύσομεν ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιοί:/ οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη: εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω,/ εἷς βασιλεύς, ᾧ δῶκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω/ σκῆπτρόν τ' ἠδὲ θέμιστας, ἵνά σφισι βουλεύῃσι.

236. τέταρτον δ' εἶδος μοναρχίας βασιλικῆς αἱ κατὰ τοὺς ἡρωικοὺς χρόνους ἑκούσιαί τε καὶ πάτριαι γιγνόμεναι κατὰ νόμον. διὰ γὰρ τὸ τοὺς πρώτους γενέσθαι τοῦ πλήθους εὐεργέτας κατὰ τέχνας ἢ πόλεμον, ἢ διὰ τὸ συναγαγεῖν ἢ πορίσαι χώραν, ἐγίγνοντο βασιλεῖς ἑκόντων καὶ τοῖς παραλαμβάνουσι πάτριοι. κύριοι δ' ἦσαν τῆς τε κατὰ πόλεμον ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν, ὅσαι μὴ ἱερατικαί, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις τὰς δίκας ἔκρινον.

series of seven archons, who each ruled for ten years.[237] In 683/2, the annual archonship was established, with Kreon the first such office holder.

It is now commonly agreed that these *basileis* lists are the stuff of legend, and indeed were probably only codified for the first time late in the fifth century.[238] All we can be sure of is that later Athenians believed that before the seventh century, Athens was ruled by *basileis*. In all likelihood, the historical *basileis* of Geometric Attica were not "kings," in the monarchical sense, but local leaders from leading families.[239] These leaders, to adopt the Homeric model, not only conducted and participated in elaborate funerary games and pageantry, as our burial evidence shows for much of the Geometric period, but also led sacrifices to the gods on behalf of the community. To judge from the relatively scant archaeological evidence for sanctuaries in the Geometric period, discussed in further detail in Chapter Four, below, temples and elaborate sanctuaries were not the focus of religious life in the Geometric period. Rather, religious authority to lead sacrifices was principally held by the leading members of society, a role they assumed through the status of their family, and won or reinforced on the battlefield, in ritual contests at funeral games, and through their economic power.

Status for women, however, was not won in the same theaters of action. To what extent can we discern the religious authority of women in the Geometric period, and upon what was this authority based? It is to women, therefore, that we now turn.

3. Women and Power in the Geometric Period

---

237. Tradition varies about whether these decennial officials were archons or *basileis*. Though Eusebius calls them archons, for example, the Suda, s.v., Πάριππον καὶ κόρην, calls one of the officials, Hippomenes, a *basileus*, and the *Marmor Parium* calls them all *basileis*.

238. Cf. Jacoby 1954, pp. 43-51, who persuasively argues that the entire list of *basileis* was constructed by Hellanicus, with minor modifications by later atthidographers and chronographers, in an attempt to bridge the gap between the annual archon list, which begins in 683/2, and the tales of early *basileis*. Hellanicus' sources were probably oral and written accounts of past for the first dynasty; the second dynasty may have been almost entirely fanciful. Cf. Drews 1983, pp. 88-91, who notes that almost no stories are associated with the *basileis* of the second dynasty. On the early *basileis* of Athens, see also Jacoby 1902; Carlier 1984.

239. Drews 1983, pp. 98-115. In some ways, the term *basileus* may have been interchangeable with other words for leaders, such as archon or *prytanis*. Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1322b, who says that those who oversee common festivals in his day are called either archons, *basileis*, or *prytaneis*, depending on the city: ἐχομένη δὲ ταύτης ἡ πρὸς τὰς θυσίας ἀφωρισμένη τὰς κοινὰς πάσας, ὅσας μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἀποδίδωσιν ὁ νόμος, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς κοινῆς ἑστίας ἔχουσι τὴν τιμήν: καλοῦσι δ' οἱ μὲν ἄρχοντας τούτους οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις.

Elite female burials in Geometric Attica were distinguished from other contemporary graves, male and female, by more than the quantity and quality of their grave goods. Elite females were provided with their own symbolic burial package, included seals, model granaries, kalathoi, and horse pyxides.[240] All represent the hallmarks of a prosperous and wealthy estate, and therefore signal a claim of high status. Though these symbols are predominantly associated with elite females, there is still a tendency today to see these claims of status as ultimately indicators of a male-oriented society. These symbols of landed wealth have been interpreted as dowries, for example, placed in the grave to symbolize a transfer of power and wealth.[241] In all likelihood, however, most marriages in Geometric Attica did not involve a dowry, at least as the institution functioned in the Archaic and Classical periods.[242] Aristotle, *Pol.* 1268b, reports that marriage customs of old required no dowry. On the contrary, men "bought wives from one another."[243] What Aristotle is most likely recording is a memory of the practices of Geometric Athens and Attica.

---

240. Handmade Incised Ware, also called Attic Dark Age (ADA) incised ware, also appears almost exclusively in wealthy female burials, usually found in pyre debris, though occasionally in a cremation grave unburned. A few have appeared in child burials. On this ware, see especially the monograph by Bouzek 1974; cf. also Smithson 1961, pp. 170-172; Reber 1991, pp. 118-139; Strömberg 1993, pp. 97-99, fig. 15; Coldstream 2003, pp. 29-30. When the ware is introduced in the Protogeometric period, shapes include dolls, pyxides, bowls, beads, and whorls in the Protogeometric period. In the Early Geometric period pointed pyxides, and tripods appear; the double granary from Phaleron, Early Geometric II or Middle Geometric I, is also Handmade Incised Ware. Many of the shapes are influenced by similar items in more perishable material, such as wood or woven baskets. The ware is particularly associated with cremation burials; it disappears from graves with the reintroduction of inhumation as a popular burial type in the Late Geometric.

241. E.g., Langdon 1993.

242. Dowries seem to become standard practice by the early sixth century. If Plutarch, *Sol.* 20.4, is correct, Solon sought to inhibit the practice of arranging marriages on the basis of profit and price. To do so, Solon restricted the property a bride could bring to a marriage to only three changes of clothes and some modest household items. Certainly by the early sixth century, dowries appear to be common throughout the Greek world, including Attica. Cf. Hdt. 6.122.2, for the story of the sixth-century Athenian Kallias, who provided gifts for his daughters so that they may marry whomever they choose; and Hdt. 6.126-30, for an account of the vast sums Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sikyon, spends hosting suitors for his daughter, among whom Athenians were preeminent.

243. τοὺς γὰρ ἀρχαίους νόμους λίαν ἁπλοῦς εἶναι καὶ βαρβαρικούς. ἐσιδηροφοροῦντό τε γὰρ οἱ Ἕλληνες, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἐωνοῦντο παρ' ἀλλήλων.

In the following pages, we review the evidence in Homer for the economic and religious authority held by women. These two authorities were related, and the one the flip side of the other. Having discussed Homeric authority for women, we then discuss in more detail the phenomenon of the wealthy female burial found throughout the Geometric period. It is argued that the burial package of these aristocratic women portrays the same authority as seen among the leading women of Homer.

3.1. Female Authority in Homer

The lack of dowries in marriages is attested in the Homer epics. Unlike the Classical period, where words like προῖκα and φερναί can be used specifically to denote the gifts of a dowry, there is no word in Homer that has the exclusive meaning of a dowry. Wedding or marriage gifts are instead referred to as ἕδνα. Most often, these gifts are from the groom's family to the bride's family.[244] The gifts to the potential bride began at the wooing stage, in what often became a display of competitive gift giving among a host of suitors. The wooing of Penelope provides a study into what was expected of the suitors. According to Telemachos, suitors should compete with one another in gifts of cattle, sheep, feasts, and other lavish gifts.[245] Though Penelope's suitors are breaking custom by consuming the goods of the household, they do give gifts to both her and her family.[246] Indeed, before the archery test decided the issue, it was assumed by many that the "prize"–Penelope–would go to the victor of what was essentially a competition of gift-giving.[247] In the end, the successful suitor would have spent considerable resources for a bride, both during the competitive courtship and in the subsequent marriage gifts to her family. Iphidamos, *Il.* 11.244-5, sent Kisseus one hundred cattle as a suitor, with the promise of one thousand goats and sheep if he won her hand, which he did. Maidens had such a potential to attract wealth that they were called ἀλφεσίβοιαι, *Il.* 18.593, a testament to their "cattle-fetching" beauty and status for potential suitors.

---

244. *Od.* 8.318-319 (the gifts Hephaistos gave Zeus to marry Aphrodite); 15.367 (gifts Laertes and Antikleia received for Ktimene).

245. *Od.* 18.276-279: οἵ τ' ἀγαθήν τε γυναῖκα καὶ ἀφνειοῖο θύγατρα/ μνηστεύειν ἐθέλωσι καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἐρίσωσιν,/ αὐτοὶ τοί γ' ἀπάγουσι βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,/ κούρης δαῖτα φίλοισι, καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῦσιν.

246. *Od.* 15.17-18; 18.284-303.

247. *Od.* 21.162; cf. 11.117; 13.378; 15.18; 16.391; 20.289-90. For Eurylachos as the leading contender due to his extravagant gift-giving, see *Od.* 20.335, 15.16-18. Cf. the assumption, *Od.* 6.159, that Nausikaa will marry whoever gives the most gifts. For Penelope as the ἄεθλον, "prize," for which the suitors are contesting, see *Od.* 21.106-109.

Marriage gifts were not the responsibility of the groom or his family, alone. The family of the bride was responsible for organizing the wedding, and provided a number of gifts for the bride to bring into her marriage.[248] There are only three examples of a father offering a potential groom gifts to marry his daughter, without any expectation of marriage gifts in return; only one of these offers is accepted.[249] In these cases, the "value" of the daughter was of little consequence; each offer is a calculation by a king that the marriage will augment his own strength, either by producing a military alliance or by adding a warrior prince to his domain.

Aside from these exceptions, the overall tendency is for a marriage to spur gift exchanges from both families. The wedding gifts from both sides were called ἕδνα.[250] As such, wedding gifts were not categorized as "dowries" or "brideprices," but seen as comparable to the practice of *xeneia*.[251] We get the impression from Homer, however, that in the case of wedding gift exchanges, the bride's family received far more than the groom or his family, particularly when the gifts during the competitive courtship phase are considered. It is this imbalance that would also lead later generations to think of this time as one when brides were "bought".

Such an imbalance of exchange also makes the best sense in a society where the household was the autonomous center of economic production and consumption. In Homer, the hallmarks of wealth–cloth, cattle, sheep, goats, land, orchards, precious metals, etc.–are never purchased or traded in a local market place. Rather, they are gained almost exclusively either through plunder, or through gift exchanges between members of different communities, such as happens at weddings or through the practice of *xeneia*. Trade, in other words, most often takes the form of gift exchange with outsiders.[252] The goods a household exchanges are those it controls or produces itself. In

---

248. *Od.* 1.277-278; 2.196-197. For gifts given by the bride's family to the groom, cf. also 4.736-737; 6.27-30; 9.147-1488; 289-290; 20.342-343; 23.227-229; *Il.* 17.443; 18.82-85; 22.51; 22.468-72.

249. Agamemnon, *Il.* 9.144-148, 286-290, offers Achilles his daughter, along with a host of gifts, in an attempt to reconcile with Achilles. Alkinoos, *Od.* 7.311-315, offers his daughter Nausikaa to Odysseus, we may presume with little thought of getting gifts in return, since Odysseus has just washed up on his shores destitute. Both offers are rejected. Bellerophon, *Il.* 6.191-195, does accept the daughter of Iobates, king of Lycia, along with large tracts of land for orchards and ploughing. A fourth possible example is Tydeus, *Il.* 14.119-125, who seems to have accepted a similar deal from Adrastos, king of Argos.

250. *Od.* 1.277; 2.196; 2.252.

251. Finley 1981, p. 241; Seaford 1994, pp. 16-17.

252. Seaford 1994, pp. 17-19. For the low opinion of traders in Homer, see, e.g., *Od.* 8.162-164.

cases where a household controls considerable resources, and therefore the ability to create ever greater ties with other households through gift exchange, for example, the potential for ever increasing political or economic power is substantially greater. In a society comprised essentially of autonomous households, the status and leadership of women within the household and even the community as a whole was more pronounced than we find in the later Archaic and Classical periods.

One reason was the role cloth and clothing held as a valuable commodity and symbol of family prestige. As with other commodities in Homer, clothing and other textiles were produced entirely by the wives, daughters, and slave women of the household, or gained through gift exchanges.[253] The wealthiest homes held an abundance of clothing in their storerooms, which provided a means to accommodate guests, and a supply of esteemed gifts.[254] An abundance of cloth also facilitated the elite the ability to change clothes throughout the day, including after baths, and before dances, feasts, and other such entertainments.[255] This is in contrast to most poor people, who have only one set of clothes; the swineherd Eumaios, for example, regrets that though it is custom to offer suppliants a set of clothes, he does not have any to provide Odysseus, who has come to him disguised as a beggar.[256] An elite man's status and even identity was therefore symbolized by what he possessed in cloth.[257] Finally, Andromache decides she will burn sets of some of the finest clothes in Troy's storerooms so that Hector will accrue more fame

---

253. There are no references to clothes being traded or bartered for in Homer. The peplos Hecuba selects to dedicate to Athena, *Il.* 6.289-292, is made by Sidonian women, though even here garment is made in the household; Paris had brought the Sidonian women to Troy as slaves.

254. Storerooms of clothes: *Od.* 2.339; 15.104-105; 21.51-52; *Il.* 6.288-190. Cloth for guests to use: *Od.* 3.345-351; 3.467; 6.214. Cloak and tunic for departing guest: *Od.* 13.67; 14.516. Large gifts of cloth: *Od.* 8.392-293; 24.275-277. Cf. *Il.* 24.229-231, for the vast amount of cloth offered as part of the ransom for Hector's body.

255. *Od.* 6.60-65; 8.248-249.

256. *Od.* 14.510-517: τῷ οὔτ' ἐσθῆτος δευήσεαι οὔτε τευ ἄλλου,/ ὧν ἐπέοιχ' ἱκέτην ταλαπείριον ἀντιάσαντα,/ νῦν: ἀτὰρ ἠῶθέν γε τὰ σὰ ῥάκεα δνοπαλίξεις./ οὐ γὰρ πολλαὶ χλαῖναι ἐπημοιβοί τε χιτῶνες/ ἐνθάδε ἔννυσθαι, μία δ' οἴη φωτὶ ἑκάστῳ./ αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἔλθῃσιν Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υἱός,/ αὐτός τοι χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε εἵματα δώσει,/ πέμψει δ' ὅππῃ σε κραδίη θυμός τε κελεύει.

257. There are many instances in Homer where a man is recognized or not recognized by his clothing. See, e.g.,

in the eyes of the Trojans.[258] It is possible, then, that a large amount of cloth could have been burned at some at the graves of elite members of society, including perhaps a specially made funerary shroud, if we may judge by the weaving of such a shroud by Penelope.[259] Part of a man's reputation, therefore, in part relied upon the skills of his wife in particular, as well as his daughters and other female members of the household.

For women themselves, skill at weaving was a definitive source of status and esteem within the community. This is particularly the case with the weaving of peploi of women, which appear to have been the most elaborate of all woven garments, and the only ones woven with patterns or stories.[260] While the weavers of most cloth mentioned in Homer are anonymous, almost every peplos is identified by the name of the weaver.

An elite woman's responsibilities for the economic well-being of a household went beyond weaving. Women also were responsible for managing the stores and supplies held by a household, and controlled access to all storerooms. Penelope, for example, was in charge of watching over all the household possessions.[261] In a telling display of women's management of a household's possessions, they possessed the keys and controlled access to the storerooms. Hecuba, for example, needs no accompaniment to get the peplos she intends to dedicate to Athena.[262] Yet no male is seen freely entering his home's storerooms without the assistance of a female. In order to get into the storeroom of weapons, Telemachos not only had to convince a female housekeeper to open the doors for him, he also to convince her not to report the incident to Penelope.[263] Priam

---

258. *Il.* 22.508-514: νῦν δὲ σὲ μὲν παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσι νόσφι τοκήων/ αἰόλαι εὐλαὶ ἔδονται, ἐπεί κε κύνες κορέσωνται/ γυμνόν: ἀτάρ τοι εἵματ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κέονται/ λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα τετυγμένα χερσὶ γυναικῶν./ ἀλλ' ἤτοι τάδε πάντα καταφλέξω πυρὶ κηλέῳ/ οὐδὲν σοί γ' ὄφελος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐγκείσεαι αὐτοῖς,/ ἀλλὰ πρὸς Τρώων καὶ Τρωϊάδων κλέος εἶναι.

259. *Od.* 2.97-102; 19.146-7; 24.132-137. In each passage, Penelope feels she will be poorly judged by other women if she does weave a shroud for Laertes.

260. Van Wees 2003, p. 12.

261. *Od.* 19.524-529, where she even goes so far as to claim the house, and all (?) the household possessions are hers: ἐμοὶ δίχα θυμὸς ὀρώρεται ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,/ ἠὲ μένω παρὰ παιδὶ καὶ ἔμπεδα πάντα φυλάσσω,/ κτῆσιν ἐμήν, δμῶάς τε καὶ ὑψερεφὲς μέγα δῶμα,/ εὐνήν τ' αἰδομένη πόσιος δήμοιό τε φῆμιν,/ ἦ ἤδη ἅμ' ἕπωμαι Ἀχαιῶν ὅς τις ἄριστος/ μνᾶται ἐνὶ μεγάροισι, πορὼν ἀπερείσια ἕδνα. Cf. 11.177-178; 23.150-151. See also 21.9, for Penelope's free access to the storeroom that holds Odysseus' bow.

262. *Il.* 6.288. Cf. The access Arete, *Od.* 8.423-348, has to the stores.

263. *Od.* 2.344-380; 19.14-30; 21.380-387.

cannot gather together the ransom from the storerooms without calling Hecuba, nor does Menelaos enter his storeroom without Helen at his side.[264]

There is some evidence in Homer to support the notion that these leading women of a community were also its religious leaders. Indeed, we should anticipate that leading women, particularly a *basileia* such as Hecuba, did conduct communal rites just as their male counterparts did. In all cases in which a *basileus* led the sacrifices, the deity was male; Hecuba, then, would seem to be an appropriate figure to lead the prayers and sacrifices to goddesses on behalf of the community. Indeed we do find Hecuba leading a procession of older women to the temple of Athena. Once at the temple, *Il.* 6.297-311, it is the priestess Theano, however, who holds the keys for the temple of Athena at Troy, lays a robe on the knees of the statue of Athena, leads the prayer to Athena, and promises to sacrifice twelve heifers should Athena take pity on the Trojans during the war. In the context of Homeric ritual practice, it is odd that Theano would lead the prayers and sacrifices on behalf of the community, a rarity confirmed by the fact that a scholiast later felt the need to try to explain Theano's role in this scene.[265] Another explanation should

264. Hecuba and Priam: *Il.* 24.191-237; Helen and Menelaos: *Od.* 15.99-130. Note also that Maron, *Od.* 9.205-207, has to share knowledge of his secret wine with his wife and a female servant, presumably because he would have to go to them to unlock the room where they are kept. Similarly, we find in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, lines 149-159, that the wives of the great men of early Eleusis are the managers of the household estate: ταῦτα δέ τοι σαφέως ὑποθήσομαι ἠδ' ὀνομήνω/ ἀνέρας οἷσιν ἔπεστι μέγα κράτος ἐνθάδε τιμῆς/ δήμου τε προὔχουσιν ἰδὲ κρήδεμνα πόληος/ εἰρύαται βουλῇσι καὶ ἰθείῃσι δίκῃσιν:/ ἠμὲν Τριπτολέμου πυκιμήδεος ἠδὲ Διόκλου/ ἠδὲ Πολυξείνου καὶ ἀμύμονος Εὐμόλποιο/ καὶ Δολίχου καὶ πατρὸς ἀγήνορος ἡμετέροιο,/ τῶν πάντων ἄλοχοι κατὰ δώματα πορσαίνουσι:/ τάων οὐκ ἄν τίς σε κατὰ πρώτιστον ὀπωπὴν/ εἶδος ἀτιμήσασα δόμων ἀπονοσφίσσειεν,/ ἀλλά σε δέξονται: δὴ γὰρ θεοείκελός ἐσσι.

265. Scholia in Iliadem, 6.304: εὐχομένη δ' ἠρᾶτο: ὅτι τὸν ἱερέα περὶ τῶν κοινῶν εὔχεσθαι δεῖ, οὐκ ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστον. ἑκάστου δὲ τὸ ἀξίωμα οἶδεν ὁ ποιητής· τὴν Θεανὼ γοῦν Ἑκάβης παρισταμένης ποιεῖ εὐχομένην, καὶ τὸν Χρύσην τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων παρόντος τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως (cf. *Il.* 1.446-56). This opinion is clearly not supported by other evidence from Homer.

be offered, namely that Hecuba was indeed the priestess of Athena; Theano's role as priestess is a later Athenian interpolation.[266]

The earliest reference to the appeal to Athena on behalf of the Trojans is at the beginning of Book 6, when Helenus, *Il.* 6.86-100, urges Hector to ask Hecuba to gather the older women of the city and go to the sanctuary of Athena. Once she has opened the temple doors with the key–οἴξασα κληῖδι θύρας ἱεροῖο δόμοιο–she is to dedicate to Athena the fairest robe she owns, and promise a sacrifice of twelve heifers. Hector takes Helenus' advice, *Il.* 6.265-279, and sends Hecuba to gather the elder women and offer sacrifices to Athena at her temple. In both passages, Helenus and Hector assume Hecuba herself has rights to, if not possession of the temple key, as well as the right of leading sacrifices and appeals to Athena on behalf of all the Trojans. In neither passage is a priestess mentioned or assumed to be necessary for conducting the rites.

The religious authority that Hecuba possessed in leading communal rites did not derive simply from her role as the wife of Priam. Hecuba was a leading domestic and economic figure in her own right. Of all Homeric women, Hecuba is portrayed as the fiercest guardian of her family, one who is moved to violent thoughts when her family is threatened.[267] Furthermore, she is the only character in Homer provided with the epithet ἠπιόδωρος, "bountiful, plentiful," *Il.* 6.251, a nod to her economic power. Though we have only the dimmest of views into the religious authority of women in Homer, restoring Hecuba's religious authority is in accord with the general tendency in an idealized Homeric world for communal leaders to be their religious leaders.

We can see in Homer, then, a world in which women not only contributed to an estate's status and wealth through their weaving, but also held considerable responsibili-

---

266. The scene at the Athena temple is unique in many ways; for example, it features the only cult statue in Homer, and is the only scene to take place at a temple. In addition, the providing of a peplos for a cult statue of Athena, located within a temple on an acropolis, all seems a little too analogous to the Athena Polias sanctuary in Athens. As a result, the authenticity of this passage has been the subject of debate, and it is likely that the passage was a later Athenian interpolation. Cf. Lorimer 1950, pp. 442-449, for whom the passages dealing with the temple of Athena in Troy are likely Athenian interpolations for three reasons: 1. Athena throughout the *Iliad* is a bitter enemy of the Trojans; 2. Theano is never qualified as a priestess until *Il.* 6.298 (cf. her appearance in 5.70; 11.224); and 3. The offering of a robe recalls the Panathenaic festival a little too closely.

267. Cf. Hecuba's violent thoughts concerning Achilles, *Il.* 24.209-213: τῷ δ' ὥς ποθι Μοῖρα κραταιὴ/ γιγνομένῳ ἐπένησε λίνῳ, ὅτε μιν τέκον αὐτή,/ ἀργίποδας κύνας ἆσαι ἑῶν ἀπάνευθε τοκήων/ ἀνδρὶ πάρα κρατερῷ, τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἦπαρ ἔχοιμι/ ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα...

ties in overseeing and accounting for the fruits of an estate's production.[268] These women, by virtue of their standing and status in society, would also have been among the religious leaders of the community. This state of affairs accords nicely with the burial package we find with elite Geometric female burials in Athens and Attica. To see how this is the case, let us now look at the mortuary evidence for females in more detail.

3.2. The Phenomenon of the Wealthy Female Burial

From the Protogeometric through the end of the Late Geometric period, Attic female grave assemblages on average far outpace the male in terms of total number of objects, number of different objects, and overall wealth.[269] The wealthiest of these female burials date to the Middle Geometric, and have been found in a number of areas of Attica, including the Kerameikos, Athenian Agora, Kallithea, Phaleron, Eleusis, and Anavyssos.[270] This phenomenon is unique to Attica; no other contemporary Greek community provided such distinctive form of burial for wealthy women.[271] Analysis of these wealthy

---

268. At *Od.* 6.181-184, we find that the best houses are run jointly by a husband and wife who are of the same mind. The relationship between husband and wife is not always harmonious; Agamemnon's experience with Clytemnestra, *Od.* 11.441-456, leads him to advise Odysseus not to trust his wife.

269. Whitley 1991, p. 183: "Chief amongst [important continuities in the Athenian burial sequence from the Protogeometric to Late Geometric period] is the phenomenon of the rich female grave. Throughout the sequence it is always graves of women that are the most richly furnished". In fact, the average female burial far outpaces the male in terms of total number of objects, number of different objects, and precious materials from the Protogeometric through the end of the Late Geometric period. Cf. also Coldstream 2003, pp. 55-63, 73-81. This phenomenon, and in particular the phenomenon of the elite female grave, has been the subject of a number of recent studies; see, e.g., Strömberg 1993; 1998; Whitley 1996; Langdon 2003.

270. Characteristic wealthy female burials from Attica with grave goods comparable with the "Rich Athenian Lady" include the following: From Athens: Middle Geometric grave G 41 from the Kerameikos, and Middle Geometric Grave 1 from Kalavotti Street (Kübler 1954, pp. 235-236; *ArchDelt* 20 (1965) Chron., pp. 75-80). From Eleusis, the Middle Geometric Isis and Alpha graves (Skias 1898, pp. 103-107; note Young 1939, pp. 234-236, who prefers a Late Geometric date for these burials; Whitley 1991, p. 199, who sees an early eighth century, MGII/LGI date for both). From Anavyssos, Middle Geometric Graves 2 and 51 (*ArchDelt* 21 (1966) Chron. 97-98; cf. *ArchDelt* 29 (1973-1974) 108-109). See also Coldstream 2003, pp. 55-63, 73-81.

271. Whitley 1996.

female graves provides a small glimpse into the position these women held in Geometric Attic society. These burial packages show that at least until the seventh century, some women were prominent leaders of their communities, and held significant economic and religious authority in their own right.

Perhaps the most famous of these wealthy female burials–dated to the Middle Geometric period, ca. 850–was discovered in 1967 along the north slope of the Areopagus in Athens.[272] At the time of her death, she was thirty to thirty-five years old, and seven or eight months pregnant. Her body was cremated on a pyre, along with over twenty pots, and twenty-one handmade terracotta vessels, balls, spindles and beads. Her cremated remains were then placed within an amphora urn, along with a lavish array of personal affects that were removed just prior to her cremation. These include three pins, two fibulae and a finger-ring of bronze; six finger-rings, and elaborate earrings in gold; an iron pin with a bronze globe; a necklace with over one-thousand faience discs, accented with beads of glass and one rock-crystal; an ivory disc and two ivory seals. The bones of two goats, a calf, a lamb, and cattle were also placed within the urn. These animals would have provided over seventy kilograms of meat, providing what was surely an elaborate funerary feast. The urn was sealed with a cup and set within a trench, into which was then thrown the rest of the pyre debris. Additional unburned jugs, a pyxis, and an amphora sealed with a cup were set within the trench, along with a gold ring and another pin, at which time the trench was filled in. There is no evidence for a grave marker.

The burial package of "Rich Athenian Lady," as she is called, represents the richest ever discovered in post-Mycenaean Athens or Attica. Discussions of her status has revolved around one burial object in particular, a remarkable clay chest, the lid of which is topped with five conical granaries.[273] It has tempted many to connect the five granaries

---

272. Smithson 1968. For a recent discussion, including new analysis of the bone evidence, see Liston and Papadopoulos 2004.

273. Smithson 1968, pp. 92-97, nos. 22 and 23. There have been recent attempts to identify the model "granaries" as bee-hives; see, e.g., Richards-Mantzouliniou 1979; Cherici 1989; Williams 2000, pp. 393-394. Morris and Papadopoulos 2004, reject this identification, based in part on similar Egyptian models that date nearly one thousand years earlier; cf. Smithson 1969, pp. 11-13; Padgett 1993. The identification of these models as granaries is made more secure by the two slots at the base, which has parallels in the Late Geometric platforms of actual granaries from Lefkandi (Popham et al. 1980, pp. 15-16, 23-25; Ainian 1997, p. 120) and Smyrna (Snodgrass 1971, pp. 379-380, fig. 117; Cook 1962, p. 32, fig. 6). In Attica, the round Building III at Lathouriza has been interpreted as a seventh-century granary by Lauter 1985b, pp. 24-25. Langdon 1976, p. 51, interprets the circular Building C on Mt. Hymettos as a storage pit; more recently, Ainian 1994, pp. 65-80, has suggested that the building was designed to recall contemporary granaries, in an effort to thank Zeus symbolically for successful rain.

with the property class of the *pentakosiomedimnoi*, the "five hundred measure" property class established before the time of Solon.[274] Others have suggested that the granaries symbolize wealth more generally, which together with birth was a prerequisite for the office of archon before Drakon.[275] The granaries, in other words, have usually been interpreted as symbols of the wealth and political status of husband or family of the "Rich Athenian Lady".

These granaries do not tell us about the status of the lady's *husband*, but rather about the economic and domestic status authority *she* possessed over the family farm. This becomes clear when we place the model granaries in context. To date, twenty-seven models have been found in Greece; twenty-two are single granaries, two are double, one is triple, and one is the quintuple model found with the "Rich Athenian Lady." The models range in date from the Middle Geometric to Protoattic, with the majority dating to the Late Geometric. All but one granary model comes from Attica; more strikingly, almost every model found *in situ* comes from wealthy Attic female burials.[276] Not one model can be assigned to an adult male burial. The near exclusive association of granary

---

274. First suggested by Smithson 1968, pp. 96-97, and found in many discussions since. For the property class, cf. *Ath. Pol.* 7.3-4: [Σόλων] τιμήματι διεῖλεν εἰς τέτταρα τέλη, καθάπερ διῃρητο καὶ πρότερον, εἰς πεντακοσιομέδιμνον καὶ ἱππέα καὶ ζευγίτην καὶ θῆτα. καὶ τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ἀπένειμεν ἄρχειν ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίμνων καὶ ἱππέων καὶ ζευγιτῶν, τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ταμίας καὶ τοὺς πωλητὰς καὶ τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς κωλακρέτας, ἑκάστοις ἀνάλογον τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ τιμήματος ἀποδιδοὺς τὴν ἀρχήν: τοῖς δὲ τὸ θητικὸν τελοῦσιν ἐκκλησίας καὶ δικαστηρίων μετέδωκε μόνον. [4] ἔδει δὲ τελεῖν πεντακοσιομέδιμνον μέν, ὃς ἂν ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας ποιῇ πεντακόσια μέτρα τὰ συνάμφω ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρά...

275. E.g., Snodgrass 1971, pp. 379-380; Langdon 1976, p. 89; Coldstream 1995, p. 395. On the qualifications for office under Drakon, cf. *Ath. Pol.* 3.1, 6: ἦν δ' ἡ τάξις τῆς ἀρχαίας πολιτείας τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος τοιάδε. τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς καθίστασαν ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην...ἡ γὰρ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην ἦν, ἐξ ὧν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται καθίσταντο. διὸ καὶ μόνη τῶν ἀρχῶν αὕτη μεμένηκε διὰ βίου καὶ νῦν.

276. Elite female burials with granary models have been found in the Kerameikos in Athens, Phaleron, Eleusis, and Kallithea. A child's grave – gender unknown – from the Kerameikos accounts for the only other *in situ* granary models found in Attica. All models date to the Geometric period except for one sole early Protoattic example. For a catalogue of granaries, with bibliography, see Smithson 1968, pp. 92-97, n. 41, nos. 22, 23; Cherici 1989; Williams 2000. Cf. Strömberg 1993, p. 58, table 2.7. For discussions of the twin granary found at Phaleron, which unlike other models is a Handmade Incised Ware, see Smithson 1969; Padgett 1993, pp. 72-73, fig. 14. The lone non-Attic model is a triple granary from the Late Geometric sanctuary of Artemis at Ano Mazaraki; Petropoulos 1987, pp. 88-89, pl. IA', fig. 9; 2002, pp. 154-155, fig. 13, pl. 4.

models with elite women suggests that economic prosperity and even authority were in the hands of the elite women of Geometric Attica.

Though granary models are almost exclusively found in burials, they were not made for the sole intent of being buried. It is likely that leading women dedicated granary models at sanctuaries, perhaps as a sign of appreciation to an appropriate deity, or to place the family grain symbolically under the deity's protection. The upper lugs on the lid of the five-granary chest, for example, are fashioned as snake heads. Grain and snakes have a natural association; snakes may have been the most efficient guardian of granaries against rats and mice. Snake imagery is at home in sanctuaries of fertility deities; in Attica, snake imagery is particularly prevalent at Demeter sanctuaries in the seventh century.[277] These snakes may suggest that the family grain was placed symbolically under the care of Demeter.

The connection of granary models with deities is strengthened by a single model now in the British Museum.[278] It is unique among granaries found to date in that it has a hole pierced near the top, presumably for suspension at a sanctuary. In Attica, votives pierced for suspension, such as terracotta plaques, moldmade heads, and votive shields, have been found, with just one exception, to be exclusively dedicated at sanctuaries of Demeter, Athena, or Artemis.[279] The only model granary definitively associated within a sanctuary deposit, however, comes not from Attica, but from Late Geometric sanctuary

---

277. See, e.g., Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pl. 10, nos. A51-52, A54; Miles 1998, pl. 24, for snakes decorating votive plaques to Demeter at Eleusis and Athens, respectively. Snake iconography has been found in other seventh-century votive deposits, though the shrine of Nymphe is the only other identified, contemporary sanctuary where snake iconography is found; in this case, plastic snakes are attached to loutrophoroi; see Brouskari 1974, p. 93. Snake iconography is found in only two other seventh-century votive deposits, though the object of worship is unknown in each case. The first is the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit, within which was found the well-known "Goddess and snakes" plaque; see Burr 1933, pp. 604-609, no. 277, fig. 72-73; Cook 1934, pp. 195, 217; Boardman 1954, p. 197, Agora no. 2; Brann 1962, pp. 22, 87, no. 493. The second is a votive pit found under the Panathenaic Way, within which was deposited votive material dating from the seventh century to early fifth. Included among the seventh-century votives was a bronze *protome* of a bearded snake. For this deposit, see Thompson 1958, pp. 148-153; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 119-121, pl. 65 a, b. Beginning in the Late Geometric period, plastic snakes are commonly associated with death, and found applied to funerary vessels, such as prothesis and ekphora pots of the Late Geometric II and Protoattic periods, and Late Geometric horse pyxides; see p. 32, n. 133, p. 33, and Bohen 1988, p. 6, pl. 36.

278. British Museum GR 1997.8-15.1; Williams 2000, pp. 392-394, fig. 4.

279. The published exception: one painted terracotta foot from the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion. See Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 9; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 18.

of Ano Mazaraki, where Artemis was worshipped in part as a goddess of vegetation.[280] The granaries apparently were dedicated either so that the goddess would watch over the dedicant's grain, or as an expression of thanks for bounty.

The economic authority of women is even clearer when we observe that seals, kalathoi, and plastic horses are also strongly associated with the burial package of female elites in the Geometric period. With the disappearance of the elite female burial in seventh-century Attica, each of these items become clearly associated with seventh-century sanctuaries for fertility deities.

The burial urn of the "Rich Athenian Lady" contained two pyramidal ivory seals, likely possessions she used during her life.[281] These seals suggest that she possessed responsibilities and authority over some of the more important regulated, commercial activities conducted on behalf of the family.[282] To date, no seal has been found within contemporary male or child graves.[283] Seals have been found, however, in a number of other elite female graves around Athens; the exclusive association of seals with elite females once again reinforces the notion that leading women in the Middle and Late Geometric held an important role managing the economic affairs of the family estate.[284]

A fragment from a speech entitled "On the Priestess" by the fourth-century orator Lykourgos tells us that by law priestesses had to fix their seal to account books, indicat-

---

280. At least one miniature bronze tripod and a number of contemporary Late Geometric bronze and iron weapons have also been recovered from sanctuary deposits; Gadolou 1996; Petropoulos 2002, p. 150, pl. 3, fig. 3 If the sanctuary was for Artemis, alone, her worship certainly involved more than agricultural rituals; perhaps the weapons are a nod to her to aspect as a deity of hunting, as well. Spears and shields could also be dedicated to Artemis as reflections of the dedicant's prowess in war; see, e.g., *Anth. Pal.* 6.97, 127, 128.

281. Smithson 1968, pp. 115-116, nos. 79-80, pl. 33; Boardman 2001, p. 109, fig. 152.

282. Cf. Smithson 1968, p. 83: "The stamp seals in the ['Rich Athenian Lady'] grave suggest that women, too, had responsibilities in economic affairs, though these may have been confined to domestic matters."

283. On the gendered distribution of seals in graves, see Strömberg 1993, p. 58, table 2.7, p. 77. One would imagine that some men also had seals, though why these markers of identity would not be buried with any male is unknown. According to Boardman 2001, p. 109, it is possible that (most?) seals were made of more perishable material, such as wood, and have not survived in male burials. Even if true, it is striking that seals of valuable materials, such as ivory, are only found in elite female burials.

284. Middle Geometric seal from Kerameikos Grave 41; Kübler 1954, pl. 41. Middle Geometric seal from Kavalotti Street Grave 1; *ArchDelt* 20 (1965) Chron. 75-80, pl. 46; Boardman 2001, p. 109, fig. 153. Late Geometric seal from Kerameikos Grave VDAK1: Freytag 1974, pp. 22-23, no. 52, pl. 5; Boardman 2001, p. 385, fig. 318.

ing that at least by this period seals were an important aspect of religious authority.[285] Though it is highly unlikely that Geometric seals were used for account books, some elite females may have possessed seals in order to mark or guarantee ritual activities at shrines or sanctuaries. One seal found in a Late Geometric elite female burial from the Kerameikos is particularly suggestive.[286] It is a thin, square ivory, the length of which is pierced with a hole for suspension, presumably so that it could be worn. On one side of the seal are two enthroned figures, on the other a deer. Though the gender of the seated figures cannot be determined, terracotta figurines of seated goddesses are common in seventh-century Attic sanctuaries of Demeter, Artemis, and Athena. The seal suggests that the woman dealt with activities relating to or thought to be overseen by these goddesses. Seals were certainly directly involved in activities at sanctuaries and shrines by the Late Geometric and seventh century; seals found at the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron, and the sanctuaries of Athena and Poseidon at Sounion.[287] The seals, in other words, suggest both economic and religious authority in the hands of elite women.

Clay kalathoi begin to be deposited within female graves at the Kerameikos, though they are not a marker of elite burial at this time. By the Middle Geometric period, these objects become yet another hallmark of the elite female burial. At least eight open-work kalathoi were burned on the pyre along with the "Rich Athenian Lady"; three kalathoi are found in Isis grave at Eleusis, among the richest of graves in Attica; and two are found in a Late Geometric female burial from the Athenian Agora–Grave XVII–itself the richest of the so-called "Tholos Cemetery."[288] The shape represents in miniature terracotta a particular type of woven basket for carrying wool. In the same periods, spindle whorls, not a common grave good for women, become a marker of elite female burials as

---

285. Conomis et al. 1970, Fr. VI, no. 4 = Suda s.v. συσσημαίνεσθαι; Connelly 2007, pp. 197-198, 217-221.

286. Kerameikos Grave VDAK1: Freytag 1974, pp. 22-23, no. 52, pl. 5; Boardman 2001, p. 385, fig. 318.

287. Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 8, p. 211, fig. 21; Boardman 1963, pp. 123-127, fig. 12, pl. 15; 2001, pp. 122-123, figs. 178-183; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, 33, fig. 17, pl. 10, 33.

288. For the Protogeometric examples, and a general discussion of kalathoi in female graves, see Strömberg 1993, pp. 56, 66, 73, 86, table 2.4. "Rich Athenian Lady": Smithson 1968, pp. 98-103, nos. 28-34, fig. 4, pl. 28. The Isis grave at Eleusis has two cut and one solid kalathos: Skias 1898, p. 107, fig. 27, pl. 2. Grave XVII from the "Tholos Cemetery" has solid-walled two kalathoi, one of which may be a Boiotian import or Attic imitation: Young 1939, pp. 79-80, nos. XVII.5, 6, fig. 54.

a well.[289] Both items speak to the centrality of textile manufacture for families; their presence in graves would seem to indicate the role these elite women held in overseeing this part of the domestic economy.

Some of the solid-walled kalathoi are pierced with holes for suspension; open-work kalathoi could easily be suspended as well. We should entertain the possibility that at least some, if not all of these kalathoi were votives, symbols both of an important industry and of the deities who safeguarded this aspect of the domestic economy. In Athens, this deity appears once again to have been Demeter. Votive kalathoi appear in seventh-century deposits from the sanctuary of Demeter in Athens, though rarely anywhere else in Attica.[290] Outside of Attica, kalathoi appear in great numbers beginning in the seventh century at sanctuaries to Demeter in Corinth, and Hera in Perachora.[291]

Horse iconography is today often interpreted as a straightforward symbol with aristocratic status; few interpretations go beyond this rather general statement, though it is often assumed that horse iconography is primarily associated with the male status.[292] It is perhaps unsurprising, therefore, that the overwhelming majority of Protogeometric to Late Geometric funerary vessels with painted horse decoration are found in male burials. Before the Late Geometric period, horse iconography is rare, and usually restricted to one or two small horses in profile; there is no sense that a particular "scene" is being depicted, and there are no other accompanying figures.[293] The horses, in other words, may well be at home, simply standing as symbols of economic clout or status. In

---

289. Two spindle whorls were found with the "Rich Athenian Lady," for which see Smithson 1968, p. 108, nos. 58-59, pl. 30. Strömberg 1993, p. 95, who has assembled the evidence for female burials with spindle whorls, suggests that they are associated primarily with "'ladies' of the rich families."

290. Miles 1998, p. 112. One seventh-century kalathos has also been found at the sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Hymettos, and two have been found on the Zeus (?) shrine on Tourkovounia; cf. Langdon 1976, p. 69, no. 311, pl. 26; Lauter 1985a, pp. 79-80, nos. 126-127.

291. Sanctuary of Demeter at Corinth: Pemberton 1989, pp. 19-25; Sanctuary of Hera at Perachora: Payne 1962, pp. 302-303. A number of the kalathoi from the Demeter sanctuary are pierced for suspension; none from the Hera sanctuary are.

292. Horse symbols are interpreted by Smithson 1968, p. 96, as "signs of affluence"; by Snodgrass 1971, p. 414, as a marker of aristocratic society; by Coldstream 2003, p. 77, as "badges of knightly status". For Bohen 1997, pp. 46-47, horse symbols and model granaries "recall the basis of social status in ownership of land and its attendant produce and livestock" that became popular during a period of "probable consolidation of aristocratic control..."

293. See, e.g., Whitley 1996, pp. 224-226 for examples from the Kerameikos.

the Late Geometric period, horses become much more prominently featured on funerary pottery, particularly with the advent of chariot and other horse scenes on prothesis or ekphora kraters. In these cases, horses are usually depicted in ritual settings, such as chariot processions or games associated with funerals. The horses, in other words, are not the static, symbolic profiles they were before the Late Geometric; they are now active, and taking part in public performances. Such events were likely absent from female funerary rites, which may explain the absence of horse iconography on female prothesis vessels.[294]

While painted, two-dimensional horse representations are generally associated with male funerary pottery, three-dimensional, plastic representations of horses are restricted to elite female burials from the Early to Late Geometric.[295] These terracotta horses are usually found in groups of one to four affixed to the lid of pyxides; in the case of multiple horses, the horses stand abreast of one another to indicate a team of hors-

294. Ahlberg 1971, pp. 32-40, assembles the evidence for the distribution of iconographic elements on prothesis and ekphora, including horse and chariot scenes, by gender of the deceased.

295. The exceptions are so few as to "prove the rule." A funerary pyre from Grave XII of the "Tholos Cemetery," dated to the very end of the Late Geometric period, ca. 700, contained several terracotta figurines, including a horse; a chariot, horse, and charioteer group; three dogs; and three seated figures, one of which is enthroned; for all the terracottas, see Young 1939, pp. 61-67, nos. XII14-25, figs. 40-42. The grave to which this pyre belonged is not known, but the pottery, in particular the iconography of the prothesis pot, indicate the pyre was for a male. The richest grave of the "Tholos Cemetery" is Grave XVII, a female; among her twenty-two vessels are two horse pyxides; Young 1939, pp. 83-85, nos. XII15, 17, fig. 80. Individual horses have been found in elite female graves, e.g., the two horses found in Late Geometric grave G50 from the Kerameikos; Kübler 1954, pp. 243-245, pl. 143; Bohen 1988, p. 102, nos. 207-208, pl. 36. This grave also included a pyxis with a team of four horses on the lid. Painted horses have been found on pottery in elite female burials, but to my knowledge, only on horse pyxides; see, e.g., Bohen 1988, pp. 129-130, nos. H57, 62.

es.[296] The strong association of plastic horses and horse teams with elite women shows that horse iconography was not restricted to portraying male status. Yet the way in which iconography was employed differed for each gender, as can be seen not just by the different medium in which horses were fashioned for male and elite female burials, but also in the way that the horses were presented in each medium.

For men, horse iconography of the Late Geometric period generally represented wealth and status in action, away from the family estate; examples include processions, competitive games, and martial conflict. Horses were also part of the domestic economy, and a sign of a successful, wealthy estate with a diversified economy.[297] Overseeing the maintenance and raising of horses would have been part of the larger duties of estate oversight and management that at least some number of elite women possessed in the Geometric period. This interpretation is supported by horse-training scenes that decorated some of the possessions buried with elite females, including a Middle Geometric ivory seal and a fibula.[298] While horse-training itself would have been conducted by men, as would much of the work in the fields and around the farms, women would have held considerable responsibilities in managing the estate, and the success of the estate could be symbolically shown by horses.

In the seventh century, plastic horses cease appearing in female graves, instead appearing almost exclusively at Demeter, Artemis, and Athena sanctuaries throughout At-

---

296. For a catalogue of horse pyxides, and discussion of their distribution in graves by gender, see Bohen 1988, pp. 7-12, 95-104, 125-127, nos. 170-224, pl. 17-39; Strömberg 1993, pp. 56, 74, 86-90, table 7.4, fig. 9. While most horse pyxides date to the Middle and Late Geometric, the earliest date to EG I; see, e.g., the "Boots Grave" from the Athenian Agora; Young 1949, p. 290, no. 3, fig. 3, pl. 67. Strömberg 1993, p. 87, observes that in the two cases where horse pyxides were found in male graves, the horses were missing, leaving only their traces on the lid. It is tempting to suggest that the horses were deliberately broken off before interment; if so, the association plastic horses with elite females may have been so strong that the horses had to be broken off before a pyxis could be considered appropriate for a male burial.

297. Painted along the top of one model granary, in fact, are two horses. See Karlsruhe B 1511; CVA Karlsruhe 1, Deutschl. 7, pl. 4, figs. 5-8. The image is one of horses at the home estate, with one horse watching the other as it plays or prances. This model symbolizes two significant aspects of landed prosperity, grain and horses.

298. The seal is from the Kavalotti Street Grave 1; *ArchDelt* 20 (1965) Chron. 75-80, pl. 46; Boardman 2001, p. 109, fig. 153. Langdon 2003, p. 11, notes the horse-training scene engraved on a fibula from Kerameikos Grave G41, one of the wealthiest female burials of the Middle Geometric period; for the fibulae from this burial, see Kübler 1954, pp. 235-236, pls. 159-161; Coldstream 2003, p. 59, fig. 14.

tica.[299] The connection between horses and goddesses is well illustrated at the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis, where we find a terracotta of a goddess–dated ca. 700–seated upon a throne fashioned to look like back-to-back horses.[300] Similarly, a galloping horse was painted on the back of a terracotta goddess throne found within an elite female grave from Kallithea.[301] We must consider the possibility, therefore, that the plastic horses atop the pyxides of elite women symbolized not just the economic prosperity of a family estate, but some aspect of the divine, as well. Other horses found at these sanctuaries are clearly plastic renderings of the horse in action, taking part in processions or races. In these cases, the horse votives were indications of that some of the elaborate male burial rituals, such as games, had moved to the sanctuary.

To sum up, females and males of the Geometric period possessed religious authority by virtue of their greater societal authority and status. For males, this greater authority inherent in their military and/or economic leadership or power; for females the related authority was primarily economic. In both cases, we may imagine that membership in an illustrious family was a necessary, though perhaps not sufficient prerequisite. This religious authority need not have been tied to a particular shrine or sanctuary, and what shrines existed may at most have been simple, rustic affairs of no more than a rock altar centered around a sacred stream, rock, or grove.[302] The archaeological record, at any rate, indicates that the most ostentatious rituals and games occurred at the graves of these leaders until the Late Geometric period, at which time there was a dramatic shift not in ritual, so much as in the location of ritual. We turn now to this rising arena of communal ritual, the sanctuary.

---

299. Horses, riders, chariots: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, 17-23, 109-112, fig. 1, 4. Demeter at Eleusis: Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 151-159, pl. 18-19. Artemis at Brauron: p.c. Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon, April 30, 2008, who is publishing the terracottas from the site. Athena on Acropolis: Touloupa 1972; Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255. Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 208, 210, fig. 20; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 34, fig. 66.

300. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 204, no. A71, pl. 12.

301. Callipolitis-Feytmans 1963, pp. 414-418, no. 2, figs. 8-9, pl. 12; this same grave also held a model granary. The grave is dated Late or Subgeometric. Cf. from the Athenian Acropolis a near life-size terracotta statue of a goddess – dated ca. 680-670 – decorated with a winged horse in Nicholls 1991.

302. A vivid image of such a shrine is provided in Pl. *Phdr*. 230b. Cf. Burkert 1996, p. 23: "Both the concepts of *hieron* and of *asylon* which characterize the sanctuary are independent of the construction of temples and probably antedate their advent, as the altar (*bomos*) clearly does. A sanctuary will normally comprise a tree, a stone, and a source of water. Tree and water are the minimal conditions for survival, and the stone serves as a mark to make it special".

Chapter Four: The Rise of the Attic Sanctuary

1. Introduction

As with changes in the mortuary evidence, the rise of Attic sanctuaries and shrines has most often been discussed in terms of the rise of the Athenian polis. The evidence, however, is best accommodated if we think of Attic sanctuaries coming to prominence as an attractive alternative to funerary display. While many scholars have noted the transfer of wealth and ostentation from grave to sanctuary beginning in earnest around 700, discussion is often limited to simply stating this observation.[303] *Why* this transfer took place is less discussed. In addition, most discussions fail to note the extent to which ritual, as well as the religious authority of the landed aristocracy, was also transferred to the sanctuaries. In this chapter, I argue that the transition of ritual and ritual authority from grave to sanctuary was spurred initially by the aristocracy's desire for a new arena for competitive displays as they embraced austerity in funerary rites. These sanctuaries, and the festivals and processions associated with them, in turn created a ritual topography, which in turn provided a territorial claim for the local communities which they initially served.[304] Let us first review the evidence for the rise of sanctuaries in the Geometric period and seventh century.

Note: The sanctuaries that follow are discussed in brief. A full discussion, with bibliography, of each sanctuary and shrine can be found in the Appendix 1, pp. 210-254.

2. Protogeometric Period through the Middle Geometric

The earliest secure activity at a sanctuary or shrine dates to the Late Protogeometric period. Activity this early, however, is minimal, and restricted to three sites. The first

---

303. See, for example, Morris 1987, pp. 191-192; Snodgrass 1980, pp. 58-62. Van Wees 1998, pp. 367-377, views what he sees as the move of weapons from the grave to sanctuary as an attempt to keep conspicuous wealth in the public eye. On the whole, weapons are not a common dedication among the majority of Attic sanctuaries during the Geometric and Protoattic periods. For Osborne 1989, p. 319, the "cultic boom" of the seventh century is described as an effort to move away from the communal framework. Quite the contrary is the case. These cults *were* the communal framework.

304. Mylonopoulos 2006, p. 87.

is the sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Hymettos.[305] Only a handful of sherds were found for the Early and Middle Geometric I periods, though by Middle Geometric II and into Late Geometric I, activity once again increased, to judge from the increasing number of pottery sherds. Mt. Parnes is also reported to have pottery dating from the Late Protogeometric period, though the finds from this site remain unpublished.[306] As a result, we also do not know the level of activity on Mt. Parnes during the Early and Middle Geometric periods. Five other peak sanctuaries in Attica, presumably dedicated to Zeus, are known mostly from surface surveys. The pottery is often simply dated "Geometric"; without future work at these sites, it is difficult to know the extent to which peak sanctuaries saw ritual activity during the Early and Middle Geometric periods.[307]

Protogeometric pottery is also reported at the sanctuary of Artemis Mounychia in Peiraieus, though whether this early pottery is indicative of sanctuary or some other activity is not known.[308] The degree to which this activity continued into the Middle Geometric period is not reported. Activity at the sanctuary of Athena in Pallini begins in the Early Geometric period.[309] Small numbers of Middle Geometric sherds are also reported from a sanctuary site for an unknown female deity at Kiapha Thiti, located on a hill overlooking the passes that connect the Vari plain with the plains of Lower and Upper Lamptrai.[310]

It is interesting to note that during the periods in which Athenian and Attic graves held their highest material wealth, and trade was at its Geometric period peak, sanctuary and shrine activity was minimal, and essentially restricted to peak sanctuaries. It is possible, of course, that there were other sacrifices and festivals that did not leave an ar-

---

305. Langdon 1976.

306. Mastrokostas 1983, summarizes the finds, but provides no detailed publication of the pottery or other finds. Other summaries can be found in Hood 1959, p. 8; Daux 1960, p. 658; Vanderpool 1960, p. 269; Langdon 1976, pp. 100-101; Wickens 1986, I. 158-159, II. 243-245; Ainian 1997, p. 315.

307. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 27-30; Langdon 1976, pp. 103-105. Peak sanctuaries with "Geometric" pottery include, Mt. Agrieliki, which overlooks the southern Marathon plain; Mt. Merenda and Mt. Charvati, which overlook the southern Mesogeion plain; Mt. Pani's main peak, which overlooks the passes that connect the southern Mesogeion, Lower Lamptrai and Anavyssos plains; Mt. Pani's Kertovouni peak, which overlooks the Anavyssos plain.

308. Travlos 1988, pp. 340-346; Palaiokrassa 1989, 1991a, pp. 53-56, 64-66, 1991b, p. 96.

309. Filis 1994; 1997; Platonos-Giota 1999; Blackman 2000; Whitley 2003; 2006.

310. Christiansen 2000.

chaeological trace; these may have required no sanctuary, or at the very least consisted of rites at simple shrines and ritual activities that are difficult to detect in the archaeological record.

3. Late Geometric Period

Beginning in the second half of the eighth century, a series of sanctuaries and shrines appear in the archaeological record for the first time. In Athens, a wealth of bronze was recovered from the Athenian Acropolis, representing over seventy hammered tripod leg and ring-handle fragments from tripods and cauldrons.[311] In addition, over one thousand Late Geometric I sherds are reported, the published samples of which often depict funerary images, such as prothesis scenes.[312] Late Geometric activity has also been claimed for the site of the future City Eleusinion in Athens;[313] for Artemis Mounychia at Peiraieus;[314] the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis;[315] Artemis at Brauron;[316] Athena at Sounion;[317] and a possible sanctuary of Zeus at Tourkovounia.[318] The Late Geometric period may also be the date of two cave shrines, one possible to the Nymphs on Mt. Kastela, located southeast of Anavyssos, and another possibly for Antiope on Mt.

---

311. Schweitzer 1971, pp. 138-142; Touloupa 1972; Hurwit 1999, pp. 91-94.

312. Graef and Langlotz 1909, pp. 23-34, pls. 8-11. Evidence for activity on the Athenian Acropolis earlier in the Geometric period is scant. Only one or two published sherds date to the Protogeometric period; Desborough 1952, p. 93; Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 7; Graef and Langlotz 1909;. One sherd dates to the Early Geometric; Coldstream 1968, p. 13, n. 2; Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 272; Middle Geometric sherds are equally scarce. Cf. Hurwit 1999, pp. 88-89.

313. Miles 1998, pp. 17-23.

314. Travlos 1988, pp. 340-346; Palaiokrassa 1989, 1991a, pp. 53-56, 64-66, 1991b, p. 96.

315. For the definitive publication of the votives from the earliest sacrificial pyre from the site, Kokkou-Vyridi 1999 pp. 39-44, 197-216, plan 7-8, pl. 7-20; she dates the earliest votive material to the end of the eighth century. Contra Noack 1927, pp. 12-13; Binder 1998, p. 132, who date the earliest material to the seventh century.

316. Papadimitriou 1963; Kontis 1967; Themelis 1971; Hollinshead 1980, pp. 30-44; Eustratiou 1991b; Brulotte 1994, pp. 321-359; Themelis 2002, pp. 108-111.

317. Stais 1917, pp. 178-181, 207-213; 1920, pp. 48-55.

318. Lauter 1985a, pp. 24, 27, 122-123, 138-139.

Kitharion in northern Attica.[319] With the exception of the Athenian Acropolis, the Late Geometric material from all sites is slight, and for new sites seems to date to the end of the eighth century, Late Geometric II.

4. Seventh Century

After 700, there is a dramatic increase in the number of sanctuaries and shrines across Athens and Attica, as well as a marked increase in activity at preexisting sites. On the Athenian Acropolis, fewer than one hundred Protoattic sherds have been recovered, along with fewer than ten bronze tripods.[320] The Acropolis is among the richest of sanctuaries in terracotta votive figurines, however, which number into the hundreds.[321] The most striking of these terracotta votives is a near life-size, wheel-made terracotta statue of a female, dated to the first half of the seventh century.[322]

Elsewhere in Athens, activity is now detected at the shrine of Nymphe and the Hill of the Nymphs in Athens;[323] at sanctuaries to an unknown goddess at Lathouriza and at Panagia Thiti, both near Vari;[324] an Artemis sanctuary at Loutsa;[325] peak sanctuaries on Mt. Penteli, which overlook the plain of Marathon, Mt. Profitis Elias, which overlooks the agricultural plain south of Anavyssos, and the Kassidis peak, which overlooks the

---

319. Mt. Kastela cave: Wickens 1986, II pp. 15-20, no. 2; Lohmann 1993, pp. 68, 495, no. AN1, pl. 52.8, 122; Oikonomakou 1994; Blackman 2000, p. 15. Mt. Kithairon cave: Stikas 1939, p. 52, 1940; Wickens 1986, pp. 274-275, no. 50.

320. Bronze tripods: Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255.

321. Terracotta figurines: Jahn and Michaelis 1901, pl. XXXIV, nos. 1, 2; Winter 1903, pl. 24 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, 9, 10, 11; Casson and Nicholson 1912, pp. 318-320, 346-347, who note that many of the ninety-four standing female figurines were found northeast of the Propylaia, but no exact number is given. Küpper 1990, p. 20, suggests that over three hundred more, reported as Mycenaean in *AA* 1893, 140-141, are actually seventh-century in date.

322. These five fragments were published by Nicholls 1991; all now appear to be lost or misplaced. He dates the statue to ca. 680-670.

323. Shrine of Nymphe: Wycherley 1970, pp. 293-295; Travlos 1971b, pp. 361-364, figs. 464-467; Brouskari 1974, pp. 84-94; Hill of the Nymphs: No report of the deposit has yet been published, though some of the material, including loutrophoroi, is now on display in the new Acropolis Museum.

324. Lathouriza: Lauter 1985b; Ainian 1994, 1995. Panagia Thiti: Eliot 1962, pp. 56-58, fig. 5; Willemsen 1965, pp. 122-123, pl. 39.1.

325. Eustratiou 1991a, p. 73.

Charaka plain in southern Attica;[326] and the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion.[327] Another possible site is a sanctuary to an unknown goddess at Trachones.[328] Finally, according to Thucydides, 1.126.1-6, a festival for Zeus Meilichios, the Diasia, was established by the time of Kylon's failed coup attempt in 632. The shrine may have been located in Agrai, a rural district across the Ilissos River; to date, no archaeological evidence has been found to confirm Zeus Meilichios was worshipped in this area.[329]

In addition to the activity recorded at these sites for the first time, there is a dramatic increase in activity at all sites established during the Geometric period. The sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Hymettos is illustrative. While activity begins in the Protogeometric period, wanes throughout much of the Early and Middle Geometric periods, and an upsurge in activity is detected in the Late Geometric, sherds from the seventh century handily outnumber all those of the previous period combined.[330] This pattern is indicative of the rise of sanctuary activity in Athens and Attica.

---

326. Mt. Penteli: Langdon 1976, p. 102. Mt. Profitis Elias: Langdon 1976, p. 104. Kassidis Peak: Lohmann 1993, pp. 388-389, no. CH 60, pls. 52.5, 123.3.

327. Stais 1917, pp. 194-197.

328. Küpper 1990, p. 20; Mersch 1996.

329. See *SEG* 21.541.137-143; Jameson 1965, pp. 154-172; Robertson 1992, pp. 21-22, map 1; Lalonde 2006, pp. 108-109.

330. The sherd counts by date are the following. Late Protogeometric: 69; Early Geometric I: 0; Early Geometric II: 13; Middle Geometric I: 12; Middle Geometric II: 91; Late Geometric I: 82; Late Geometric II: 294; seventh century: 589; sixth century: 109; fifth-first century: scant sherds; Late Roman: a number of lamps. See Langdon 1976, p. 75, table 1-2.

Concluding Remarks: The Ritual Continuum from Graves to Sanctuaries

By the seventh century, funeral displays and ostentation were dramatically reduced, lessening the centrality such rituals held for competitive displays of status and authority, as well as the shared rites around which a community could be formed. The proliferation of sanctuaries served to provide a new arena for these ritual activities, one which appealed to the leading families once they abandoned ostentatious burial practices. Many of these ritual activities at sanctuaries were initially much the same as has been conducted at funerals, indicating not a break, but a continuum of ritual practice. The great number of bronze tripods found on the Athenian Acropolis in the Late Geometric period, for example, are best understood not as prizes won in athletic competitions for the goddess, but prizes won during funerary games below the Acropolis, and subsequently dedicated to a deity, perhaps Athena.[331] Such an interpretation would also explain the large number of funerary vessels, particularly those with prothesis scenes, which themselves may have been prizes won. By dedicating funerary prizes, status now became displayed more prominently, on a height overlooking all Athens. The sheer number of tripods that have survived from the Late Geometric period–around seventy–suggests a number of rival families may have dedicated their prizes on the Acropolis. Once dedicated on the Acropolis, these symbols of status and authority won during elaborate funerary rituals continued to compete long after the funerals.

A review of standard terracotta dedications at sanctuaries of the seventh century shows a similar connection with what were previously funerary rites of the Geometric period.[332] Horses, horse and rider, and chariot figurines are common in Demeter, Artemis and Athena sanctuaries throughout Attica.[333] Terracotta votive shields have been found at Demeter sanctuaries in Athens and Eleusis, as well as from the Acropolis

---

331. Kyle 1987, pp. 25-31; Langdon 1997, pp. 116-118.

332. For reference, see the votive charts in the appendix, pp. 296-305.

333. Horses, riders, chariots: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, 17-23, 109-112, fig. 1, 4. Demeter at Eleusis: Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 151-159, pl. 18-19. Artemis at Brauron: p.c. Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon, April 30, 2008, who is publishing the terracottas from the site. Athena on Acropolis: Touloupa 1972; Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255. Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 208, 210, fig. 20; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 34, fig. 66. Athena at Pallini: Filis 1994; 1997; Platonos-Giota 1999; Blackman 2000; Whitley 2003; Whitley 2006.

and a sanctuary to an identified goddess at Kiapha Thiti.[334] Terracotta votive plaques have been found at Demeter sanctuaries in Athens and Eleusis, as well as from the Acropolis and the Athena sanctuary at Sounion, many of which are decorated with images of snakes and/or tripods.[335] As we noted above, bronze tripods continue to be deposited on the Athenian Acropolis.[336]

This seventh-century terracotta votive package–terracotta horses, chariots, tripods, shields, and snakes–mirrors the motifs that are commonly found on prothesis funerary vessels of the Late Geometric period. The relationship between prothesis pot iconography and plastic votive offerings is further strengthened by a Late Geometric II funerary pyre discovered in the Athenian Agora.[337] This pyre contained a prothesis amphora, with images from a chariot procession below. On one side of the amphora, above the prothesis scene, is a line of mourning men. On the other side, opposite the mourning men, are depicted three men, one holding a wreath, another a knife, the third a pot, possibly an incense-burner. Snakes are painted in the panels with the prothesis and chariot scenes, and plastic snakes have been applied to the rim, shoulder, and handles of the vessel. More remarkable, the pyre included an array of terracotta figurines, including a charioteer and a horse.[338]

A contemporary pyre from the same cemetery also held a terracotta figurine of a seated mourning woman.[339] On the front and back of the figurine another seated female figure is drawn, her hands positioned just as that of the figurine, and echoing the mourning women painted on prothesis pots. As the potter's debris from a seventh-century pit near the Demeter sanctuary illustrates, potter, painter, and figurine maker were one; it is therefore natural that the potter would try his hand at rendering in plastic the

---

334. Votive Shields: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, 17-23, 109-112, fig. 1, 4. Demeter at Eleusis: Skias 1898, col. 69; Wolters 1899, p. 120, n. 12-13. Athena on Acropolis: Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 100, nos. 2484-2492. Kiapha Thiti: Christiansen 2000, p. 71, pl. 10.

335. Votive Plaques: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, pl. 24. Demeter at Eleusis: Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 39-69, pl. 9-11; cf. Noack 1927, pp. 12-13, fig. 4-5; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Eleusis nos. 1-5; Travlos 1983, p. 337, fig. 16. Athena on Acropolis: Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 286; Boardman 1954, pp. 195-196. Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 209, fig. 19; Boardman 1954, p. 198; Goette 2000, p. 33-34, pl. 34.

336. Touloupa 1972; Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255. Note also a miniature bronze tripod from the sanctuary of Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 208, fig. 18; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 32.

337. Grave XII from the Tholos cemetery; Young 1939, pp. 55-67, figs. 37-42.

338. Other figurines include at least four seated (mourning?) women, three dogs, and a bird.

339. Grave XI, for which see Young 1939, pp. 46-55, figs. 35-36.

scenes he was accustomed to painting.[340] Here we find a remarkable example of a potter expressing mourning in two media with one figurine.

These two pyres exemplify a transitional period, in which elements of the iconography of funerary ritual, including processions of soldiers and games, become rendered in three dimensions, a process already begun with snakes applied to the pots at the end of the Late Geometric period. The chariots, shields, and tripods that we find at goddess sanctuaries, then, are plastic representations of some of the ritual activity now conducted at festivals on behalf of a goddess, and thereafter considered appropriate dedications to them. As such, these terracottas provide evidence that some of the features common at a number of festivals familiar to us from later periods, such as the competitive games and processions of armed soldiers conducted at the Panathenaia, became common by the early seventh century. Our evidence for the funding and oversight of festivals and sanctuaries becomes clearer towards the end of the seventh century and beginning of the sixth century, when what may be properly considered the historical period of Early Athens begins. It is to this evidence that we now turn in Part Two.

340. Just north of the Eleusinion was found a pit of debris from a potter's workshop, dated to the second half of the seventh century. Within the pit were found neatly stacked skyphoi, kotylai and other cup shapes, along with a variety of other shapes, such as aryballoi. Lamps, spindle whorls and loomweights were also recovered. Included among the deposit were close to three hundred terracotta figurines, including fifty-six standing columnar figures, and five enthroned female figures. Dozens of horses and horse groups. Also found were five terracotta plaques, and four terracotta shields. The proximity of the potter's workshop to the City Eleusinion suggests that at least some of the votives were intended for deposition at this sanctuary to Demeter. See deposit S 17:2 in Brann 1962, p. 131; Miles 1998, pp. 17-18; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 143-186.

PART TWO:
THE ROLE OF PRIVATE INITIATIVE IN ATHENIAN RELIGION
CA. 640-450

Chapter Five: The Age of Drakon and Solon

1. Introduction

In 640, a wealthy Athenian named Kylon won a prestigious victory at the Olympic games. In the years that followed, he attempted to seize the Athenian Acropolis. The coup ended disastrously; his followers, and perhaps Kylon himself, were slaughtered by a group led by the powerful Alkmaionidai clan. The subsequent hostilities between descendants and supporters of Kylon and the Alkmaionidai began a long period of factional strife. A religious crisis also befell the city, for the murders of the conspirators at the altars of Athena brought a curse upon Athens.

In the first part of this chapter, we ask the question: Who held the authority and power to resolve this religious crisis? Was such an authority centralized, and held by the institutions of the state? We also investigate the reforms that followed the coup, in particular the religious reforms of Solon. As we will see, Solon has been credited with writing up the first state calendar of sacrifices, establishing official state festivals aimed at unifying the Athenians, and breaking the aristocratic hold on Athenian religious life. We examine the evidence claim, as well as any evidence for the role of prominent families in the religious life of Athens. Let us begin our investigation with Kylon's coup.

2. Kylonian conspiracy: political and religious crisis

At some point between the years 636 and 628, a wealthy Athenian named Kylon attempted to seize the Acropolis.[341] Our sources on this event vary in important details.[342] According to Herodotus, Kylon's armed followers consisted of a company of his peers,

---

341. Kylon's coup came after his victory at Olympic Games according to Hdt. 5.71.1, and Thuc. 1.126.3. Euseb. *Chron.*, Ol. 35, dates Kylon's victory of the double-race at Olympia to 640. As Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1-4, makes clear, the coup attempt occurred some length of time before Drakon's reforms, traditionally dated to the thirty-ninth Olympiad, 624/3-621/0. For more on Drakon's date, see below. The coup attempt occurred during an Olympic year; cf. Thuc. 1.126. As a result, 636 is the earliest year that the attempt could have been made, and 628 the latest. Lévy 1978, argues for an early sixth century date for the Kylonian conspiracy, ca. 597-595, a position refuted by Gagarin 1981b and Rhodes 1981, pp. 79-84.

342. For a detailed discussion on the variations of the tale in the ancient sources, see Jameson 1965, pp. 167-172.

ἑταιρηία τῶν ἡλικιωτέων.[343] Kylon's coup immediately failed, leading him to take refuge at τὸ ἄγαλμα, the statue of Athena on the Acropolis. According to Herodotus, οἱ πρυτάνιες τῶν ναυκράρων, or "the presidents of the *Naukraroi*," who ruled Athens at the time, succeeded in removing the men from the Acropolis; contrary to custom, however, Kylon and his men were put to death by members of the Alkmaionidai.

Thucydides, in what may be a conscious corrective to Herodotus' tale, offers a different version of the events: Kylon attacked the Acropolis not only with a band of peers, but with rival Megarians, with whom he had close ties due to his marriage to the daughter of Theagenes, the tyrant of Megara.[344] The coup failed because Kylon misunderstood an oracle, which foretold that the best time to take the Acropolis would be during the great festival of Zeus. Kylon did not ask whether this festival was the Panhellenic Olympic Games or the Athenian Diasia; as a recent Olympic victor, he simply assumed that the Olympic Games were meant.[345] When word of the coup spread, farmers streamed in from the countryside and blockaded the Acropolis. The siege lasted for so many weeks that while Kylon and his brother managed to escape, those who could not get away began to die of famine, some even dying within the temple or sanctuary. The rest of the men sought the protection of Athena at her altar. Only after the people grew tired of the long blockade did they return to their fields, handing over responsibility for guarding the Acropolis to the nine archons, who Thucydides, in contrast to Herodotus, claims were the principal authorities in Athens. These archons convinced Kylon's army to leave Athena's Acropolis sanctuary only by promising that no harm would come to them. Kylon's men were killed, however, as they came down, including those who took refuge at the sanctuary of the Furies. The killers, most notably members of the Alkmaionidai, declared accursed and guilty of crimes against Athena, were banished along with their families.

Our third major source is Plutarch, whose account depends largely on Aristotle.[346] As with Herodotus' account, Megarians are not mentioned. Plutarch agrees with Thucydides, however, that the archons were the ruling body of Athens, and even names Megakles the Alkmaionid as the archon who convinced the Kylonian band to surrender.

---

343. Hdt. 5.71. For the role of *hetairoi* in armed conflicts in Homer and in the Archaic period, cf. Murray 1983.

344. Thuc. 1.126. For Thucydides' account as a corrective to the Herodotus, or at least the *communis opinio*, see Wade-Gery 1933, p. 22; Jacoby 1949, pp. 186-187, 368, n. 84; Jameson 1965, pp. 167-172; Gomme 2003, ad loc.

345. Is it possible that Kylon also found the time fitting because many of Athens' leading men, some of whom his rivals, would have been away at the Olympic Games?

346. Plut. *Sol.* 12.4-6. Cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1.1, for similar details found in Plutarch.

The conspirators, in an attempt to remain under the protection of Athena, came down from the Acropolis holding a thread that they had fastened to her statue. When they reached the sanctuary of the Furies, the thread broke, and Megakles led the other archons in killing the conspirators, including those at altars.[347] A cycle of violence ensued between the surviving members of the conspirators' families and the Alkmaionidai, which lasted for decades until Solon convinced the Alkmaionidai to stand trial before three hundred jurors, selected from the leading families of Athens. With Myron of Phlya conducting the prosecution, the Alkmaionidai were convicted and banished, and their descendants' bodies exhumed and cast out of the land. The cursed land was purified by Epimenides of Crete, who reformed Athenian religious practice by instituting new sacred rites and altars.

In each of these accounts, the broad outlines are clear: Kylon attempted a coup that ended with the death of most of his men; the Alkmaionidai were the family most associated with the killing, which was deemed an outrage against Athena, since the men had been her suppliants; the Alkmaionidai were accused of similarly defiling at least one other sanctuary; these events led to a curse on the city, lifted only later by the banishment of the family for some period of time.[348]

The central issue for us in this story is determining who had the power to judge and punish religious crimes in the seventh century, and in particular those crimes committed by both the Kylonian band, and its killers. Our three principal sources may disagree about which board served as the central political authority of Athens, but all agree that the political apparatus of Athens was not particularly strong or efficacious. No state army arose to defend the Acropolis against the relatively small band of men that accompanied Kylon; this is particularly striking if we accept the versions of the tale that record Megarians among Kylon's force.[349] Instead, the initial response to the coup was met by an outraged group of local farmers and families, who themselves were sufficient in arms

---

347. For discussion of the tale as it relates to the topography of Early Athens, see Harris-Cline 1999, who suggests that the seventh-century altar of the Furies, or Dread Goddesses, was on the east side of the Acropolis, as was the descent route of the Kylonian band.

348. Our sources are silent as to why the Alkmaionidai felt justified in killing the suppliants while suppliants. Anderson 2005, p. 181, suggests that the coup threatened the power of the Alkmaionidai, and that their violent reaction was meant to serve as a warning to future threats. Jameson 1965, pp. 170-171, suggests that the Alkmaionidai likely claimed that Kylon and his cohorts committed religious transgressions so outrageous that their status as suppliants was not sufficient to save them.

349. Frost 1984, pp. 286-287.

and numbers to blockade Kylon's men. Some of these men undoubtedly were the armed followers of powerful and local families, no doubt rivals to the family of Kylon.[350]

These families and their followers handed over to the ruling board the responsibility to deal with the situation only weeks later, when those gathered had grown tired of the long blockade.[351] Although the authority to deal with the situation eventually fell to the ruling board, the tradition is clear on what happened next: the final punishment was meted out primarily by a single powerful family, the Alkmaionidai.

The family of Kylon was itself a powerful and wealthy one; in the aftermath of the slaughter of the Kylonian band, the family regained its strength, and they and the Alkmaionidai clashed violently, inaugurating a cycle of vengeance killings among the descendants of the families that would tear the city apart for decades to come.[352] The organs of state were not sufficient to the task of quelling the violence, nor did they have recourse to an armed force to deal with the situation. With violent clashes among armed families and their supporters have become the norm, Athens became a dangerous place to live.

3. Drakon and the Trial of the Alkmaionidai

350. Frost 1984, p. 293: "[N]o regular mobilization ever seems to have taken place [before Kleisthenes], unless the army that went to Plataea in 519 was such a force. On the other hand, it can be demonstrated that in late archaic Athens, regardless of the actual law, an effective military force could be raised [by individuals] by the promise of land for the participants–but for virtually no other reason." For a similar state of affairs in Archaic Rome, cf. Cornell 1995, pp. 143-144, who describes the military leaders of that period as *condottieri*, or warlords, "whose power rested on the support of armed personal dependents, in Latin called 'clients' (*clientes*), or 'companions' (*sodales*). These armed formed what were essentially private armies, operating independently of state governments, moving freely across state frontiers, and frequently changing allegiances."

351. The coup presumably occurred in August, the month when the Olympic Games were held. If our sources are right that the blockade of the Acropolis went on for weeks, it is possible that the blockade lasted until the fall, when the farmers had to leave the affair to the board so that they could attend to their farms.

352. Plut. *Sol.* 12.2.

This untenable situation may provide the context for Drakon's laws on homicide in ca. 621, more than a decade or so after the Kylonian conspiracy.[353] We are fortunate that a late fifth-century inscription, *IG* i³ 104, records some of Drakon's law on the prosecution of unintentional murder. According to the law, *basileis* were to preside over the trial of the accused, and the *ephetai*, a board of fifty-one men, were to give the verdict. In the event of a conviction, pardon could be granted by members of the deceased's family. The guilty were sent into exile, and were banned from games, Amphiktryonic rites, and "frontier market"; anyone who killed a person in exile was to be considered as guilty as someone who kills an "Athenian."[354] Implicit in this law is the sense that the Athenian state had recognized borders, and a sense of who was and was not an Athenian. Importantly for our study, the institutions of the state, here the *basileis* and *ephetai*, were given the authority not only to enforce laws on homicide, but ban guilty parties from Athenian religious life.[355]

This law was to be applied retroactively; given that fact, it is possible that part of Drakon's motivation was to curtail the right of families to kill on the basis of vengeance alone.[356] If so, the law did little to end the factional strife among the leading families of Athens, as well as among those who felt disenfranchised by these families.[357] Fear and instability prevailed in the city. Strange and ill-boding portents began to appear around

---

353. The traditional date for Drakon's reforms is sometime during the thirty-ninth Olympiad, 624/3-621/0; cf. Tatian, *Or. ad Graecos* 41, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.16; Eusebius, *Chron.* 99b; Suda s.v. Δράκων. For a discussion of the date of Drakon, see Stroud 1968, pp. 66-70, who prefers 621/0, and Develin 1989, pp. 30-31. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 4.1, places Drakon's reforms within the–as yet undated–archonship of Aristaichmos.

354. *IG* i³ 104.27-30: ἐὰν δ]έ [τ]ις τὸ[ν ἀν]δ̣ρ̣[οφόνον κτένει ἢ αἴτιος ἦι φόνο, ἀπεχόμενον ἀγορᾶ]ς ἐφορί[α]ς κ̣[α]ὶ [ἄθλον καὶ *h*ιερὸν Ἀμφικτυονικὸν, *h*όσπερ τὸν Ἀθεν]αῖον κ̣[τένα]ν̣[τα, ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐνέχεσθαι·

355. For discussions of *IG* i³ 104, and Drakon's homicide law in general, see Stroud 1968; Gagarin 1981a; Stanton 1990, p. 26; Osborne 1996, p. 188; Gallia 2004. Cf. Dem. 20.157-158. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 4, provides a fuller list of Drakon's supposed reforms. Whatever we think of the nature or historicity of the constitutional initiatives traditionally assigned to Drakon, only his laws on homicide were accepted or efficacious; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 5.1-2; Arist. *Pol.* 1274b; Plut. *Sol.* 13, 17.

356. *IG* i³ 104. 19-20: καὶ *h*οι δὲ πρ]ότε[ρ]ον κτέ[ν]α[ντ]ε[ς ἐν] τὸ[ιδε τὸι θεσμὸι ἐνεχέσθον. Stroud 1968, pp. 70-74, for the possibility that the law was a response to vengeance killings.

357. What religious reforms, if any, Drakon initiated are unknown; cf. Stroud 1968, p. 81.

the city, and seers confirmed that the gods, upset at some pollution, had a hand in this terrible state of affairs.[358]

The Kylonian faction, unable to drive out the Alkmaionidai after decades of struggle, and perhaps now forbidden to decide the issue through arms as a result of Drakon's laws, seized an opportunity to employ a new weapon to use against their rivals: religion.[359] The Kylonians accused the Alkmaionidai of pollution and defilement, no doubt assuring the community that the banishment of this family would appease Athena, and bring stability to Athens. What body actually held the power to judge and punish the religious transgressions of the family?

We should expect that the *basileis* and *ephetai* would be the presiding officials over the murder case, but if they were, neither is attested in the versions of the trial that have survived.[360] Our evidence of the prosecution comes from Aristotle and Plutarch, who record that Solon, together with the ἄριστοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων–the "best of the Athenians"–convinced the Alkmaionidai to submit to an *ad hoc* court of three hundred of the "best men," chosen from Athens' leading families.[361] The prosecutor's name, Myron of Phlya, is recorded, a detail that perhaps encourages some belief in the tale. This court convicted the Alkmaionidai of sacrilege, and sentenced the entire family to exile.

Solon's authority to convene the court was derived from his personal influence and standing within the community.[362] Likewise, the authority of the members of the court to judge the case was probably based upon their respective family's position within the community, not any constitutional position. The members of the court and their families had themselves presumably taken a side in the conflicts that ravaged the city for generations. The convening of this court would have provided the leading families an *ad hoc*, state institution in which to negotiate new alliances, and in the end attempt to calm the disorder brought about by the feuding clans. In the end, the trial was just as much a ne-

---

358. Plut. *Sol.* 12.3.

359. For the long lapse of time between the slaughter of the Kylonian band and the subsequent trial and expulsion of the Alkmaionidai, cf. Plut. *Sol.* 12.1, citing Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1. Thucydides is silent on the length of time a time between the murders and expulsion; Herodotus does not mention the first expulsion at all.

360. Given the powerful positions that the Alkmaionidai held in Athens, it is easy to imagine that some of the *basileis* or *ephetai* were sympathetic with, or even members of, the Alkmaiondai. If true, this would hamper any efforts by Kylonian sympathizers to take advantage of Drakon's law.

361. Plut. *Sol.* 12.2-3; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1.1. Herodotus and Thucydides are silent on this issue.

362. Plut. *Sol.* 12.2, cites only Solon's good reputation, δόξα, as the basis for his authority to convene the court.

gotiation of power among the leading families of Athens as it was about judging religious infractions.

That said, we should consider the possibility that the details of the Alkmaionid pollution were exaggerated or even arose at a later date. As we have seen, our earliest sources for the event date to the fifth and fourth centuries, and their conflicting testimony may reflect different spins by different factions. The families who held the priesthoods and maintained the shrines of Athena on the Acropolis and the Furies down below, the sites most associated with the sacrilege, handed down different versions of the event, as did the traditions passed down by individual clans, including the Alkmaionidai, who no doubt had a different version they told.

The versions of Alkmaionid pollution that we have, however, were those circulated by the enemies of the Alkmaionidai in 508, more than a century after the fact, in an effort to provide a pretext to drive them and their supporters out of Athens. At that time, the Peisistratidai had been driven out of Athens, and in the power vacuum that followed, the Alkmaionidai were getting the best of Isagoras and his followers for control of Athens. All sources agree that Isagoras thought of the curse as a way to provide a religious pretext for King Kleomenes to come to Athens to drive out the Alkmaionidai and their sympathizers once again.[363] It is possible that Isagoras exaggerated and perhaps composed some aspects of the Kylonian sacrilege, the details of which had been handed down in the collected and conflicting memory of the priests of the shrines and families involved. Isagoras' tale competed with these other versions. The fourth-century historian Theopompos records one such competing version, in which a plague arose as a result of the pollution brought about by the actions of the *Kylonian* band, not the Alkmaion-

363. Hdt. 5.70.2: τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα πέμπων ὁ Κλεομένης ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας κήρυκα ἐξέβαλλε Κλεισθένεα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλους πολλοὺς Ἀθηναίων, τοὺς ἐναγέας ἐπιλέγων: ταῦτα δὲ πέμπων ἔλεγε ἐκ διδαχῆς τοῦ Ἰσαγόρεω. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι καὶ οἱ συστασιῶται αὐτῶν εἶχον αἰτίην τοῦ φόνου τούτου, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ μετεῖχε οὐδ' οἱ φίλοι αὐτοῦ. Thuc. 1.126.1-2: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἐπρεσβεύοντο τῷ χρόνῳ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐγκλήματα ποιούμενοι, ὅπως σφίσιν ὅτι μεγίστη πρόφασις εἴη τοῦ πολεμεῖν, ἢν μή τι ἐσακούωσιν. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν πρέσβεις πέμψαντες οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐκέλευον τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὸ ἄγος ἐλαύνειν τῆς θεοῦ. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 20.2: ὁ δὲ Ἰσαγόρας ἐπιλειπόμενος τῇ δυνάμει, πάλιν ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν Κλεομένην ὄντα ἑαυτῷ ξένον, συνέπεισεν ἐλαύνειν τὸ ἄγος, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἀλκμεωνίδας δοκεῖν εἶναι τῶν ἐναγῶν.

idai, and that two men associated with Kylon were executed in the early sixth century in an effort to lift the curse.[364]

It is perhaps no surprise, then, that this attempt to link the Alkmaionidai with a still active curse had no effect on the Athenians.[365] Though over seven hundred families were exiled as "accursed," this was accomplished only by Kleomenes' military might; neither he nor Isagoras had the authority to affect the exile on religious grounds, alone.[366] Once Kleomenes was forced to withdraw, the exiled families immediately returned, and Kleisthenes was welcomed as the ἡγεμὼν...καὶ τοῦ δήμου προστάτης, leader and champion of the people.[367] In the end, Isagoras' promotion of a tale of Alkmaionid pollution failed to turn the Athenians against Kleisthenes, and played little material role in the events of 508. There is no evidence that these accusations of pollution, alone, ever prevented the Alkmaionidai from gaining political authority in the sixth and fifth centuries.[368]

The possibility that the story of Alkmaionid pollution and punishment was exaggerated or invented by the clan's sixth-century enemies puts us at a disadvantage when trying to reconstruct the actual events of the seventh century. That said, if we accept the

---

364. Diog. Laert. 1.110: οἱ δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπεῖν τοῦ λοιμοῦ τὸ Κυλώνειον ἄγος σημαίνειν τε τὴν ἀπαλλαγήν: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποθανεῖν δύο νεανίας, Κρατῖνον καὶ Κτησίβιον, καὶ λυθῆναι τὴν συμφοράν. These two young men, Kratinos and Ktesibios, must have been members of his band. Diogenes Laertius cites the fourth-century historian Theopompos as one of his sources for this episode.

365. The Athenians may have even responded by ordering the Spartans to drive out their own ancestral curses back home. This, at any rate, is what happened in the fifth century, when the Spartans, in an attempt to drive out Perikles, again demanded that the Athenians drive out the curse. Thuc. 128.1-2: ἀντεκέλευον δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους τὸ ἀπὸ Ταινάρου ἄγος ἐλαύνειν: οἱ γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀναστήσαντές ποτε ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος [ἀπὸ Ταινάρου] τῶν Εἱλώτων ἱκέτας ἀπαγαγόντες διέφθειραν, δι' ὃ δὴ καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς νομίζουσι τὸν μέγαν σεισμὸν γενέσθαι ἐν Σπάρτῃ. ἐκέλευον δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς Χαλκιοίκου ἄγος ἐλαύνειν αὐτούς.

366. Hdt. 5.72, and Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1.20.3, record that after the fall of the Peisistratids, Kleomenes of Sparta and Isagoras exiled 700 families for their association with this curse. This total indicates that while the Alkmaionidai were held most accountable by their enemies for the curse, other allied families were also implicated.

367. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 20.4.

368. Cf. Parker 1983, pp. 16-17. There is the odd tale, Hdt. 1.61, that when Peisistratus married the daughter of Megakles, one of the Alkmaionidai, he refused to lay with her in a way that would beget children, out of fear of the family pollution. On the other hand, Megakles, himself was of sufficient renown and standing to marry the daughter of Kleisthenes of Sikyon, winning renown in all Greece for the Alkmaionid family; cf. Hdt. 6.130-131.1.

tale as recording a seventh-century event, then what the various versions of the tale all share is the notion that leading families themselves were at times responsible for resolving religious crises, which they were able to do through state institutions.

4. Epimenides

At this point, we should say a few words about one remarkable character, Epimenides. According to Plutarch, the exile of the Alkmaionidai did not completely rid Athens of its curse and pollution.[369] The upheavals and distress experienced by the Athenians at the end of the seventh century were accompanied by a number of supernatural, and foreboding occurrences in the city; the seers conducted sacrifices, and the city's worst fears were realized: the gods were upset, and the city was polluted and cursed. Epimenides of Crete was brought in by Solon to purify the city, which he did by instituting new rites and shrines, reforming funerary ritual, and establishing for the Athenians a generally more restrained and seemly religious life.[370] Diogenes Laertius reports a similar tale; a plague afflicted the city, which the Pythian priestess said could only be lifted by purifying the city. The Athenians sent a certain Nikias to Crete to ask the help of Epimenides, who conducted sacrifices, ordered altars built in atonement, and bade two members associated with Kylon's coup attempt to be killed. He declined the substantial rewards offered to him by the Athenians, asking only for a treaty of friendship and alliance between Knossos and Athens.[371] If this tradition is true, and Epimenides of Crete played a crucial role in purifying the city and in establishing new rites, he stands as perhaps the most influential figure in seventh-century Athenian religion. But how valid is this tale?

Epimenides' role in the purification of the pollution is unique in the history of Athenian religion. No foreigner ever has been accorded the power and authority for such

369. Plut. *Sol.* 12.4; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 1, whose only surviving comment on Epimenides is that he purified the city after the Alkmaionidai were banished.

370. On Solon, Epimenides, and the chronology of the late seventh century, cf. Rhodes 1981, p. 83; Fornara and Samons 1991, p. 7; Ruze 1997, p. 332.

371. Diog. Laert. 1.110. Ath. 12.602 c-d, records a third century version of the tale by the historian Neanthes of Cyzicus, who reports that Kratinos voluntarily gave himself up as an act of patriotism, as did his lover Aristodemos; we also hear that the Athenian Polemon doubted the veracity of the tale.

sweeping changes in Athenian custom.[372] Though *argumenta ex silentio* are generally not the best basis for evidence, the absence of Epimenides in the detailed accounts of Herodotus and Thucydides is particularly striking, and leads us to doubt the veracity of his involvement.[373] Furthermore, by the fourth century–the date of our earliest source for Epimenides' role in purifying seventh-century Athens–there were alternative traditions that placed his purification of Athens much later, to shortly before the Persian War.[374] In other words, while there arose a tradition that at some point in antiquity Epimenides came to Athens to expiate some pollution, what exactly he did and when he did it was contested.[375]

These doubts are understandable when we consider the semi-mythical status that this religious man held among all Greeks. Though the tradition disagreed about how long he lived, most agreed that he was somewhere between one hundred fifty and two hundred years old when he died, and to have gained his prophetic and purifying powers

---

372. Parker 1996, p. 50, is particularly dismissive of Epimenides' role in Athenian religion: "One cannot imagine the Athens of the fifth or fourth century entrusting its problems to a holy man come from abroad; such a one would perhaps scarcely even appear in a fiction that was set in the classical period. But there is no more history than this to be extracted from the doings of a figure whose very nature it is to be wrapped in swathes of the fabulous."

373. Jacoby 1949, p. 186, argues that both Herodotus and Thucydides left out Epimenides in an effort to defend the Alkmaionidai by concealing the expiatory measures of Epimenides. This argument is easily refuted: 1. The Alkmaionidai are certainly culpable of pollution in the tales told by these two historians, and 2. Diogenes Laertius includes Epimenides, yet lays blame for the pollution squarely on the Kylonians.

374. Pl. *Leg*. 1.642d-e: Κλεινίας: καὶ μήν, ὦ ξένε, καὶ τὸν παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ λόγον ἀκούσας τε καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος, θαρρῶν ὁπόσα βούλει λέγε. τῇδε γὰρ ἴσως ἀκήκοας ὡς Ἐπιμενίδης γέγονεν ἀνὴρ θεῖος, ὃς ἦν ἡμῖν οἰκεῖος, ἐλθὼν δὲ πρὸ τῶν Περσικῶν δέκα ἔτεσιν πρότερον παρ᾽ ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μαντείαν, θυσίας τε ἐθύσατό τινας ἃς ὁ θεὸς ἀνεῖλεν, καὶ δὴ καὶ φοβουμένων τὸν Περσικὸν Ἀθηναίων στόλον, εἶπεν ὅτι δέκα μὲν ἐτῶν οὐχ ἥξουσιν, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθωσιν, ἀπαλλαγήσονται πράξαντες οὐδὲν ὧν ἤλπιζον, παθόντες τε ἢ δράσαντες πλείω κακά.

375. This tradition was strong enough to warrant a statue of Epimenides in front of Demeter's temple in Athens by Pausanias' day; cf. Paus. 1.14.4, who specifically refers to the statue as that of Ἐπιμενίδης Κνώσσιος. It is of interest that this statue was next to one of Triptolemos; according to the scholia for Aeschines 2.78, Epimenides was an alternative name for Bouzyges, the old Attic equivalent of Triptolemos. Could Pausanias or his guide have identified the wrong Epimenides?

after a decades-long sleep in a cave on Crete.[376] His status as a semi-divine figure is confirmed by claims that the Nymphs provided his food, and that the Cretans sacrificed to him as a god.[377] His special status as a purifier, prophet, author, and priest was such that many cities had tales of his visit, and his semi-mythical status and biography allowed room for widely divergent traditions about these visits.[378] As a result, the historicity of any tale of Epimenides is to be doubted, and the testimony of Plutarch and Aristotle does little to advance our knowledge of seventh-century Athenian religion.

5. Solon's Religious Reforms

As we have seen, strife had divided the powerful Athenian clans throughout the second half of the seventh century, and neither the agreed upon resolutions of the leading families, such as exile of the Alkmaionidai, nor the reforms of Drakon eased the tensions. According to tradition, Solon once more was invested with the authority to resolve the societal crisis. He is credited by most ancient and modern commentators with instituting a number of reforms in 594, the year he was eponymous archon; many were aimed at politically and economically reorganizing Athenian society in an effort to unify an Athenian community long divided by disputes among the powerful clans, a state of affairs now worsened by the disparity between the rich and poor.[379] We are interested here, however, in any reforms that involved Athenian religious and ritual practice in particular, including the establishment of the first "state" sacrificial calendar, and a number of unifying festivals and shrines, including the *Genesia*, *Synoikia*, and the shrine of Aphrodite Pandemos. Such initiatives, if historical, would mark a dramatic turning point in state involvement in, and authority over, Athenian religion. Let us here

---

376. Diog. Laert. 1.109, 111, reports that the sleep lasted fifty seven years. Cf. Paus. 1.14.4, who says that Epimenides remained asleep in the cave until he was forty years old. While this tale seems too fantastical to believe, Marinatos 1941, suggests that the decades of "sleep" are meant to indicate the length of his theological training in the cave.

377. Diog. Laert. 1.114.

378. The Lakedaemonians, for example, said that they possessed his body, which they watched over; Diog. 1.115. Cf. Leahy 1958, who believes that the Lakedaemonians possessed Epimenides' skin, which had oracles written upon it. Cf. Souidias, s.v. Ἐπιμενίδης, for the belief that his skin was tatooed with letters.

379. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 5.1-2: τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς τάξεως οὔσης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν δουλευόντων τοῖς ὀλίγοις, ἀντέστη τοῖς γνωρίμοις ὁ δῆμος. [2] ἰσχυρᾶς δὲ τῆς στάσεως οὔσης καὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἀντικαθημένων ἀλλήλοις, εἵλοντο κοινῇ διαλλακτὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα Σόλωνα, καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ...; cf. Plut. *Sol.* 13.

review the evidence for the religious initiatives of Solon, beginning with "Solon's Calendar."

5.1. "Solon's Calendar"

In the late fifth century, the Athenians commissioned a general scrutiny and transcription of Solon's laws. The first revision was in 410-404 under the democracy, and the second was in 403-399, with the restoration of the democracy after the fall of the Thirty Tyrants. We know more about the scope of the two revisions as a result of a court speech written by Lysias in 399.[380] We do not know the prosecutor for whom Lysias wrote the speech. The defendant is Nikomachos, who was a member of both revision commissions.[381] The exact legal charges against Nikomachos are difficult to pinpoint, but the litany of attacks upon his conduct, whether warranted or not, reveal the nature of the project with which he and his fellow *anagrapheis* were entrusted. The commission of 404-399 was entrusted with writing up the laws and sacrifices already found on the *kyrbeis* and stelai, in accordance with the *syngraphai*, the instructions or drafts provided to the commission.[382] The revised calendar of sacrifices was a particular point of contention for the prosecutor, who accused Nikomachos of adding more sacrifices than the state could afford to fund, all while cutting out some ancestral sacrifices found on the *kyrbeis*.[383] Nikomachos, in other words, was accused of badly abusing his authority.

The results of the two revisions have been found inscribed on fourteen fragments. Although the inscribed revisions included more than religious matters, most of the fragments record portions of the sacrificial calendar.[384] The revised calendar was inscribed

---

380. For full discussion of the speech, cf. Todd 1996.

381. Lys. 30.2, 4. This Nikomachos may be the same individual who is listed among other public officials that Pluton believes would be better off dead in Ar. *Ran.* 1504-1514, written in ca. 406.

382. Lys. 30.17. For more discussion of the *syngraphai*, see Rhodes 1991, p. 95; Parker 1996, pp. 44-45.

383. Lys. 30.17-19.

384. Parts of Drakon's law on homicide, *IG* i^3 104, laws concerning the council, *IG* i^3 105, and the text of trierarchic law, *IG* I^3 236a, are also preserved. Thirteen fragments of the revisions have been collected together for the first time by Lambert 2002, with translation, extensive commentary, and bibliography. To Lambert add now a new fragment published by Gawlinski 2007. For earlier discussions of insciptions, see Dow 1960; 1961; Fingarette 1971; Clinton 1982; Robertson 1990; Rhodes 1991; Parker 1996, pp. 43-55.

on stelai, clamped together to form a wall; although none of the fragments were found *in situ*, it is generally agreed that the laws were displayed in the Stoa Basileios.[385] Both faces of the stelai originally were inscribed with the first revision in Attic script. One face was later erased, and inscribed with the second revision in Ionic script.[386] The sacrifices were arranged month by month, and day by day within each month. For each sacrifice, the deity or hero is named, followed by a description of the animal to be sacrificed, any extra sacrifices such as wine or grain, and any other payments for the officiating personnel. A separate column recorded the costs, and monthly totals were listed.

The surviving fragments of the later revision of the calendar support Lysias' claim that the *anagrapheis* compiled their list of sacrifices from a variety of sources. Entries for each sacrifice are accompanied by the authority upon which the sacrifice was included on the calendar.[387] Some of the sacrifices, including the *Synoikia*, are denoted as being from the φυλοβασιλεῖς, or tribe-kings, an archaic office traditionally thought to have been established in the pre-Solonian period. Other sacrifices are denoted as those arranged by month, those of no fixed day, and (possibly) from the stelai, though this is not certain.[388] It is possible that the tribe-king, monthly, and movable sacrifices were taken from similar rubrics found on the *kyrbeis*, itself a category of authority that itself does not appear on the calendar.[389]

Just how "Solonian" is this calendar? The speech of Lysias confirms that by the fifth-century, the ancestral rites inscribed on the *kyrbeis* were believed to date to the time of Solon. Most scholars today agree that those sacrifices found on the *kyrbeis* did,

---

385. As argued, e.g., by Rhodes 1991, pp. 90-91. Cf. Andoc. 1.82.

386. For the order of inscribing and the erasure, see esp. the discussions in Dow 1961, pp. 63-65, 70-72; Lambert 2002, p. 355.

387. First noted by Dow 1959.

388. Parker 1996, p. 45; Lambert 2002. Only the initial sigma of the restored rubric ἐκ τῶν σ[... is preserved, and most have followed Dow 1959, p. 20 in reading ἐκ τῶν σ[τηλῶν, which seems to find support in Lys. 17: θαυμάζω δὲ εἰ μὴ ἐνθυμεῖται, ὅταν ἐμὲ φάσκῃ ἀσεβεῖν λέγοντα ὡς χρὴ θύειν τὰς θυσίας τὰς ἐκ τῶν κύρβεων καὶ τῶν στηλῶν κατὰ τὰς συγγραφάς, ὅτι καὶ τῆς πόλεως κατηγορεῖ: ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐψηφίσασθε. The word "στηλῶν" in this passage, however, is an emendation for the nonsensical εὔπλων and ὅπλων found in the manuscripts; other emendations are possible, such as οὐ πλείω, as Nelson 2006, notes. If so, other emendations on the stone, such as ἐκ τῶν σ[υγγραφῶν], as Robertson 1990, pp. 68-70, prefers to read, may well be right.

389. So argues Dow 1959, p. 10. Cf. Parker 1996, p. 45.

in fact, record Solonian reforms.[390] Our earliest literary testimony for the *kyrbeis* of Solon, as well as the archaic *axones* that held Drakon's homicide law, dates only to the fifth century.[391] According to late fourth-century sources, the *kyrbeis* and *axones* were kept somewhere on the Acropolis until 461, when Ephialtes transferred the *kyrbeis* to the Agora and the *axones* to either the Prytaneion or the Bouleuterion. If true, we would have a *terminus ante quem* of 461 for their inscription.[392] In other words, outside of the testimony of much later sources, there is no independent, corroborating evidence that compels us to believe that the sacrifices inscribed upon the *kyrbeis*, and included in Nikomachos' sacrificial calendar, necessarily date to the time of Solon.[393] If the φυλοβασιλεῖς sacrifices on Nikomachos' calendar did in fact originate in the kyrbeis,

---

390. See, e.g., Stroud 1979; Robertson 1986. Those found on the stelai–if this emendation is correct–are best explained as the more recent, post-Solonian sacrifices for which the state had since assumed at least some responsibility. On this point, cf. Oliver and Dow 1935, p. 10; Jeffery 1948, p. 109; Stroud 1979, p. 8.

391. Sources collected by Stroud 1979, who suggests that the *axones*, large wooden inscriptions that rotated on an axis, held the same laws as those found on the *kyrbeis*.

392. Harp. s.v. Ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος, citing Didymos, himself citing the fourth-century historian Anaximenes of Lampsikos, for the idea that the *kyrbeis* were once on the Acropolis. Cf. Poll. 8.128, says that the *axones* and *kyrbeis* were actually transferred to the Prytaneion and Athenian Agora, respectively. Stroud 1979, pp. 41-44, accepts the idea that the *kyrbeis* and *axones* were once on the Acropolis. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 7.1, suggests that Solon immediately set up his *kyrbeis* before the Stoa Basileios; this account as it stands is problematic, for the stoa was not built until well after Solon's archonship. For the date of the Stoa Basileios, see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, p. 84; Shear Jr. 1975, pp. 369-370. Robertson 1986, pp. 168-176, believes that the *kyrbeis* were always in the Athenian Agora.

393. Though the *kyrbeis* do not survive, we are told that they were inscribed in the *boustrophedon* style. This style ceased to be commonly used in inscriptions after the mid-sixth century, the practice did continue into the early years of the democracy, particularly on inscriptions dealing with ritual practice. Cf. Harp. s.v. Ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος. *IG* i^3 231, regulations concerning the City Eleusinia, is inscribed *boustrophedon*, and dates to ca. 500. For more discussion of the *boustrophedon* style in early fifth-century religious regulations, see Jeffery 1948, pp. 103-104.

which by no means is certain, we nevertheless have no greater certainty about their date than to say that they must belong before 461.[394]

That said, it is nonsensical to assume that none of the sacrifices of the calendar date to the time of Solon.[395] There is little reason to doubt that at least some, if not most of the laws inscribed on the *kyrbeis* and *axones* were genuinely Solon's. The difficult question, to which there is no satisfactory answer, is which of the sacrifices in particular date to Solon's time. Succeeding generations of examinations and scrutinies of Solon's laws, as well as the tendency in the fifth and fourth century to attribute most ancient laws to "Solon," have made it difficult to judge which of his laws we may accurately and confidently assign to the early sixth century in general, and to Solon, in particular.[396] Some of Solon's reforms became so obscure over the succeeding generations that by the fifth century, periodic reviews and re-codifications of "Solon's laws" were necessary, or at least possible.[397] These scrutinies and examinations of the extent and content of Solon's laws were conducted most often during the periodic reframing of what constituted τὰ πάτρια, the basis of authority upon which succeeding regimes claimed their legitimacy.[398]

Such negotiations or revisions of τὰ πάτρια could involve the scrutiny of more than just Solon's laws. For example, the oligarchy that had overthrown the democracy in 411

---

394. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 8.3, 57.4, who says there were four φυλοβασιλεῖς, originally established to rule the four tribes that predated the Solonian revision of the tribes. Aside from this comment, they remain a shadowy institution. They appear exclusively in religious contexts as sacred officials; cf. *IG* ii² 1357A.3-8, dated ca. 400-350, where they are linked with sacrifices to Erechtheus.

395. For a sober and vigorous defense of the idea that the *kyrbeis* and *axones* do record the laws of Solon and Drakon, see Stroud 1978.

396. Note, for example, Andoc. 1.95-96, attributes a law of 410 to Solon. Clinton 1982, p. 29, n. 10, suggests that this law was "Solonian" in that it was included in the second revision of Solon's laws.

397. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 9.2, for complaints that Solon's laws were ἀσαφεῖς, obscure. Recent work has shown that much of "Solon's" poetry is the work of other poets, or was composed as late as the fourth century. Note Pl. *Tim.* 21b-c, for example, where we learn that the poems of Solon sung at the Apatouria were νέα in 450. On the historicity of "Solon's" poems, see Lardinois 2006; Stehle 2006. For recent discussions about whether the laws attributed to Solon in the fourth century are verbatim "Solonian" laws, see Osborne 1996, pp. 220-221; Blok 2006; Scafuro 2006.

398. Hansen 1990, p. 77: "The purpose of the label *patrios* is to legitimate one's favourite constitution, and the Greeks' great respect for age, in individuals, in families and in societies made *patrios* an obvious term to invest one's political views with authority."

initiated an investigation into the reforms of Kleisthenes. The oligarchy asserted that their investigation would show that the ancestral laws, τοὺς πατρίους νόμους, of Kleisthenes did not establish the open and inclusive form of δημοκρατία that had been practiced in Athens; rather, Kleisthenes was responsible for restoring δημοκρατία as first established by Solon.[399] The motives of the oligarchs were clear: in order to claim that their new council of 400 was actually a return to the traditional government of their forefathers, they wanted to show that they were restoring δημοκρατία as originally established by Solon, just as Kleisthenes had done almost a century earlier.

For Athenians, τὰ πάτρια formed the core authority not only for political organization and rights, but also the proper religious practices of Athenians. When the oligarchy was overthrown in 410, the reinstated democracy entrusted Nikomachos and his fellow *anagrapheis* with compiling and transcribing the laws of Solon, including those dealing with sacrifices. The task involved more than a simple transcription of the *kyrbeis*; what was to take four months was still not completed six years later.[400] Why so long? It is true that the board would have had many documents and inscriptions which had to be scrutinized, a formidable task.[401] But the task was more than this. Τὰ πάτρια, based upon Solon's laws, had to be codified and organized in a way that legitimized the democracy. This would have been no simple task; as we see in Lysias' speech, such a codification was open to interpretation and dispute.

Before this revision could be completed, however, Athens fell to the Spartans, who promptly installed the Thirty Tyrants. There followed a review of the laws of Solon, and those found to be διαμφισβητήσεις, of disputed origin, were removed. The Thirty Tyrants, as was the case with the short-lived oligarchy of 411, claimed to be ruling according to ancestral custom.[402] With the overthrow of the Thirty, democracy was again restored, and with it yet another review of the laws was ordered, drafted once again with Nikomachos as member of the *anagrapheis*. In the meantime, the Athenians were to be governed by τὰ πάτρια, i.e., the laws of Solon and Drakon. Of course, these would have been the laws of Solon and Drakon as determined by the democracy; predictably, chaos was the result, for many Athenians realized that they were liable for breaking these an-

---

399. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 29.3: Κλειτοφῶν δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ Πυθόδωρος εἶπεν, προσαναζητῆσαι δὲ τοὺς αἱρεθέντας ἔγραψεν καὶ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους, οὓς Κλεισθένης ἔθηκεν ὅτε καθίστη τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ὅπως ἀκούσαντες καὶ τούτων βουλεύσωνται τὸ ἄριστον, ὡς οὐ δημοτικὴν ἀλλὰ παραπλησίαν οὖσαν τὴν Κλεισθένους πολιτείαν τῇ Σόλωνος.

400. Lys. 30.2.

401. Gallia 2004.

402. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 34.3, 35.2; cf. Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.2.

cient laws, in part, we may imagine, because the content and authority of these ancestral laws had been fluid.[403]

These examples show that Solon's laws, and indeed all ancestral customs, were a matter of debate and negotiation, played out over the course of many centuries and by many regimes. This same pattern of negotiation applies to the sacrificial calendar that Nikomachos and his committee drew up; as the speech from Lysias shows, there was debate over which ancestral sacrifices were to be included on the calendar, and it is reasonable to assume that there was debate among the Athenians over which sacrifices were genuinely "Solonian."

That being said, the project that the *anagrapheis* undertook in 404-399 was not to identify and codify all ancestral sacrifices in Athens. These would have numbered in the thousands, and at any rate, that was not the point of the calendar. The calendar was inscribed to document the then current state's ritual responsibility, and stood as a financial document as much as a religious one. This is revealed by the entries on the calendar, which typically include only the day of the year, the deity, and the offering, this last entry being the financial obligation; other information on the content or practice of the rituals and sacrifices is sparse to non-existent. The financial aspect of the calendar is further revealed by the charges brought against Nikomachos; the court case was not simply a disagreement about which sacrifices to include, a contentious enough matter, but a disagreement over finances. Nikomachos was charged with having included so many sacrifices that some of the most important ancestral offerings – at least as far as his accuser was concerned–were now in jeopardy of being insufficiently funded.[404] This calendar, in other words, was not a codification of the official state religion, but an invoice of current official state obligation.[405] That said, the extent to which the calendar of sacrifices served a similar function in Solon's day is a question that we can ask, but cannot answer. While we may grant that there was a calendar of sacrifices in Solon's day, we cannot assume that this calendar would have served the same financial purpose that the

---

403. Lys. 30.4; Andoc. 1.80-87. The Andocides passage is particularly illuminating, for he asserts that the Assembly passed a motion that only inscribed laws could be enforced by magistrates. One imagines that this was enacted to prevent the abuse of previous regimes that had justified their actions through appeal to vague, unwritten ancestral laws.

404. Lys. 30.19.

405. The financial aspect of ritual calendars is most evident in the fourth-century Attic Deme Calendar of Erchia, which organizes fifty-nine sacrifices into five columns, the total expenditures of each are roughly equal; these five groups of sacrifices would then presumably have been assigned or allotted to five different groups or individuals. See Daux 1963; Dow 1965; Jameson 1965; Parke 1977, pp. 175-180.

late fifth-century did. In the end, we have no evidence for or against state sponsorship of festivals and sanctuaries in this period.

5.2. "Solonian" festivals

According to tradition, Solon was responsible for establishing a number of festivals and shrines, such as the temple of Enyalios on Salamis and Aphrodite Pandemos; the latter foundation was believed by our sources, mostly on etymological grounds, to have been established as a way to unify "all the people" politically.[406] Along these lines, there have been attempts by modern scholars to link Solon with the establishment or modification of the *Synoikia* and *Genesia*–two Archaic festivals that are found on the calendar of Nikomachos–as part of his attempt to weaken the aristocracy by opening previously closed festivals to everyone.[407] As we shall see, the association of these festivals with Solon is in all cases fanciful, as are the notions that these festivals were created with the express intention of creating unifying state-level festivals.

The sources that associate Aphrodite Pandemos with Solon, and read a political meaning into her epithet, are all late; some even assign the foundation to Theseus, not Solon.[408] We find no such political connotations in Plato, our earliest secure source for Aphrodite Pandemos in Athens.[409] He has Socrates speak of her as one of two Aphrodites, one *ourania*, the goddess of elevated love, the other *pandemos*, the goddess of lower, or "common" pleasures; those who pursue these baser pleasures are πάνδημοι ἐρασταί. These two types of Aphrodite were often worshipped together throughout Greece, with examples found at Thebes, Elis, and Megalopolis.[410] Were the epithet to gain the political meaning ascribed by later sources, it would have done so after the

---

406. Enyalios on Salamis: Plut. *Sol*. 9.4. Aphrodite Pandemos: Suda, s.v. Πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη; Harp., s.v. Πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη; Ath. 569d (= *Deip*. 13.25).

407. See esp. Jacoby 1944; cf. 1949, pp. 36-41. Jacoby also postulates that Solon may have established the ἐξηγηταὶ πυθόχρηστοι, or expounders on ritual appointed by Apollo, to be a rival to aristocratic or Eupatrid *exegetai*. There is no secure evidence for the office of *exegetai* before the fifth century, however. Our earliest reference is Pl. *Euthphr*. 4c, dramatic date 399. Oliver 1950, pp. 24-52, believes that the office may have been established in 403; cf. Garland 1984, pp. 114-115, and Parker 1996, p. 49, n. 26.

408. Harp., s.v. Πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη, and Ath. 569d (= *Deip*. 13.25), both cite the second century writer Nikander of Kolophon, who in turn cites a fourth-century comedy. According to Plut. 1.22.3, Theseus founded both the Aphrodite Pandemos and Peitho shrines.

409. Pl. *Sym*. 180c-182a; cf. Xen. *Sym*. 8.9-10.

410. Thebes: Paus. 9.16.3-4. Elis: Paus. 6.25.1. Megalopolis in Arcadia: Paus. 8.32.2.

fourth century. At any rate, we do not know when this shrine was founded, so attribution to Solon must remain speculative.

Likewise, though the *Synoikia* and *Genesia* festivals may be Archaic in origin, there is no evidence that they were established by Solon, or that they were part of a program to strengthen the authority of the state at the expense of the aristocracy. The *Synoikia* appears on Nikomachos' calendar under the authority of the *phylobasileis*, who share in the sacrifice.[411] A prominent role in the festival was played by the Geleontes tribes, and the Leukotainioi, or "white-filleted" trittyes, who are among the very few pre-Kleisthenic trittyes for whom we have evidence.[412] This evidence attests to the antiquity of the sacrifices, as well as the continuity of authority and privileges held by certain pre-Kleisthenic organizations. The calendar entry does not, however, attest to the antiquity of state control of sacrifices.

According to Thucydides, our lone fifth-century source for the festival, the *Synoikia* was founded by Theseus to celebrate the *synoikism*os, or political union of Attica, and by the fifth century it had become a publicly funded festival for Athena.[413] This *aition* certainly testifies to the perceived antiquity of the festival by fifth-century Athenians, but this evidence does little to support the notion that the festival was publicly funded in the sixth century, or that it was founded by Solon. While the festival presumably celebrates unity at some level, we can say little more than this; it is possible that the festival began as local sacrifices or celebrations at the level of *oikoi* or phratries, and attained state sponsorship and celebration at a much later date.[414] At any rate, we cannot assume that unity of the state was its original purpose, nor that Solon instituted it to weaken the aristocracy.

Likewise, the *Genesia*, or festival for the dead, is found on the calendar of Nikomachos, and we have testimony that it appeared on the *axones* of "Solon."[415] This festival was celebrated at both the family and state level by the time the calendar was inscribed,

---

411. The festival also appears among the early inscribed regulations of the deme Skambonidai, *IG* i^3 244.16-19, dated ca. 480-460.

412. On pre-Kleisthenic trittyes, see Papazarkadas 2007, who argues that the Epakreis are also one of the earlier trittyes.

413. Thuc. 2.15.2: καὶ ξυνοίκια ἐξ ἐκείνου [i.e., Θησέως] Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτι καὶ νῦν τῇ θεῷ ἑορτὴν δημοτελῆ ποιοῦσιν. Plut. *Thes*. 24.4, also assumes that Theseus founded the festival, which Plutarch here calls the *Metoikia*.

414. Cf. Robertson 1992, pp. 32-43, who collects the evidence for the festival, and hypothesizes that the *Synoikia* initially consisted, in part, of a muster of arms by phratry, a practice ended by Peisistratos. For the festival, see also Parke 1977, pp. 30-33.

415. *FGH* 328 Philochoros F 168; cf. Hesych. s.v. γενέσια. Cf. Lambert 2002, pp. 368-370.

and perhaps by subgroups of the polis, such as the deme, as well.[416] As with the *Synoikia*, however, we do not know exactly when this festival became widespread, nor when it became sponsored by the centralized state apparatus.

6. Conclusion

At this point in Athenian history, evidence for the institutions of state is secure. The annual office of archon was in place, and Solon is credited with a number of political reforms, including the institution of a Council of 400 and Areopagus, as well as a number of important land and debt reforms.[417] In addition, we do have, in Drakon's law, evidence that the state could exile murderers from the religious life of Athens, whose shared festivals were recognized in a calendar. *Ad hoc* institutions, such as the court of leading men that convicted the Alkmaionidai of sacrilege and murder, could be convened, allowing a venue for leading families themselves to enforce religious norms. We have yet to find, however, any secure evidence that these state institutions funded or sponsored any public religious activity.

It is noteworthy, however, that the ancient testimony is unanimous in assuming that individuals, not the state, founded shrines and festivals. Though our sources may disagree over whether it was Theseus or Solon who founded the *Synoikia* festival and the shrine of Aphrodite Pandemos, there is never disagreement over whether an *individual* or the state had such authority and ability. It is therefore not unusual that we also hear that it was Eumolpos or Triptolemos who founded the sanctuary at Eleusis; Theseus who founded a shrine to Pietho; Orestes and Iphigeneia who found sanctuaries to Artemis in eastern Attica; or, as we saw above, Epimenides who founded a variety of shrines in Athens.[418]

This state of affairs accords well with the dim recollection among our sources that the aristocracy controlled religious life in the distant past. According to Plutarch, The-

---

416. Parker 1996, p. 49, n. 27; Lambert 2002, who argues that the *Genesia* may have been celebrated by the demes of Thorikos and Erchia.

417. The annual office of archon is usually assigned to ca. 682/1; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.1, 3; Cadoux 1948; Rhodes 1981, pp. 77-79, 97-101. Thuc. 1.126.8, for archons at the time of the Kylonian coup in the 630's, for which see Chapter Five. Council of 400: Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 8.4, 21.3, 31.1; Plut. *Sol.* 19.1-2. Areopagus: Plut. *Sol.* 19.1-2. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 6-10; Plut. *Sol.*14-25, in general, provide a broad overview of the ancient tradition of Solon's political and social reforms.

418. Eumolpos: Marmor Parium (= FGrH 239 A 15); schol. Soph. OC 1053; cf. Eur. *Erechtheus* fr. 65.100. Triptolemos: Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.6. Theseus: Paus. 1.22.3. Orestes and Iphigeneia: Eur. *IT* 1450-1457.

seus assigned the leadership of Athenian religion to the Eupatrids; Ion is said by Strabo to have divided Athens into four *bioi*, one of whom were *hieropoioi*; finally, the *basileis* of antiquity held supreme control and authority over communal sacrifices, according to Aristotle.[419] As the sixth century wore on, however, our evidence for private initiative in public festivals and religious building projects becomes much more abundant. It is to these later years that we now turn.

419. Plut. *Thes*. 25.2; Strabo, 8.7.1; Arist. *Pol*. 1285b10.

Chapter Six: The Age of the Peisistratidai

1. Introduction

The new political apparatus that Solon established did not yet appear to include an organized army, nor have we evidence one way or the other whether the state as yet sponsored or funded religious activity.[420] Solon's political reforms began life on weak legs, and strife among the powerful aristocratic clans continued unabated. The years immediately following Solon's initiatives included one year with no archon, the unsuccessful *coup d'état* of Damasias, and a year of ten archons.[421] This strife continued throughout the first half of the sixth century. Peisistratos seized the Acropolis in 561/0, and twice lost control of the city before he won it for good in 546/5, in what would mark the beginning of a thirty-five year reign of the Peisistratidai.[422] The eighteen years in which Peisistratos himself ruled were considered by our sources to be a "golden age";[423] he was famed for following the laws himself, and does not seem to have introduced any radical constitutional changes.[424]

The middle of the sixth century, meanwhile, marked a transformative stage in the religious life of Athens and Attica. Temple building at many Athenian and Attic sanctuaries progressed at an unprecedented pace, and many of the festivals founded in the seventh century became more spectacular. Perhaps the most important festival in Athens was now made the grandest with the institution of the quadrennial Panathenaia, a festival that rivaled the Panhellenic games at Olympia, Nemea, Isthmia, and Delphi. The Athenian Acropolis itself was aggrandized with a new entrance, altars, and its first stone temple. Other sanctuaries in Attica, such as those at Eleusis, Rhamnous, and Sounion,

---

420. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 13; cf. Plut. *Sol.* 29.

421. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 13; cf. Plut. *Sol.* 29. Damasias held the archonship for over two years (ca. 582-580) before he was expelled by force.

422. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14-15; Hdt. 1.59-64.

423. Hdt. 1.59; Thuc. 6.54.5; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 16.7.

424. Ancient sources are unanimous in claiming that Peisistratos worked within the framework of the existing laws: Hdt. 1.59.6; Thuc. 6.54.5-6; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14.3, 16.2, 7.

were likewise transformed with monumental architecture.[425] It has tempted more than one scholar to conclude that the Peisistratidai were largely responsible for fostering these ever more elaborate festivals and architectural programs in an attempt to create a firmer sense of civic unity throughout Attica.[426] It is also commonly thought that this new polis-oriented, centralized religious network arose at the expense of local aristocratic families, whose religious authority was gradually appropriated by the state.[427] To this end, the Peisistratidai not only aggrandized sanctuaries and festivals, but even transferred to Athens some Attic sacrifices and sanctuaries, such as Artemis Brauronia, Dionysos Eleuthereus, and Demeter at Eleusis. Processions from Athens to these Attic sanctuaries further incorporated Attica into the emerging state. As such, the Peisistratidai used religion as a vehicle for advancing the process of civic integration and consciousness.[428]

The degree to which these changes reflect the unifying measures of the Peisistratidai has recently come into question.[429] No construction on the Acropolis can be de-

---

425. Eleusis is discussed below. Rhamnous: Petrakos 1987, pp. 299-205; Petrakos 1991, p. 20. Sounion: Boersma 1970, p. 183. For overviews of developments at sixth-century sanctuaries in Athens and Attica, see, e.g., Boersma 1970, pp. 11-27; Shapiro 1989; Parker 1996, pp. 67-101; Camp 2001, pp. 26-39. Archaeological evidence for new religious sites in Athens and Attica is scant, and collected by Parker 1996, p. 74, n. 29; Mersch 1996.

426. Cf. Morgan 1990, pp. 12-13: The "appearance of temples and formal festivals, with their implications of state investment, provide unequivocal evidence of ordering social and political territory on a regional basis. Many of these developments date from Peisistratid times and were perhaps conscious attempts to solve a major problem for the emergent Athenian state, that of defining an exceptionally large territory and relating it to the civic centre... The role of the Peisistratids in centralising cults has long been recognised, but the way in which centre and boundaries are balanced deserves greater attention."

427. Snodgrass 1980, pp. 115-116: there was a "general tendency of tyrants" to enlarge "state cults and festivals, to the detriment of the exclusive, family-based cults which had widely prevailed: this is especially true of Peisistratus... [R]eligion, along with much else, was now being pressed into the service of the community as a whole; that is, of the state..."

428. This model is supported by, among others, Shear Jr. 1978; Kolb 1981; Stahl 1987; Shapiro 1989; Frost 1990; Manville 1990, pp. 162-173; Eder 1992; Salmon 1997; Camp 2001, pp. 28-39.

429. Shapiro 1989, p. 13, for example, admits that evidence for such a religious program under the Peisistratidai is thin, but that "clearly the Tyrants would have had good reason to establish other [to us, undiscovered] cults and sanctuaries," a claim supported by parallels "with sixth century tyrants elsewhere in Greece" that show that "manipulation of cult was one of the principal political tools at a tyrant's disposal."

finitively assigned to the Peisistratidai.[430] Nor can we be sure that the Brauronia and City Dionysia festivals were founded until after the reign of the Peisistratidai.[431] Yet even those who remove Peisistratos from the center of religious agency still find in sixth-century religious practice a tale of increasing state control over the religious and political life of Attica. For example, the ritual processions celebrating the Eleusinian Mysteries, Artemis Brauronia, and the City Dionysia are cited as symbolic of religious and political control that "Athens," the place and state, gained over Eleusis, Brauron, and Eleutherai, respectively.[432] On this model, the sixth century marks an important period in the religious life of Athens and Attica, for many sanctuaries are now enlisted into the service of the Athenian state.[433]

The mid-sixth century was indeed a time of spectacular festivals and architectural flourish; but are these developments inherently indicative of "state" religion, or of a Peisistratid campaign to enlarge "state cults"? This is the central question of this chapter. We will examine both the transformation of ritual and sanctuary architecture, and the locus of authority during this transformation. We will concentrate in particular on the developments found at four of the most important sanctuaries in Athens and Attica: Athena Polias and Dionysos Eleuthereus in Athens, Artemis at Brauron, and Demeter at Eleusis.

2. Athena and the Acropolis

The earliest archaeological evidence for ritual activity on the Acropolis dates to the Late Geometric period. Much of this evidence is associated with mortuary ritual: tripods won at games, and fragments of prothesis pots.[434] Many if not most of these objects were probably dedicated to Athena, though the evidence is not incontrovertible. Hundreds of seventh-century dedications have been recovered from the Acropolis, including a near

---

430. Hurwit 1999, p. 117.

431. In general, cf. Parker 1996, p. 69: "The religious chronology of the [sixth century] is...a concertina, which if squeezed brings all the relevant events within the Pisistratid period, if stretched puts almost all outside. In the name of caution–and perhaps even of truth–one should speak more generally of 'the sixth century expansion' rather than more specifically of 'Pisistratean religious policy'."

432. Garland 1992, pp. 43-44.

433. Parker 1996, p. 97, notes that "there is no compelling reason to believe (nor, one must allow, to deny) that either cult [Brauron or Eleusis] had ever been independent, or had served a merely local clientele."

434. See Appendix 1 for detailed discussion and bibliography for Late Geometric evidence.

life-size, wheel-made terracotta statue of an elaborately adorned female–likely Athena–which dates to ca. 680-670, securing her worship by this date at the latest.[435] Column bases attest to the presence of a temple and sanctuary of Athena in the second half of the seventh century, which the literary accounts of Kylon's coup confirm.[436]

According to traditional accounts, the Athena Polias sanctuary itself was founded well before the synoikismos, perhaps in the time of Kekrops;[437] the annual, or Lesser Panathenaia was founded sometime later by Erechthonios.[438] Among the seventh-century dedications are a number of chariot and horse-and-rider terracotta figurines, and a number of terracotta plaques depicting soldiers, chariots, and horse-and-rider images. As has been argued in Chapter Four, these dedications confirm the presence of games, and therefore Panattic participation.[439] Based upon this evidence, the institution of some form of the annual Panathenaic games occurred at least by the seventh century, if not earlier.

---

435. These five fragments were published by Nicholls 1991; all now appear to be lost or misplaced. For more on this statue, see Appendix 1.

436. See discussion in Appendix 1.

437. Paus. 1.26.6: ἱερὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστιν ἥ τε ἄλλη πόλις καὶ ἡ πᾶσα ὁμοίως γῆ—καὶ γὰρ ὅσοις θεοὺς καθέστηκεν ἄλλους ἐν τοῖς δήμοις σέβειν, οὐδέν τι ἧσσον τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἄγουσιν ἐν τιμῇ—, τὸ δὲ ἁγιώτατον ἐν κοινῷ πολλοῖς πρότερον νομισθὲν ἔτεσιν <ἢ> συνῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν δήμων ἐστὶν Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀκροπόλει, τότε δὲ ὀνομαζομένῃ πόλει: φήμη δὲ ἐς αὐτὸ ἔχει πεσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The antiquity of the sanctuary may also be indicated by the tradition of the contest between Poseidon and Athena for the right to take possession of Attica when Kekrops was king; cf. Hdt. 8.55; Apollod. 3.14.1; Paus. 1.24.3; Hyg. *Fab*. 164. Homer sang that Athena and Erechtheus shared a "rich temple" (*Il*. 2.549: πίων νηός), also described as a "well-built house" (*Od*. 7.81: πυκινὸς δόμος); the antiquity of these lines is debatable, however. Cf. Mylonas 1966, p. 136, for the view that the Homeric lines concerning the proto-Erechtheion are later Athenian interpolations. Contra, Lorimer 1950, pp. 436-437; Kirk 1985, pp. 179-180, 205-207.

438. Eight sources record Erechthonios as the founder: Harp. s.v. Παναθήναια; Androtion *FGrH* 324 F 2; Hellanikos *FGrH* 323a F 2; Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.14.6; Eratosth. *Cat*. 13; *Marm. Par*., *FGrH* 239 A 10; schol. Pl. *Parm*. 127a; schol. Aristid. 13.189.4-5.

439. Figurines: Winter 1903, pl. 25, 2b; Casson and Nicholson 1912, pp. 322, 429-432, who provide a list of animal figurines found in Perserschutt. They date what they consider the earliest of the votives, a four-horse group, to the "Geometric" period. The parallel they cite for this date, which comes from Pyre A at the Demeter sanctuary at Eleusis, has now been dated to the first half of the seventh century; see Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, no. A 153, p. 213, pl. 19. Plaques: Plaque with four-horse team: Boardman 1954, p. 196, Acropolis nos. 6, 7, and 9.

Most of our sources credit Theseus with founding the Greater Panathenaia, in a move related to the synoikismos of Attica.[440] To reinforce his unification of Attica, Theseus changed the name of the festival from the Athenaia to the Panathenaia.[441] Other testimony places the foundation of the Greater Panathenaia in historical times. One late source specifically cites Peisistratos as the founder.[442] Two other sources provide us with a year: according to Eusebius, athletic contests were added in 566/5; Marcellinus, quoting Pherekydes and Hellanikos, records that the Panathenaia was instituted when Hippokleides was archon, probably in the year 566/5.[443]

If Peisistratos founded the reorganization, it was not in his capacity as tyrant: if we accept the date of 566/5, it is five years before his first attempt at tyranny, and decades before he held power for good. It is certainly possible that Peisistratos founded the festival in this year, though any number of other individuals and families could have done so, as well. Lykourgos is as likely a candidate as any, for not only is he reported to have been powerful enough to lead one of the three major factions in Athens at the time, he was also a member of the Eteoboutadai, the *genos* that provided the priestess of Athena Polias and priest of Poseidon Erechtheus.[444] Regardless of who founded the reorganiza-

---

440. Plut. *Thes.* 24.3, assigns the founding of the Panathenaia to Theseus, which he is said to have instituted as part of the synoikismos of Attica: [Θησέως] καταλύσας οὖν τὰ παρ᾽ ἑκάστοις πρυτανεῖα καὶ βουλευτήρια καὶ ἀρχάς, ἓν δὲ ποιήσας ἅπασι κοινὸν ἐνταῦθα πρυτανεῖον καὶ βουλευτήριον ὅπου νῦν ἵδρυται τὸ ἄστυ, τήν τε πόλιν Ἀθήνας προσηγόρευσε καὶ Παναθήναια θυσίαν ἐποίησε κοινήν. This passage may indicate the founding of the Greater Panathenaia; cf. Davison 1958, p. 23: "I have not found a single case in which Παναθήναια alone necessarily, or even probably, refers to anything but the great Panathenaea." See now, however, Tully 2006, pp. 507-508, who argues that Παναθήναια was used for both the annual and Greater Panathenaia. For Theseus as the founder of the Greater Panathenaia, cf. also Paus. 8.2.1; schol. Pl. *Parm.* 127a.

441. Istros *FGrH* 334 F 4, cited by Harp. s.v. Παναθήναια; Paus. 8.2.1.

442. Scholiast on Aristid. *Panath.* 13.189.4: ὁ [τῶν Παναθηναίων] τῶν μικρῶν λέγει· ταῦτα γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἐρεχθονίου τοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος γενόμενα ἐπὶ τῷ φόνῳ τοῦ Ἀστερίου τοῦ γίγαντος· τὰ δὲ μεγάλα Πεισίστρατος ἐποίησε. τὰ δὲ Ἐλευσίνια ἐπὶ Πανδίονος ἐγένετο, ὃς πέμπτος ἦν βασιλεὺς ἀπὸ Ἐρεχθονίου. διὰ δὲ τὸν καρπὸν ἐτέθησαν.

443. Euseb. *Chron. Ol.* 34.3-4; Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 2-4 (= Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 2). Hippokleides is known from a passage in Hdt. 6.126-129, as the wealthy young bachelor who danced away his chances to marry the daughter of Kleisthenes, the tyrant of Sikyon, in the 570's. For Hippokleides as likely archon of 566/5, cf. Cadoux 1948, p. 104; Shapiro 1989, p. 19.

444. Lykourgos as leader of the "Hillmen": Hdt. 1.59; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 13.4. For discussion of the Eteoboutadai *genos*, in general, see Parker 1996, pp. 290-293.

tion, there is no doubt that the Peisistratidai were intimately involved with the Panathenaia once in power. Peisistratos probably, and his sons certainly, sponsored and conducted the procession, while Hipparchos, the son of Hippias, introduced the competitive recitation of Homer by rhapsodes at the Panathenaia.[445]

We may wonder, though, whether the founding of the Greater Panathenaia need have been the work of only one family. While one individual or family may have had a leading role, the idea would have appealed to many, if not most Athenians. Such a grand festival would provide Athens and Attica with a festival that would rival the Pythia, Isthmia, and Nemea festivals, grand festivals that had been founded or refounded only a few decades earlier.[446] What had been, materially speaking, a fairly insular, back water region throughout the seventh century was now making claims of cultural ascension worthy of their Greek neighbors. The fact that the Peisistratidai conducted and expanded the festival does not lessen the status that the Eteoboutadai would have played as holders of the priesthood of Athena Polias, and the additional role and status that many individuals or families would have played.

Material evidence supports the conclusion that in the 560's, and perhaps even in the very year 566, what was once a simpler, annual festival obtained a grander quadrennial version.[447] The earliest of the Panathenaic prize amphorae, for example, dates to ca. 560, as does the first proliferation of depictions on pottery of the Gigantomachy, a scene perhaps inspired by its inauguration as the scene woven into the peplos presented to Athena during the Panathenaia.[448] Some of the sponsors–perhaps even the principal organizers–of the sixth-century Greater Panathenaia appear on a series of inscriptions recovered from the Acropolis and dated to ca. 566-550. Three record the names of those

---

445. Hippias and Hipparchos conducting the Panathenaia: Thuc. 6.56; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 18. Hipparchos introducing or regulating performances of Homer: Pl. *Hipparch.* 228b; cf. Shapiro 1992.

446. Pythian Games in 586; Isthmian Games in 582; Nemean Games in 573. On the sixth-century Panhellenic Games founded at these sanctuaries, cf. Roller 1981, pp. 117-118; Adshead 1986, pp. 46-66.

447. For discussion of the reorganization of the Panathenaia in the 560's, see Davison 1958, pp. 23-29; Kyle 1987, pp. 24-29; Shapiro 1989, pp. 18-21, 40; Neils 1992, pp. 20-21; Parker 1996, pp. 89-92; Anderson 2003, pp. 158-177. For general discussions of the Panathenaia, mostly concerning its form in the fifth and fourth centuries, see Simon 1983; Tracy 1991; the collected essays in 1992, and 1996; Neils and Tracy 2004.

448. Earliest Panathenaic prize amphora: London, BM 130; Shapiro 1989, pl. 6a; Neils and Tracy 2004, fig. 2. Gigantomachy on pottery: Shapiro 1989, pp. 38-40. According to the scholiast on Aristid. 13.189.4-5, the Lesser Panathenaia was founded to commemorate Athena's defeat of one of the Giants.

who built the racetrack, τὸν δρόμον ἐποίεσαν, for the ἀγών of Athena.[449] These men may have been a board of *hieropoioi*, or board of sacred administrators.[450] The earliest in the series records that these men were the "first" to conduct the games for Athena.[451] These would appear to be state officials chosen to oversee the festival, those we are in the dark as to how they were chosen. In addition, we also do not know whether men were chosen based upon their ability to fund the track with their own resources. Even if these men funded the track themselves, they would have done so with public titles.

A hint that this was indeed the case may lie in two near contemporary dedications from "treasurers" of Athena, also recovered from the Acropolis. The first is *IG* i³ 590, a dedication, possibly an altar, by Chairion, who at the time served as a treasurer, ταμιεύον.[452] Dated to ca. 600-575, this is our first epigraphic attestation to this position, and provides a good example of private funding while bearing an official title. *IG* i³ 510, a bronze plaque dated to ca. 550, records the names of the board of ταμίαι. The inscription is not fully preserved, but it is possible that there were originally eight names, and so eight members of the board.[453] There may also have been a total of eight names–pos-

---

449. *IG* i³ 507-509; cf. also *IG* i³ 509bis. For the date of the inscriptions, cf. Raubitschek 1949, pp. 355-356; Davison 1958, p. 30; Keesling 2005, pp. 50-55. Travlos 1971b, p. 2, believes that the δρόμος of these inscriptions refers to the repair or construction of a physical racetrack. It is possible that δρόμος refers more generally to a particular contest; cf. Kyle 1987, pp. 26-29. The inscriptions pre-date our earliest physical evidence for a racetrack on the Panathenaic Way, which likely was used for the games by the second half of the fifth century; cf. Thompson and Wycherley 1972, p. 121; Shear Jr. 1975, pp. 362-365; Camp 1986, pp. 112-113. Miller 1995, pp. 212-214, argues that the race and track of these inscriptions were located northeast of the Acropolis, in the area of the Old, or Archaic Agora. For further discussion of the possible location of the Old, or Archaic Agora, cf. Oikonomides 1964; Wycherley 1966; Harris-Cline 1999; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 280-297; Schmalz 2006.

450. The word *h*ιροποιοί, however, does not appear on any of the much battered stones; these officials are the guesswork of Raubitschek 1949, pp. 350-358, nos. 326-328, who has been followed since. That said, the men may indeed have been called *hieropoioi*. An official board of *hieropoioi* did oversee the Panathenaia and other important quadrennial festivals by the fifth and fourth centuries; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.6-7; Develin 1989, p. 17.

451. *IG* i³ 507.4-5: [*h*οὶ τὸν] ἀγῶ[να θέσ]αν πρῶτο̣[ι] γλ/αυ[ρ]όπιδι ⋮ ρόρ[ει].

452. The inscription, as restored by Raubitschek 1949, no. 330: [Τὸν βομὸν ⋮ ἀνέθ]εκεν ⋮ Ἀθεναίαι ⋮ Χα[ι]ρίον ⋮ [τ]αμιεύον ⋮ Κλεδί̣ρ̣[ο *h*υιός].

453. Ferguson 1932, p. 6, n. 1.

sibly a board of *hieropoioi*–recorded on *IG* i³ 507.[454] If we accept the tradition that Attica was divided into four tribes before Kleisthenes, the eight names may well represent two men selected from each tribe, chosen to oversee the conduct and finances of the festival. Unfortunately, we do not know whether the funds would have been contributed by the men themselves, or taken from state coffers.

At around the same time, the Athenian Acropolis itself underwent a dramatic architectural transformation. What was once a humbler and narrower approach on the western side of the Acropolis was now monumentalized with the construction of a long ramp over eighty meters long, and ten meters wide.[455] The processional route of the Panathenaia was reorganized at this time, as well; the original annual procession started east of the Acropolis, in the area of the Old Agora, and traveled along the south of the Acropolis until it reached the western entrance. By the sixth-century, the procession approached from the northeast, as it did in the Classical period.[456]

The Mycenaean bastion just to the south of the new ramp was remodeled at the same time. Atop the bastion Patrokles, an otherwise unknown figure, dedicated a poros-limestone altar to Athena Nike.[457] The nearby remains of a statue base attest to the roughly contemporary dedication of a near life-size cult statue of Athena Nike dedicated

454. Raubitschek 1949, no. 326.

455. Eiteljorg 1995, pp. 9-11, with bibliography. Vanderpool 1974, dates the ramp to ca. 566, the same date he assigns the building of per-Persian defensive wall, for which we have literary–e.g. Thuc. 1.89.3, 93.2, 6.57.1-3–but no physical evidence. Cf. Winter 1982. One imagines that the Mycenaean gate would have been redesigned at this time, as well, but evidence is lacking. The exact layout of the Bronze Age entrance system is contested; for various restorations, cf. Mylonas 1966, pp. 37-39; Dinsmoor 1980, pp. 1-4; Travlos 1993, p. 25; Wright 1994; Shear 1999; Iakovides 2006, pp. 166-173.

456. Procession coming from northeast in sixth century: Thuc. 6.57.3. Robertson 1998, pp. 290-292, for discussion of the likely route before ca. 566.

457. The dedicator's name on the stone is ΠΑΤΡΟΚΕΣ[-?], a name that has no parallels. It has since usually been emended to ΠΑΤΡΟΚ<Λ>ΕΣ; cf. Raubitschek 1949, p. 359; Mark 1993, pp. 33-34, fig. 4. *IG* i³ 596, restores the name Πατροκ<λ>ές̣[ες].

in the same period.[458] A small temple was likely built to protect the statue, though direct evidence for the structure is lacking.[459] It is possible that worship of Athena Nike on the bastion began in the seventh century, based upon a cache of terracotta figurines found deposited within the archaic statue base during a renovation of the bastion.[460] If so, the altar and statue base mark a significant renovation in scale of the sanctuary.

While the new ramp itself would have well suited a larger, more grandiose festival for Athena, it may have originally been built to help facilitate the movement of architectural material up the Acropolis.[461] It is at just this time, ca. 560, that the first monumental stone temple to Athena was built somewhere on the summit. The temple was of the Doric order, over forty meters long and twenty meters wide, and built of limestone, with marble simas, metopes, and akroteria.[462] Enough of the pedimental sculpture has survived to reconstruct part of the sculptural program. At the center of one side were a male and female lion mauling a bull; one angle was filled with Herakles wrestling a fish-tailed creature, the other a colorfully rendered creature with three male heads with bluish beards, their lower bodies serpentine and entwined. Each is holding an object, although what they are holding, or even who this triple-bodied creature is, remains a matter of

---

458. Mark 1993, pp. 20-28, 31-35, 93-98, fig. 3, who believes that the statue was a seated image, possibly of marble. There is some question as to the material and position of the Athena Nike cult statue. Ancient testimony–Paus. 3.15.7, 5.26.6; Heliodoros, cited by Harp. s.v. Νίκη Ἀθηνᾶ–is consistent in calling the cult statue a ξόανον. The literary evidence is discounted by Mark, on the grounds that these sources may not have actually seen the statue. Robertson 1996, pp. 44-45, however, in part due to Pausanias' testimony, suggests that the cult statue was a standing wooden image; cf. Shapiro 1989, pp. 27, 31. For more discussion on the possible form and material of the statue, cf. Romano 1980, pp. 58-69; Stewart 1990a, p. 165; Ridgway 1992, pp. 135-137.

459. Hurwit 1999, p. 106, notes that "there are amidst the wealth of isolated architectural bits and pieces from the sixth-century Acropolis a number of blocks that date roughly the same time as the monumentalization of the Nike bastion and that could have belonged to a modest house for the statue." Cf. Mark 1993, pp. 34-35.

460. See Küpper 1990, p. 20, for the seventh-century date, and Appendix 1 for a more detailed discussion.

461. Hurwit 1999, p. 107, n. 42, suggests, not unreasonably, that this may have even been the original reason for building the ramp.

462. For general discussion of the architectural evidence and date, cf. Bancroft 1979; Shapiro 1989, pp. 21-24; Klein 1991; Hurwit 1999, pp. 106-111.

debate.[463] The other pediment featured two lions, once again at the center, this time with only the female lion mauling a bull, and snakes at either corner. While it is tempting to assume that this was a new temple of Athena Polias, and therefore directly associated with a reorganization of the Panathenaia, this need not be the case.[464]

In addition to a new temple, there are poros-limestone blocks, sculpture, and terracotta roof tiles belonging to about half a dozen or so much smaller buildings, most dating to the second and some to the third quarter of the sixth century. Identifying the particular building to which any individual architectural elements belongs, and even where any of the buildings were located, is a puzzle.[465] It is perhaps unlikely that each building was a temple, given the number of them. Some have considered them treasuries of prominent Athenian families, analogous to the treasuries found at Panhellenic sanctuar-

---

463. Interpretations of this creature are numerous, and include: Typhon; Geryon; a representation of Okeanos, Pontos, and Aither; and–least likely–the three factions of sixth-century Athens (Hill, Coast, and Plain). Cf. Boardman 1972; Kiilerich 1988; Stewart 1990a, p. 114; Höckmann 1991; Ridgway 1993, pp. 286-287. The snake body of the "bluebeard" figure reminds one of Kekrops and Erechthonios, mythic Athenian kings who had lower bodies of snakes. Cf. Palagia 1993, pp. 42-43; Hurwit 1999, p. 109.

464. There is, in fact, debate about whether the temple was for Athena Polias, or for Athena Parthenos. The debate centers around where on the summit this temple was located. If the Bluebeard Temple occupied the area of the so-called Dörpfield foundations–usually dated to the late sixth century, and located partially under the Classical Erechtheion–then it would have replaced the mostly wood seventh-century Athena Polias temple, two column bases from which were found within the foundations. Some, however, believe that the temple was located in the area that later was occupied by the Parthenon, and so was its "grandfather." The evidence for both theories has strengths and weaknesses; for example, the Dörpfield foundations appear to have been worked differently than the Bluebeard temple, while the area of the Parthenon in the sixth century may well have been the location of not one, but several buildings. Cf. Hurwit 1999, pp. 111-112, for a useful summary of the issues and bibliography. We do know that the temple was dismantled by ca. 485, for two of its marble metopes were used to inscribe the so-called Hekatompedon Decrees, *IG* i^3 4.

465. For general discussion of these little buildings, cf. Boersma 1970, pp. 232-234, 237, 239; Bancroft 1979, pp. 46-76; Shapiro 1989, pp. 21-24; Hurwit 1999, pp. 112-117. For the architectural terracottas, cf. Winter 1993, pp. 214-223, nos. 2-4, 7-8.

ies such as Delphi.[466] Others interpret them as indeed possibly temples or dining halls.[467] We do not know.

We may now make a few preliminary conclusions. Both literary and material evidence show that in the second quarter of the sixth century, the Athenian Acropolis was the site of a remarkable transformation. A new, grand ramp led up to the Acropolis; a new temple, perhaps to Athena Polias, was built; a number of small *oikemata* were constructed; and the Athena Nike bastion was refashioned, and the goddess herself received a new statue, altar, and possibly a modest temple. The Panathenaia also was refashioned in the second quarter of the sixth century. The Great Panathenaia appears to have been inaugurated ca. 566/5; prize amphorae may have been introduced at this time; and the processional route changed. The Peisistratidai cannot be directly linked to any of the construction projects. It is possible that one of the *oikemata* belonged to the family, and it is clear that they directed the Panathenaia by the last quarter of the century, if not earlier. But such evidence does not allow us to posit that the innovations in the Panathenaia or the architecture of the Athenian Acropolis were part of any purposeful design by the Peisistratidai, on par with the Periklean building program. It is conceivable that wealthy families funded a sanctuary with which they were particularly associated; members of the Eteoboutadai, for example, would be likely candidates for funding a temple to Athena. That said, no matter the source of funding, the Peisistratidai would presumably have sanctioned any projects, given their powerful position in Athens.

3. Artemis Brauronia

The earliest evidence for ritual activity at Brauron goes back to the Late Geometric period.[468] In the Classical period the Brauronia was an important festival managed in part by a board of *hieropoioi* established by the state.[469] The festival included a procession, probably from the Brauronion in Athens, to the sanctuary in Brauron, footraces, and likely an initiation rite for young girls called the *Arkteia*, in which the girls dressed

466. Shapiro 1989, p. 21; Anderson 2003, p. 107.

467. E.g., Camp 1994, p. 9. Cf. Hurwit 1999, pp. 115-116, who finds that different buildings may have served different purposes.

468. Cf. Appendix 1.

469. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.7.

as bears and danced.[470] There are hints of a Peisistratid association with Brauron, discussed below, that have tempted a great number of scholars to assume that Peisistratos established the Brauronia festival or promote it to a "polis-level" festival, in a program that also included the installation of an Artemis Brauronia sanctuary on the Acropolis.[471] We are, however, less well informed than most modern accounts admit as to when the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia was built on the Acropolis, or when the festival that united the two sanctuaries was founded.

A late lexicographer links Peisistratos with building a temple of Artemis at Brauron.[472] If Peisistratos did build a temple, we have yet to find it;[473] the first sacred architec-

---

470. Procession from Athens to Brauron: Ar. *Pax* 874. To my knowledge, there is no ancient evidence that details the processional route. Initiation rite as a "bear": Ar. *Lys*. 642-647. For reconstructions and discussions of the various rituals in their developed fifth- and fourth-century form, cf. Kahil 1977; Cole 1984; Dowden 1989; Sourvinou-Inwood 1988b, 1990a; Gentili and Perusino 2002; Marinatos 2002; Faraone 2003; Parker 2005, pp. 228-252.

471. The assumption that Peisistratos founded or expanded the Brauronia, and established a second sanctuary on the Acropolis, is nearly universally accepted; see, e.g., Kolb 1977, p. 103; Shapiro 1989, pp. 65-66; Frost 1990, p. 6; Hurwit 1999, p. 117. Rhodes and Dobbins 1979, discovered three phases to the Brauronia on the Acropolis, but the evidence for these phases–cuttings in the Acropolis bedrock and limestone foundation blocks–cannot be dated with any precision. The rock-cut north wall of the third phase of the sanctuary building is on the same axis with the Propylaia, suggesting, though not proving, a Periklean date for this phase; cf. Hurwit 1999, pp. 197-198. Dissenting opinions are few. Edmonson 1968, argues that the Brauronia sanctuary in Athens was first established in the fourth century. Osborne 1994, pp. 147-151, challenges generally the notion that the Peisistratidai ever used sanctuaries as a means to unify city and countryside.

472. Phot. s.v. Βραυρωνία: Ἀθήνησιν οὕτως ἡ Ἄρτεμις ἐκαλεῖτο ἀπὸ Βραυρῶνος τόπου, ἐν ᾧ μάλιστα αὕτη ἐτιμᾶτο. ἐκλήθη δὲ ὁ χῶρος ἀπό τινος ἥρωος οὕτω καλουμένου. καὶ ἦν τὸ ἱερὸν πρὸς τῷ Ἐρασίνῳ ποταμῷ κατασκευασθὲν ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου.

473. Below the southern end of the east wing of the Classical stoa lies a partially excavated "older building": Papadimitriou, *Ergon* 1961, 21; 1962, 28-29, 32; Hollinshead 1980, pp. 36-37; cf. *SEG* 53.103; 55.237. It appears to be constructed of poros blocks, oriented SW-NE, and may have wheel ruts. It is possible that this structure is a seventh-century antecedent to the stoa, though a sixth century date is also possible. Travlos 1976, p. 205, 1988, p. 55, thinks that there was a wooden temple of Artemis, traces of which no longer survive, that dates to the end of the Geometric period; for similar sentiments, cf. Antoniou 1990, pp. 42-43, 46, 54, 56, 75-76; Eustratiou 1991b, p. 79.

ture at the site is a temple dated to ca. 500, after the Peisistratid exile.[474] Our earliest evidence for the festival itself dates to the late sixth and early fifth century, and consists mostly of krateriskoi of the type particularly associated with Artemis.[475] While this evidence suggests that worship of Artemis was in full swing, it does not yet attest to an official procession from Athens to Brauron. The evidence for a sixth-century Artemis Brauronia sanctuary on the Acropolis is slim, and based on two pieces of evidence found there: 1. a single krateriskos, dated to ca. 510; 2. two crouching marble hounds, dated stylistically to ca. 520, that have been optimistically associated with the sanctuary.[476]

Ancient testimony indicates that some of the Peisistratidai were associated with Brauron.[477] While this evidence shows that the family may have originally been from the area, and perhaps still had land in the area, there are no ancient accounts that suggest that the primary residence of Peisistratos and his sons had ever been anywhere but

474. A date of ca. 510-500 for the first preserved stone temple at Brauron is universally accepted; cf. Papadimitriou 1963, p. 115; Boersma 1970, p. 175; Travlos 1988, p. 55; Shapiro 1989, p. 66.

475. Outside of Brauron and the nearby sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai Araphenides, krateriskoi have been found at the sanctuary of Artemis Mounychia at Peiraieus, as well as on the Acropolis, in the Athenian Agora, and in fill associated with the temple of Artemis Aristoboule; cf. Kahil 1963; 1965; 1977; 1981; Threpsiades and Vanderpool 1964; Palaiokrassa 1991a, 1991b, who notes that the fabric of the krateriskoi found in Brauron is different from that at Mounychia, indicating localized production. In every case, the krateriskoi are associated with a sanctuary of Artemis. These vessels often depict young girls dancing or running, often near an altar and a tree. Many believe these images depict the ritual of the *arkteia*, though there is debate; cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 1988b; Hamilton 1989; Gentili and Perusino 2002.

476. Sixth-century Krateriskos, of a type similar to votive krateriskoi found at the fifth-century Artemis Brauronia sanctuary: Kahil 1981, pl. 62. Marble hounds: Brouskari 1974, pp. 57-58; Ridgway 1993, p. 201. Our earliest architectural evidence for the Acropolis Brauronia dates to the 430's; cf. Hurwit 1999, pp. 197-198.

477. Peisistratidai from Brauron: Plut. *Sol.* 10.2; Pl. *Hipparch.* 228b.

Athens.[478] In short, while some association of the Peisistratidai with Brauron is certain, and it is possible that Peisistratos built a temple at Brauron, we cannot be sure that the processional festival had begun under the Peisistratidai. It may well have been founded in the earliest years of the democracy, or later.

4. Demeter, Athens, and Eleusis

Sometime between 575 and 550, the upper terrace of the City Eleusinion, the site of ritual activity since at least the early seventh century, was enclosed with a peribolos wall. The eastern extent of the wall has not been found, but an entrance to the precinct was built into the south wall.[479] It is usually suggested that these developments reflect the success of the policy of the Peisistratidai to incorporate the Mysteries at Eleusis within Athenian religious and political hegemony.[480] This argument is advanced despite the fact that worship of Demeter in Athens began well before the Peisistratidai came to power, and that there exists not one piece of evidence, material or literary, that associates the family with the Demeter sanctuary at Athens or Eleusis. In fact, the construction of the Archaic peribolos wall around the City Eleusinion comfortably dates to before Peisistratos' ascension to power. In addition, while the wall indicates an interest in embellishing the sanctuary in the first half of the sixth century, the sanctuary itself had not yet ex-

---

478. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 13.3-5, and Hdt. 1.59, record that in the disorder that followed Solon's reforms, Athenians were divided into three factions: the men of the coast, led by Megacles; the men of the hills, led by Peisistratos; and the men of the plain, led by Lykourgos. Neither author states that the leaders of these "parties" actually lived in these regions. In fact, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 13.5, specifically states that these were the regions in which their farms were located. That said, even if Peisistratos did live primarily in Athens, he had extensive family ties to Brauron. On Peisistratos and residence in Athens, cf. Shapiro 1989, p. 2; Anderson 2003, pp. 30-33, who suggests that the Peisistratids of Athens were associated with the Kollytos deme.

479. Miles 1998, pp. 25-27. Miles notes that at about the same time, three wells on the Panathenaic Way, near the sanctuary, were closed, perhaps indicating an enlargement of the road: Well S 22:1 was filled in and abandoned ca. 575, Wells S 21:2 and R 17:3 were closed ca. 550.

480. Shapiro 1989, p. 69: "The founding of the City Eleusinion was clearly a crucial step in Athens' increasing control over the mother cult in Eleusis...Thus, although the attribution of the founding of Peisistratos has to remain hypothetical, this sanctuary does seem to have fulfilled two objectives which we can associate with his policies: the assertion of Athens' influence in sanctuaries beyond the city's borders and the establishment in Athens of cults to meet the religious needs of the quickly growing city." Cf. Mylonas 1961, pp. 77-105; Kolb 1977; Shear Jr. 1978, pp. 9-10; Simon 1983, pp. 24-27.

panded beyond the Upper Terrace, nor been provided with any other discernible architectural additions, such as a temple.[481]

Part of the argument for Peisistratid involvement with the City Eleusinion has rested upon the presumed simultaneity of the construction of the fortification wall complex and second Archaic Telesterion at Eleusis, often referred to as the "Peisistratid Telesterion."[482] It appears likely, however, that the earlier, so-called "Solonian Telesterion" is closer in date to the peribolos wall around the City Eleusinion. In the sixth century, the terraced platform upon which the eighth- or seventh-century Building B1-3 was built was extended to the south and east, and supported by a new retaining wall of polygonal masonry. Atop this terrace was built the first of what would be many telesteria.[483] This was a plain, rectangular building, ca. twenty-four meters long and fourteen meters wide. The exterior walls consisted of one meter wide polygonal courses of blue Eleusinian limestone blocks that served as socle for the upper courses of mudbrick walls. The width of the building would have demanded multiple rows of internal column supports, presumably made of wood. Though commonly referred to as the "Solonian Telesterion," the masonry of the terrace walls and of the telesterion matches closely that of sixth-century peribolos wall in the Eleusinion in Athens, suggesting near contemporaneous construction at Eleusis of ca. 575-550.[484]

Later in the century, this telesterion was dismantled and replaced with a nearly square, and much larger telesterion.[485] It was made almost entirely of stone, and was provided with a front portico. The main hypostyle hall measured over twenty-five long by twenty-seven meters wide, within which were twenty-two columns that supported the roof. Dating to about the same period is an impressive fortification wall that served to

---

481. The construction of the Temple of Triptolemos on the Middle Terrace dates to ca. 500-490; Miles 1998, pp. 38-40. Travlos 1971b, p. 198, suggested that it replaced an earlier–now archaeologically invisible–temple, but excavations show that private houses occupied the Middle and Lower Terraces throughout the sixth century; cf. Thompson 1960, p. 337; Miles 1998, pp. 28-31.

482. E.g. Noack 1927, pp. 69-70; Mylonas 1961, pp. 63-72; Travlos 1988, pp. 91-102.

483. For this first phase of the Telesterion, cf. the extensive discussion in Noack 1927, pp. 16-32; Mylonas 1961, pp. 63-76.

484. Miles 1998, p. 28. This date is further by Clinton 1971, pp. 81-82, who dates architectural fragments that appear to belong to this building to the middle of the sixth century. Cf. van den Eijnde 2010, pp. 159-160, who argues for a late seventh-century date for construction.

485. Mylonas 1961, pp. 77-105, for full discussion of architectural remains; cf. Boersma 1970, p. 185.

enclose the entire sanctuary.[486] The building and wall have usually been attributed to either Peisistratos or his sons, but recent research has indicated that a late sixth-century date is more appropriate.[487] These monumental developments can thus be placed either into the last years of Hippias, or the first years of the democracy. We will discuss these building projects in more detail in the next chapter.

The agonistic games of the Eleusinia festival at Eleusis are well attested by the sixth century. In the middle of the century, Alkiphron the Archon dedicated a racepost and made the race course for the Eleusinia at Eleusis.[488] We have here yet another excellent example of the private funding of a festival or sanctuary while carrying an official title, much as we saw with the dedication of Chairion the treasurer on the Acropolis. The games are further attested by the dedication of a jumping weight in ca. 575-550, *IG* i³ 988, and two discus dedications in ca. 520-500, *IG* i³ 989 and 991.[489] When the games were first established is not known, though the seventh-century dedications of terracotta horses and votive plaques decorated with tripods indicate that games had been conducted at Eleusis since at least the previous century.[490] By the fourth century, the games were already thought to have been very ancient.[491]

The origin of the festival that united the two sanctuaries of Demeter, the Eleusinian Mysteries, is much debated. By the fifth century, the Mysteries consisted of a complex orchestration of rituals.[492] The first stage was in spring, when the Lesser Mysteries were

---

486. For a discussion of the wall with bibliography, see Giraud 1991, pp. 9-17.

487. Hayashi 1992, pp. 19-29, who argues that the "Peisistratid Telesterion" has close architectural affinities with the Old Bouleuterion and the Old Athena Temple. Clinton 1994, p. 162, dates the fortification wall to the years after Kleomenes attacked the sanctuary in 506, as described in Hdt. 6.75.3; cf. Lang 1996, p. 96.

488. *IG* i³ 991: δέμοι Ἀθεναίον ἄ[ρχον]/ στέλ̣ας καδέθεκεν / Ἀλκίφρον/ καὶ τόνδε δρόμον ποίεσεν/ ἐραστὸν / Δέμετρός τε χάριν/ [καὶ Φερσεφόνες τ]ανυπ̣έπλ̣ο; Clinton 2005, pp. 11-12, no. 3.

489. Clinton 2005, p. 9, no. 1, and p. 13, no. 6, respectively.

490. These seventh-century votives are discussed in Appendix 1.

491. By the fourth century, the games were held in the second and fourth years of each Olympiad, and consisted of gymnastic events, musical contests, horse racing, and what is called "the ancestral contest," τοῦ πατρίου ἀγῶν; cf. *IG* ii² 1672.258-261. Ancient testimony confirms the presumed antiquity of the games; cf. Pind. *Ol.* 9.99, 13.110; *Isth.* 1.57; Aristid. *Panath.* 13189.4-5. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.7, lists the quadrennial version of the Eleusinia as under the supervision of a state board.

492. For complete summaries of all activities associated with the Mysteries, cf. Mylonas 1961, pp. 224-285; Parke 1977, pp. 55-72; Zaidman and Pantel 1992, pp. 132-140.

conducted at Agrai in Athens. By the second half of the fifth century, the Mysteries were overseen by the archon basileus, as well as other personnel from Eleusis and members of the Kerykes and Eumolpidai *gene*. The Greater Mysteries took place in late summer, during which the *hiera*, or sacred objects, were transported from Eleusis to the Eleusinion in Athens in a procession. Qualified initiates entered the Eleusinion, and the next day, the *hiera* were accompanied by another procession back to Eleusis, where the Mysteries took place inside the Telesterion.[493] When were these ritual ties between Athens and Eleusis first established?

It is commonplace for scholars to assume that the date of the origin of the Mysteries is the date of the Athenian takeover of Eleusis. In the fifth and fourth centuries, certainly, the Athenian state oversaw much of the activity concerning the Mysteries.[494] Ancient sources ascribe the founding to Eumolpos, Triptolemos, Orpheus, and Demeter herself.[495] Some of the traditional first initiates of the Mysteries, Herakles, as well as the Dioskouri, also speak to its purported antiquity.[496] In addition, ancient testimony presumes that some of Solon's laws concerned the Mysteries.[497] Based on this evidence, some have argued that the Mysteries, and therefore Eleusis, were controlled by Athens as early as the late eighth or seventh century.[498] Others have argued that the Mysteries can only be dated to the advent of the Archaic telesteria, buildings designed for the pur-

---

493. Robertson 1998, argues that there were two processions back to Eleusis conducted on successive days, one to accompany the *hiera*, and one to accompany the statue of Iakkhos.

494. Cf. *IG* i³ 5, 6, 32, 78, 79. The administration of the Eleusinian Mysteries in the Classical period is discussed more fully in Chapter Seven.

495. Eumolpos: *Marm. Par. FGrH* 239 A 15; schol. Soph. *OC* 1035; Eur. *Erechtheus* fr. 65.100 in Austin 1968. Triptolemos: Xen. Hell. 6.3.6. Orpheus: Dem. 25.11; Eur. *Rhes*. 943-944. Demeter reveals the Mysteries to a group of *basileis*, including Triptolemos and Eumolpos: *Hymn. Hom. Dem*. 470-479; cf. Isoc. *Paneg*. 28.

496. Herakles: Apollod. 2.5.12, who records that at the time, Eumolpos was the hierophant, and foreigners were not yet allowed to be initiated, so he was adopted by Pylios; cf. Plut. *Thes*. 33.2; schol. Hom. *Il*. 8.368. According to Diod. 4.14.3, the Lesser Mysteries were instituted by Demeter in honour of Herakles, so that she could purify him for the slaughter of the Centaurs. For Boardman 1975, p. 6, associates Pylios with Peisistratos, said by Hdt. 5.65.3-4, to have been a descendent of the Neleids of Pylos.

497. Andoc. 1.111; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 57.1, for testimony that the Mysteries were among the "ancestral" sacrifices conducted by the Archon Basileus.

498. E.g., Clinton 1993, pp. 110-112; Osborne 1994, pp. 152-154.

pose of the secretive Mysteries.[499] The truth is, we do not know what form the Mysteries took in the sixth century, or how far back in time they were practiced, nor when the procession from the City Eleusinion to Eleusis was established. The fact that a peribolos wall at the City Eleusinion is contemporary with a new telesterion at Eleusis is not sufficient evidence; as we saw with our discussion of the Athenian Acropolis, much of the sanctuary remodeling is contemporary with the telesterion at Eleusis. We must, as a result, reserve judgement on the source of funding and authority over a festival for which we have little evidence. Around the year 500, we do have positive evidence for a board of Eleusinian *hieropoioi*, and by ca. 470-460, the state and its magistrates were deeply involved in the administration and financial conduct of the Mysteries. We will discuss both of these developments in more detail in the next chapter.

5. Dionysos of Eleutherai

The earliest architectural remains of a small temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus, just south of the Acropolis, consist of parts of the foundations, euthynteria, stylobate, and fragments of superstructure and pedimental sculpture. The date of this temple is contested, though most date the structure to some point between the years 550 and 500.[500] The dating of the City Dionysia festival associated with this temple is no more secure. By the fifth century, this festival ranked among the most spectacular of the city's festivals. Whether the City Dionysia was created for its famed stage tragedies or these were added to an existing festival is not known.[501] Based in part upon the date found in some ancient sources for the first dramatic performance of Thespis in Athens, ca. 534, most modern accounts attribute the institution of the City Dionysia to Peisistratos.[502] We do not know, however, whether the year given for Thespis' performance by the Hellenistic and later sources is accurate;[503] even if the year is correct, we do not know whether Thespis' first

---

499. E.g., Sourvinou-Inwood 1997, who accepts the "Solonian" and "Peisistratid" dates for the Archaic telesteria.

500. Pickard-Cambridge 1946, pp. 3-4; Boersma 1970, pp. 137, 189; Travlos 1971b, p. 537; Wycherley 1978, p. 183. Connor 1990, pp. 24-25, believes that the Z-clamps of the temple resemble those used in the construction of the Stoa Basileios, and so dates the temple to ca. 500.

501. Arist. Ath. Pol. 3.3, 56.5, 57.1, considers the festival to be relatively recent; cf. also Thuc. 2.15.4.

502. *Marm. Par., FGrH* 239 A 43; cf. Suda s.v. Θέσπις.

503. West 1989.

performance was actually held in Athens or elsewhere in Attica.[504] If we may judge from the official records of victors, the advent of tragedy at the festival in Athens did not begin until ca. 500.[505]

This date may find indirect support from Aristotle, in his discussion of the chronological distinction between τὰ πάτρια, i.e., ancestral rites administered by the older offices of the archon basileus and polemarch, and τὰ ἐπίθετα, i.e., recently added rites that were administered by the eponymous archon.[506] When the formal distinction between τὰ πάτρια and τὰ ἐπίθετα first arose in Athens is not known, although it was certainly in use by the mid-fifth century.[507] At this time, oversight over publicly funded πάτρια, i.e., the rites that dated before the Kleisthenic reforms, were assigned to the archon basileus and polemarch, while publicly funded ἐπίθετα, or rites added recently, i.e., after the reforms, were assigned to the eponymous archon. Among the ἐπίθετα that the eponymous

---

504. As Connor 1990, pp. 36-32, notes, the key phrase on the *Marm. Par.* for the entry on Thespis, δρᾶμ[α ἐν ἄ]στει, was a conjecture made by Boeckh, who did not see the stone first hand. Earlier reports of this line, now no longer legible, record a different reading: ΝΑΛ...ΣΤΙΝ. If this reading is correct, then the only testimony that links Thespis with a dramatic festival in Athens is no longer authoritative. It is possible, however, that Thespis first performed plays in the countryside by this date; cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1966, p. 72; Parker 1996, p. 93. For the associations of Thespis and the countryside: Dioscorides *Anth. Pal.* 7.410; Hor. *Ars P* 2760277. Contra, Burnett 2003, who finds that the epigraphical evidence of the *Marm. Par.* does not contradict a Peisistratid origin, and a first victory in ca. 528.

505. Both *IG* ii² 2318 and 2325 record victories in dramatic and dithyrambic contests at the City Dionysia. The first victories are around the year 500 or slightly earlier; see Pickard-Cambridge 1966, pp. 101-103; West 1989. Cf. Connor 1990; 1996, for general argument that the City Dionysia cannot be verified before ca. 510.

506. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.3: ὅτι δὲ τελευταία τούτων ἐγένετο τῶν ἀρχῶν, σημεῖον καὶ τὸ μηδὲν τῶν πατρίων τὸν ἄρχοντα διοικεῖν, ὥσπερ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ πολέμαρχος, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς τὰ ἐπίθετα: διὸ καὶ νεωστὶ γέγονεν ἡ ἀρχὴ μεγάλη, τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις αὐξηθεῖσα. Cf. 57.1. Although Aristotle does not offer a definition of τὰ πάτρια and τὰ ἐπίθετα, the distinction appears to be only chronological.

507. Cf. *IG* i³ 7, a decree of ca. 460-450 that records an oracle concerning the Praxiergidai *genos*, and details of their πάτρια.

archon oversaw was the City Dionysia, which would place the founding of the festival to ca. 500.[508]

The festival featured the image of the god himself; the ancient, wooden statue of Dionysos Eleuthereus was first taken to a temple at the Academy, offered a sacrifice, and then escorted back to the temple.[509] This procession is thought to evoke the mythic arrival of Dionysos at Eleutherai, which for most scholars represents the incorporation of that city at the border of Boiotia and Attica into the Athenian state.[510] This assumption is based upon Pausanias, who records that Eleutherai, out of hatred for the Thebans, decided to come over to Athens at some point in the past; he notes in the same passage that the temple, from which the ancient wooden image of Dionysos was carried off to Athens, now has its own copy.[511] While this passage is often taken to mean that the Athenians took their statue once Eleutherai decided to join Athens, Pausanias appears to keep the two events chronologically distinct.[512] According to traditional accounts, Pegasos of Eleutherai brought the ancient wooden image of Dionysos Eleuthereus to

---

508. Garland 1992, pp. 24-25, argues that the City Dionysia was not ἐπίθετα, but πάτρια, since it was "introduced around the time of Peisistratos... [I]t would seem that the eponymous archon presided over both *patria* and *epitheta*. And this in turn strongly suggests that the Athenians themselves did not necessarily know the relative chronology of their cult." This is difficult to accept, and at any rate not demonstrable.

509. Paus. 1.29.2, says that the temple was near a gymnasium on what was once the property of a private individual. For more on the festival, cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1966, pp. 57-70. The procession of the cult image from the temple on the south slope of the Acropolis to the temple in the Academy and back again is usually thought today to represent the arrival of the god into Athens from Eleutherai. Perhaps this is so, but this is not attested in ancient sources. We know almost nothing about the processional route or the little temple in the Academy.

510. E.g., Shapiro 1989, p. 85: "The first temple was presumably built to house that primitive cult statue, which a century later was replaced by a chryselephantine statue by Alkamenes. The City Dionysia began with the transfer of the ancient *xoanon* to Athens and the building of the early temple." Cf. Kolb 1977, pp. 124-133; Frost 1990, p. 78.

511. Paus. 1.38.8: ἐκ δὲ Ἐλευσῖνος τραπομένοις ἐπὶ Βοιωτῶν, ἐστὶν ὅμορος Ἀθηναίοις ἡ Πλαταιίς. πρότερον μὲν γὰρ Ἐλευθερεῦσιν ὅροι πρὸς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἦσαν: προσχωρησάντων δὲ Ἀθηναίοις τούτων, οὕτως ἤδη Βοιωτίας ὁ Κιθαιρών ἐστιν ὅρος. προσεχώρησαν δὲ Ἐλευθερεῖς οὐ πολέμῳ βιασθέντες, ἀλλὰ πολιτείας τε ἐπιθυμήσαντες παρὰ Ἀθηναίων καὶ κατ' ἔχθος τὸ Θηβαίων. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πεδίῳ ναός ἐστι Διονύσου, καὶ τὸ ξόανον ἐντεῦθεν Ἀθηναίοις ἐκομίσθη τὸ ἀρχαῖον: τὸ δὲ ἐν Ἐλευθεραῖς ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐς μίμησιν ἐκείνου πεποίηται. Cf. Paus. 1.20.3.

512. Cf. Badian 1993, pp. 118-119; Parker 1996, pp. 93-94.

Athens sometime during or just before the reign of Amphictyon, one of the early kings of Athens; the Athenians accepted the statue on advice from the oracle at Delphi.[513] There is no ancient testimony that associates, chronologically or otherwise, the arrival of the statue from Eleutherai with the decision of that city to join Athens. Furthermore, while the story of how the Athenians gained the statue has many parallels in the Greek tradition, there are no other instances in which the Athenians saw fit to seize an ally's cult image.[514] As for when Eleutherai was incorporated into Attica, all we can say is that it happened at least by the middle of the fifth century;[515] a reasonable date may be after 508/7, after the Athenian campaign against the Boiotians and Chalkidians changed the power dynamic in the region.[516] The keeping of an official list of victors, as well as the organization of the City Dionysia, indicates state oversight by ca. 500. That said, this involvement of the state need not exclude the primacy of private initiative in funding the contests.

6. The Peisistratidai and Athens

So far, we have found that many of the festivals and religious activity can be associated with the Peisistratidai on only the thinnest of evidence. This is not to say that the Peisistratidai left religious matters alone. In fact, Thucydides and Aristotle record that the Peisistratidai, on their own authority, levied a tax on the Athenians, with which funds they conducted all wars, built public works, and conducted sacrifices for the tem-

513. Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 243a: Πήγασος ἐκ τῶν Ἐλευθερῶν αἱ δὲ Ἐλευθεραὶ πόλις εἰσὶ τῆς Βοιωτίας—λαβὼν τοῦ Διονύσου τὸ ἄγαλμα ἦκεν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικήν. Cf. Paus. 1.2.5, who seems also to know the story: μετὰ δὲ τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου τέμενός ἐστιν οἴκημα ἀγάλματα ἔχον ἐκ πηλοῦ, βασιλεὺς Ἀθηναίων Ἀμφικτύων ἄλλους τε θεοὺς ἑστιῶν καὶ Διόνυσον. ἐνταῦθα καὶ Πήγασός ἐστιν Ἐλευθερεύς, ὃς Ἀθηναίοις θεὸν ἐσήγαγε: συνεπελάβετο δέ οἱ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς μαντεῖον ἀναμνῆσαν τὴν ἐπὶ Ἰκαρίου ποτὲ ἐπιδημίαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

514. For individuals bringing cult statues from one city to another, cf., e.g., Paus. 2.7.6; Eur. *I.T.* 1450-1457. On this point, cf. also, Souvinou-Inwood 1994.

515. An Athenian casualty list tentatively dated to ca. 447, *IG* i^3 1162.96-97, lists Ἐλευθερᾶθεν Σεμιχίδες among the dead.

516. Connor 1990, pp. 10-11.

ples.[517] It is likely that the tyrants spent public monies on the Panathenaia, since the family conducted the procession.[518] What other religious buildings or rites were publicly funded?

Let us begin to answer this question by first examining the festivals and sanctuaries with which the Peisistratidai are certainly connected. Among the most ostentatious of their projects was their plan to build a monumental temple of Olympian Zeus.[519] The tyrants did not establish this sanctuary. According to Athenian tradition, Deucalion founded the shrine near a cleft through which the water from Deucalion's Flood drained.[520] The physical remains of foundations under the Olympieion confirm that there was an earlier building, likely an earlier temple dismantled by the Peisistratids to make way for their grander architectural vision.[521] At over one hundred meters long and over forty meters wide, the new, enlarged Olympieion was meant to rival in size the largest temples in the Greek world, those at Samos, Ephesos, Didyma, Selinous, and

---

517. Thucydides and Aristotle disagree as to whether the tax was five or ten percent, respectively. Thuc. 6.54.5: οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρχὴν ἐπαχθὴς ἦν ἐς τοὺς πολλούς, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνεπιφθόνως κατεστήσατο: καὶ ἐπετήδευσαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ τύραννοι οὗτοι ἀρετὴν καὶ ξύνεσιν, καὶ Ἀθηναίους εἰκοστὴν μόνον πρασσόμενοι τῶν γιγνομένων τήν τε πόλιν αὐτῶν καλῶς διεκόσμησαν καὶ τοὺς πολέμους διέφερον καὶ ἐς τὰ ἱερὰ ἔθυον. Arist. Ath. Pol. 18.4: ἅμα δὲ συνέβαινεν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰς προσόδους γίγνεσθαι μείζους, ἐξεργαζομένης τῆς χώρας. ἐπράττετο γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν γιγνομένων δεκάτην.

518. Thuc. 6.56.1-3; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 18.

519. According to Arist. *Pol.* 1313b, the Peisistratidai started the temple, while Vitr. *De Arch.* 7, praef 15 attributes it more specifically to Peisistratos himself. Pottery from the foundations of the temple suggests that the project began after Peisistratos' death, during the reign of Hippias and Hipparchos; cf. Welter 1922. As Wycherley 1978, p. 156, notes, it is possible that Peisistratos planned the temple, even if it was his sons who began the actual construction. For general discussions of the Olympieion: Penrose 1887, pp. 272-273; Wycherley 1964; 1978, pp. 155-164; Boersma 1970, pp. 25, 199; Travlos 1971b, pp. 402-411; Tolle-Kastenbein 1994; Camp 2001, pp. 173-176.

520. Deucalion as founder: Paus. 1.18.7-8; cf. Thuc. 2.15.4, who suggests that the sanctuary pre-dated the synoikismos of Theseus. The cleft through which the flood waters had flowed was in the temenos of Ge Olympia.

521. Remains of pre-Peisistratid building: Penrose 1888, p. 82; Welter 1922, pp. 66-67; Boersma 1970, pp. 25, 199; Travlos 1971b, p. 402; Wycherley 1978, pp. 155-156. The date of the building is not known; it is estimated to have been ca. thirty wide by sixty meters long.

Akragas.[522] The Peisistratidai, however, did not get to see their grand project to completion; with only the foundations and a few column drums in place, the project was abandoned when the tyrants were driven from the city.[523] This abandonment suggests that, in contrast with the Panathenaia, the public in fact did not have a vested financial interest, and that the project was indeed seen to be Peisistratid in concept and funding.[524]

Near the Olympieion was the Pythion, a precinct sacred to Apollo. Like the Olympieion, traditional accounts of the fifth century believed the sanctuary was founded before the synoikismos of Theseus.[525] Later lexicographers report that Peisistratos built a

---

522. For Shear Jr. 1978, p. 10, the scale and plan of the temple was "probably a direct response…to the new temple of Hera at Samos begun by the tyrant Polykrates about ten years earlier… Nothing could illustrate more vividly that spirit of competition among builders of temples" than the contemporaneous rise of such large temples in the Greek world. Cf. Parker 1996, p. 72.

523. Vitr. *De Arch.* 7, praef. 15, who also records the names of the architects that the Peisistratidai employed: Antistates, Kallaischros, Antimachides, and Porinos. The temple lay as the Peisistratidai left it for three hundred years, at which time Antiochos resumed work in the Hellenistic period. Antiochos did not finish the temple; that would have to wait until Hadrian; cf. Dio Cass. 69.16; Paus. 1.18.6; Philostr. *V. S.* 1.25.6; Spartianus *Life of Hadrian* 13.6.

524. Many commentators have assumed that the family also founded the Olympieia, a festival that later came to include a cavalry procession and equestrian competition. See, e.g., Deubner 1966, p. 177; Parke 1977, pp. 144-145; Simon 1983, pp. 15-16; Kyle 1987, p. 46. Cf. Robertson 1992, p. 139; Parker 1996, p. 96, for the idea that the Peisistratidai enlarged an existing festival. When the festival was established, however, is not known. Our earliest evidence for the Olympieia, collected by Kyle 1987, p. 46, dates to the fourth century; for more on the festival in its later form, cf. also *IG* ii^2 1496, A82; 3079.5-13, both inscriptions of the third century that record that the *anthippasia* contest was held at the Olympieia as well as during the Greater Panathenaia.

525. Thuc. 2.15.4, 6.54.6-7. There has been debate about the exact location of the Pythion in Athens. Thucydides attests to a location near the Olympieion; cf. Paus. 1.19.1. Fragments from the Pythian altar dedicated by Peisistratos the Younger, *IG* i^3 948, were reportedly recovered from the Ilissos River. For evidence of the possible location of the Pythion in this vicinity, see Travlos 1971b, pp. 100-103, figs. 130-137. Others have been tempted to identify a second Pythion with a cave associated with Apollo Hupo Makrais on the north slope of the Acropolis; cf., e.g., Wycherley 1963; Travlos 1971b, p. 91; Clinton 1973; Davies 2007, pp. 59-60. A new fragment of sacrifices from the late fifth-century Law Code of Nikomachos, Agora I 7577 in Gawlinski 2007, records sacrifices to both [Ἀπόλλωνι Ὑπὸ] Μακραῖς (line 4) and [- - - - - - - - - -] ἐπὶ Πυθίῳ (line 9). This fragment decides the issue, at least for fifth-century nomenclature: there was only one Pythion, and it was near the Ilissos.

temple at the Pythion, and add the colorful report that the Athenians, angered that their tax money was being spent on this temple, expressed their rage by defecating in the Pythion.[526] To date, no evidence of this temple has been identified, and it is possible that there never was a temple in the precinct.[527] Even if this is the case, the association of the Peisistratidai with the Pythion is secure: the younger Peisistratos, son of Hippias, dedicated an altar at the sanctuary, much of which survives to this day.[528]

Since the tripods won at the dithyrambic chorus competitions at the Thargelia festival were dedicated at the Pythion, it has been suggested that the festival was created by the Peisistratidai.[529] There is no evidence, literary or material, that supports this attribution. The origins of the Thargelia are obscure, and the first performances of the dithyramb in Athens at the City Dionysia date to the last decade of the sixth century, after the fall of the tyrants.[530] It is possible, if not likely, that the festival dates to the the beginning of the fifth century.[531]

---

526. Phot. s.v. Πύθιον; Suda, s.v. Πύθιον; s.v. Ἐν Πυθίῳ κρεῖττον ἦν ἀποπατῆσαι; Zen. *Codex Athous* 2.94: ἐπὶ Πυθίωι κρεῖττον ἦν ἀποπατῆσαι; Hsch. s.v. ἐν Πυθίῳ χέσαι.

527. Paus. 1.19.1, only mentions a statue of Apollo at the Pythion, which may imply there was no temple there in his day. Cf. Judeich 1931, p. 386, n. 5; Wycherley 1978, pp. 166-168; Parker 1996, pp. 72-73. Public outrage at the misuse of public monies in the Archaic period has some parallels. Polyaenus 5.1: Phalaris of Akragas became tyrant by keeping the money that the people gave him to build a temple to Zeus, and using it to hire an army and seize the city. Diod. 8.9: Agathokles of Syracuse was made general supervisor of construction of a temple of Athena, but instead used the best stones quarried for the temple to build his own house. The gods stepped in this time; he was struck by a lightning bolt, and his house burned to the ground. Both sources are late, and the stories may be apocryphal.

528. Thuc. 6.54.6; *IG* i^{3} 948.

529. Tripods won at the Thargelia dedicated in the Pythion: Suda s.v. Πύθιον; cf. *SEG* 21.469 (= Sokolowski 1962, no. 14), a second century decree that mentions games of the Thargelia that take place [πρ]ὸς τοῦ Πυθίου (line 37), and sacrifices from the festival ἐν [κήπ]οις ἐπὶ τοῦ Πυθίου (lines 53–54). Neither reference places the activities directly within the Pythion. Cf. the fourth-century choregic monuments in *SEG* 27.12-19. For the association of the Thargelia with the Pythion, see Matthaiou 2003, pp. 90-92. For claims of a Peisistratid origin for the festival, cf. Pickard-Cambridge 1966, pp. 9-10; Osborne 1993, p. 25.

530. Connor 1990; Anderson 2003, pp. 178-184.

531. Cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 54.3, who assigns the administration of the Thargelia to the eponymous archon, who supervises only τὰ ἐπίθετα, or recently added rites.

Literary and epigraphic evidence confirms that the Altar of the Twelve Gods, one of the most famous altars in Athens, was dedicated by Hipparchos' nephew, the younger Peisistratos.[532] We will have more to say on the importance of this altar, below. For the moment, we should note how short the list of well documented Peisitratid religious building projects is, and how few can be shown to be funded by public funds. The monumental Olympieion may well have been privately funded, and the Altars of the Twelve Gods and of Pythian Apollo certainly were. The expenditures of state funds may have been mostly for sacrifices and festivals. Such sacrifices were "state" sacrifices only to the degree that the Peisistratidai spent state funds on them. That said, the Peisistratidai were not the state, nor was every sacrifice they sponsored was a "state" sacrifice.[533]

Though the Peisistratidai privately sponsored building activity at a handful of shrines, this marked them as no different from other powerful families. The Alkmaionidai were contracted to build the temple of Apollo at Delphi, and likely were the primary sponsors of the sanctuaries at Sounion in the sixth century.[534] In the middle of the sixth century, Alkiphron the Archon dedicated a racepost and made the course beautiful for the Eleusinia at Eleusis.[535] The Gephyraioi established a number of shrines, and may well have established their own rites and mysteries of Demeter Achaia.[536] The family of Isagoras apparently established their own sanctuary to Zeus Caria.[537] To the altars that Patrokles dedicated to Athena Nike, Hipparchos dedicated to the Twelve Gods, and

---

532. Thuc. 6.54.6. On its construction and date, see recently Gadbery 1992.

533. Thucydides, 6.54.5, specifically states that the Peisistratidai left the state apparatus in place, content that their political power was assured as long as members of their family or supporters occupied important offices. Cf. Hdt. 1.59; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 16.7.

534. For the Alkmaionidai and Sounion, cf. Camp 1994. For the temple at Delphi: Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19.4; schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 7.9b (= Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F 115); schol. Dem. 21.144.

535. *IG* i³ 991: δέμοι Ἀθεναίον ἄ[ρχον]/ στέλ̣ας καδέθεκεν / Ἀλκίφρον/ καὶ τόνδε δρόμον ποίεσεν/ ἐραστὸν / Δέμετρός τε χάριν/ [καὶ Φερσεφόνες τ]ανυπ̣έπλ̣ο. Note also the dedication of a discus, *IG* i³ 989, dated ca. 520-500.

536. Hdt. 5.61.2: ἐπὶ τούτου δὴ τοῦ Λαοδάμαντος τοῦ Ἐτεοκλέος μουναρχέοντος ἐξανιστέαται Καδμεῖοι ὑπ' Ἀργείων καὶ τρέπονται ἐς τοὺς Ἐγχελέας. οἱ δὲ Γεφυραῖοι ὑπολειφθέντες ὕστερον ὑπὸ Βοιωτῶν ἀναχωρέουσι ἐς Ἀθήνας: καί σφι ἱρά ἐστι ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι ἱδρυμένα, τῶν οὐδὲν μέτα τοῖσι λοιποῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι, ἄλλα τε κεχωρισμένα τῶν ἄλλων ἱρῶν καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀχαιίης Δήμητρος ἱρόν τε καὶ ὄργια.

537. Hdt. 5.66.1: Ἀθῆναι, ἐοῦσαι καὶ πρὶν μεγάλαι, τότε ἀπαλλαχθεῖσαι τυράννων ἐγίνοντο μέζονες: ἐν δὲ αὐτῇσι δύο ἄνδρες ἐδυνάστευον, Κλεισθένης τε ἀνὴρ Ἀλκμεωνίδης, ὅς περ δὴ λόγον ἔχει τὴν Πυθίην ἀναπεῖσαι, καὶ Ἰσαγόρης Τισάνδρου οἰκίης μὲν ἐὼν δοκίμου, ἀτὰρ τὰ ἀνέκαθεν οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι: θύουσι δὲ οἱ συγγενέες αὐτοῦ Διὶ Καρίῳ.

Chairion the Treasurer may have dedicated, we add the altar that Charmos, a close friend of the Peisistratidai, dedicated to Eros at the Academy.[538] In other words, private individuals dedicated every one of the altars for which we have evidence of funding.[539]

The same practice prevailed in the rest of the Archaic Greek world. Lykourgos of Sparta built temples to Zeus and Athena; Maiandros dedicated an altar and temenos to Zeus; Gelon of Syracuse built a temple to Demeter and Kore, and died before he could complete a second Demeter temple; Polykrates dedicated the island of Rheneia to Apollo; Kleisthenes of Syracuse founded a sanctuary to the hero Melanippos; and one man in Syracuse, possibly named Kleomenes, inscribed his dedication, a temple to Apollo, right on the eastern stylobate of the temple itself.[540] Private initiative in the funding of public religious works was much the norm in Archaic Athens, Attica, and indeed all Greece.[541]

Aristocratic control over Archaic religious practice accords well with other evidence that indicates the extraordinary control prominent families held over many aspects of Athenian life. The economy of the Archaic period, such as it was, was located in individual *oikoi*, or households, and as such the aristocratic households held enormous economic power.[542] Wealthy individuals and families, such as the Alkmaionidai and Peisis-

---

538. Paus. 1.30.1; Kleidemos *FGrH* 323 F 15. Cf. Plut. *Sol.* 1.7, who reports that Peisistratos dedicated a statue to Eros at the Academy.

539. This practice continues in the aftermath of the reforms of Kleisthenes; note, e.g., *IG* i³ 605, an altar recovered from the Athenian Acropolis that was privately dedicated in ca. 500.

540. Lykourgos: Plut. *Lyk.* 6. Maiandros: Hdt. 3.142. Gelon: Diod. 11.26. Polykrates: Thuc. 1.13.6. Kleisthenes: 5.67-68. Kleomenes: *IG* 14.1: ΚΛΕΟ[ΜΕΝ? (or) ΜΕΔ?]ΕΣ ΕΠΟΙΣΕ ΤΟΠΕΛΟΝΙ. The remainder of the inscription is lost. Cf. Dinsmoor 1975, p. 75; Marconi 2007, pp. 42-45. Cf. the non-Greek temple builders, such as Alyattes, who built two temples to Athena, Hdt. 1.19-22; cf. Kroesos' renowned offerings at Ephesos and Delphi, Hdt. 1.92.

541. Note too the tendency among our sources to attribute the origins of the sanctuaries and festivals to either the deities themselves or semi-mythical individuals, such as at Demeter at Eleusis (Eumolpos, Triptolemos, Orpheus); Athena Polias in Athens (Erechthonios, Theseus); Dionysos Eleuthereus in Athens (Pegasos of Eleutherai); and Artemis at Brauron and Halae (Iphigeneia and Orestes).

542. Such power led to strife, such as that Solon is traditionally thought to have tried to address at the beginning of the sixth century. Cf. Sol. frs. 5 and 36 in West 1992; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 2, 5-6, 9-13; Plut. *Sol.* 13-16. As Cohen 1992, shows, the art of third-party banking and moneymaking was a fourth century innovation. Before then, production, distribution, and consumption were accomplished exclusively through familial, religious, and political relationships.

tratidai, were also the principal military powers in Athens and Attica.[543] Before Kleisthenes, no regular mobilization ever seems to have taken place; instead, effective military forces were in fact controlled by individuals.[544] The story of Kylon's coup provides such an example; while Kylon was able to take the Acropolis with a relatively small band of followers, his men were effectively routed by followers of Megakles.[545] Solon led a force to take Salamis from the Megarians.[546] In the sixth century, Peisistratos conducted his own military campaigns against Sigeion, Nisaia, and during his coup attempts at Athens.[547] Political offices were restricted to the wealthiest families.[548] Aristocratic families, in other words, were the paramount possessors of power and authority in society.

7. Herms, Athens, and Attica

That said, there is little doubt that sixth-century festival and sanctuary life served to integrate Athens and the other communities of Attica, and that the leading families played a role, and had a vested interest, in this process of unification. The Peisistratidai, in particular, owed much of their power to fostering ever stronger ties between communities. This interest is particularly evident in the Herms that Hipparchos erected along the roads of Attica to mark the halfway point between the demes and the *asty* of

---

543. Frost 1984; Anderson 2003, pp. 16-17, 147-157. For a similar state of affairs in Archaic Rome, cf. Cornell 1995, pp. 143-144, who describes the military leaders of that period as warlords, "whose power rested on the support of armed personal dependents, in Latin called 'clients' (*clientes*), or 'companions' (*sodales*). These armed formed what were essentially private armies, operating independently of state governments, moving freely across state frontiers, and frequently changing allegiances."

544. Hdt. 5.78, in fact, says that Athenians rose to military prominence only after the reforms of Kleisthenes.

545. Hdt. 5.71; Thuc. 1.126; Plut. *Sol.* 12.4-6.

546. The fullest account is provided by Plut. *Sol.* 8-10; cf. also Dem. 19.252; Diog. Laert. 1.46-48; Polyaenus 1.20.1-2; Ael. *VH* 7.19; Paus. 1.40.5; Justin 2.7.

547. Sigeion: Hdt. 5.94-95. Nisaia: Hdt. 1.59.4; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14.1; Aen Tact 4.8-12; Front. 2.9.9; Justin 2.8. Acropolis: Hdt. 1.59, 61-63; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14.1, 15.2, 17.3; Plut. *Sol.* 30.3; Polyaenus 1.21.3; schol. Plato *Rep.* 566B.

548. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 26.2, for example, records that it was not until five years after the reforms of Ephialtes that *zeugetai* were eligible to become archons.

Athens.[549] Though the number of Herms that Hipparchos erected is not known, they were certainly widely distributed along roads throughout Attica.[550] While these Herms would have reinforced a sense of unity within Attica, and related all Attic communities to the *asty* of Athens, ancient testimony is clear that the Hipparchos did not erect the Herms with the expressed intent of bringing about a more unified civic union.[551] Let us examine more closely the ancient testimony.

All the Herms that Hipparchos set up bore his name and various proverbs of wisdom that he either composed himself or found personally appealing. Hipparchos was famed for his wisdom and teachings in Athens, kept company with some of the century's most famous poets, and reportedly introduced the competitive recitation of Homeric epics to the Panathenaia.[552] Having attained the status as premier wisdom-monger in the city of Athens, his aim now was to replace Delphi as the foremost font of popular wisdom in the countryside, and thereby tempt those in Attica to come to Athens to become educated at the feet of Hipparchos himself or his circle.[553] The Herms also advertised the wisdom and benefactions of the whole Peisistratidai family, including their sponsorship

---

549. Pl. *Hipparch.* 228d: [Ἱππάρχος] ἐπιβουλεύων αὖ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς παιδεῦσαι ἔστησεν αὐτοῖς Ἑρμᾶς κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τῶν δήμων ἑκάστων.

550. Shapiro 1989, p. 125, estimates that there were ca. 150 demes, and therefore as many Herms in the sixth century. Lavelle 1985, p. 417, cautions that such estimates are anachronistic. At any rate, there were never more than 139 Kleisthenic demes. One Herm of Hipparchos has survived to present day: *IG* i³ 1023. The stone has since been lost, though a photograph does remain; cf. Kirchner and Dow 1937, pp. 1-3; Lavelle 1985, p. 412, n. 2. On one side the Herm proclaims that it marks the halfway point between Kephale and the *asty* of Athens: [ἐ]ν μ*h*έσοι Κεφαλῆς τε καὶ ἄστεος ἀγλαὸς *h*ερμῆς /[μνῆμα τόδε *h*ιπ(π)άρχο·] [–⏑⏑ –⏑⏑ –]. Any words of wisdom from Hipparchos himself have not survived on the stone.

551. An opinion expressed succinctly by Parker 1996, p. 77: "[The Peisistratidai] were keen, modern historians plausibly suppose, to encourage allegiance to an 'Athens' (state and place) the splendours of which were largely in their own control."

552. Pl. *Hipparch.* 228b-c; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 18.1.

553. Pl. *Hipparch.* 228d-e: [ὁ δὲ Ἱππάρχος] ἐπιβουλεύων αὖ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς παιδεῦσαι ἔστησεν αὐτοῖς Ἑρμᾶς κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τῶν δήμων ἑκάστων...ἵνα πρῶτον μὲν τὰ ἐν Δελφοῖς γράμματα τὰ σοφὰ ταῦτα μὴ θαυμάζοιεν οἱ πολῖται αὐτοῦ, τό τε "γνῶθι σαυτόν" καὶ τὸ "μηδὲν ἄγαν" καὶ τἆλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀλλὰ τὰ Ἱππάρχου ῥήματα μᾶλλον σοφὰ ἡγοῖντο, ἔπειτα παριόντες ἄνω καὶ κάτω καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκοντες καὶ γεῦμα λαμβάνοντες αὐτοῦ τῆς σοφίας φοιτῷεν ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπὰ παιδευθησόμενοι.

of religious activity.[554] Each Herm marked the distance from a particular deme to the Altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens;[555] this altar, dedicated by Hipparchos' nephew at about the same time that Hipparchos erected his roadside Herms, was effectively rendered a central religious monument in Athens due to its relation to the Herms.[556] The Peisistratidai were renowned for their public works projects;[557] it is also possible, if not demonstrable, that the Herms would have drawn attention to a road system that the Peisistratidai helped to build.[558] The purpose of the Herms, I would argue, was in part to reinforce the renown, power, and authority of Hipparchos and the Peisistratidai within the polis of Athens and the countryside.

8. The Peisistratidai and Oracles

Related to this claim of wisdom is the claim by the Peisistratidai that they were the preeminent possessors of oracular knowledge. In the sixth century, the two most powerful families in Athens, the Alkmaionidai and the Peisitratidai, are both associated with

---

554. On the general renown of the Peisistratidai regarding wisdom and virtue, cf. Thuc. 5.64.5: ἐπετήδευσαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ τύραννοι οὗτοι ἀρετὴν καὶ ξύνεσιν...

555. Distances measured from Altar of Twelve Gods: Hdt. 2.7.1: ἔστι δὲ ὁδὸς ἐς Ἡλίου πόλιν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἄνω ἰόντι παραπλησίη τὸ μῆκος τῇ ἐξ Ἀθηνέων ὁδῷ τῇ ἀπὸ τῶν δυώδεκα θεῶν τοῦ βωμοῦ φερούσῃ ἔς τε Πῖσαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν νηὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου. Cf. *IG* ii² 2640: [ἡ πόλις] ἔστ[η]σ[έν με β]ροτ[οῖς] μνημεῖον ἀληθές/ [πᾶσιν] σημαίνε[ιν μέ]τ[ρον] ὁδοιπορίας·/ [ἔστιν γὰρ τ]ὸ μεταχσὺ θεῶμ πρὸς δώδεκα βωμόν/ [πέντ' ἐπὶ?] τεσσαράκοντ' ἐγ λιμένος στάδιοι.

556. Dedication of Altar of Twelve Gods: Thuc. 6.54.6. Peisistratos the Younger dedicated the altar to commemorate the archonship that he held in 522/1; the Herms were set up in Attica before 514, the year that Hipparchos was murdered. Arnush 1995, has recently argued that the altar and inscription date to ca. 495, but cf. Aloni 2000, p. 23.

557. Thuc. 2.15.5, attributes the Enneakrounos, or nine-spouted fountain house, to the Peisistratidai. This may have been funded by tax revenues, though this is not inevitable. While Thucydides locates the fountain near the bed of the Ilissos, but to date it has not been found. Paus. 1.14.1, locates the Enneakrounos near the Odeion of Perikles, and attributes it to Peisistratos. This fountain house has been found, and dates to the last quarter of the sixth century, which falls within the time frame of Peisistratos' sons. For discussion of these two fountain houses, see Boersma 1970, p. 23; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 197-200; Shear Jr. 1978, p. 11; Camp 1986, pp. 162-166; Shapiro 1989, pp. 6-7.

558. Harrison 1965, p. 113; Quinn 2007, p. 95.

the manipulation of oracles.[559] At times the families competed directly for the favor of a particular oracle, as the dedications to Apollo at Mt. Ptoion in Boiotia illustrate.[560] The Alkmaionidai, however, were particularly associated with Delphi, for which they rebuilt the temple of Apollo, and on behalf of which they were reported to have led the First Sacred War. The connection between the oracle and the Alkmaionidai was close enough that rumors were spread that the family either persuaded or bribed the Pythia to tell the Spartans to aid their war against the Peisistratidai.[561]

The Peisistratidai were no friends of the sanctuary at Delphi.[562] We have no record of a consultation of Delphi on behalf of Athens during the Peisistratid period.[563] As noted above, Hipparchos hoped to supplant Delphi in wisdom through his Herms. Members of the family also claimed to be preeminent oracle readers in their own right. Peisistratos assumed the name Bakis to stress his authority and ability as an interpreter of oracles.[564] Peisistratos also routinely employed oracles to justify political and military actions. Among his supporters was Amphilytos the Acarnanian, a χρησμολόγος who composed an oracle that supported Peisistratos' third attempt at tyranny.[565] Peisistratos justified "purifying" Delos on the basis of an oracle.[566] It may not be coincidence that Peisistratos

---

559. It is interesting to note that neither family is associated with any priesthoods. This may in part explain their heavy involvement in controlling oracles and sponsoring building programs at sanctuaries.

560. Dedication of Alkmeonides I, ca. 540: *IG* i³ 1469; dedication of Hipparchos, son of Peisistratos, ca. 520-515: *IG* i³ 1470. On these competing dedications, see Schachter 1994.

561. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 19.4; schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 7.9b; schol. Dem. 21.144; Hdt. 5.62-63, 66, 6.123-125. The earliest association of the Alkmaionidai with Delphi is Alkmeon's command of the forces during the First Sacred War, for which see Plut. *Sol.* 2.2.

562. According to a scholiast on Pind. *Pyth.* 7.9b., the Peisistratidai were even rumored to have burned down the temple of Apollo that the Alkmeonidai rebuilt at Delphi.

563. Fontenrose 1978.

564. Suda, s.v. Βάκις; schol. Ar. *Pax* 1071. The oracles of Bakis were influential and authoritative; cf. Hdt. 8.20.2, 8.77, 8.96.2, 9.43, for events in that war that Bakis is supposed to have predicted.

565. The oracular lines are found at Hdt. 1.62.4. Plat. *Theag.* 124d, calls Amphilytos a ἡμεδαπὸς, "fellow-countryman", and links him with Bakis and Mousaios as fellow χρησμῳδοί. Clem. *Strom.* 1.132, calls him an Athenian. For more on oracle-mongers and oracle collections, see Fontenrose 1978, pp. 144-165.

566. Hdt. 1.64.2; Thuc. 3.140.1. The oracle is not named.

conducted his purification after he subjugated Naxos, previously the preeminent sponsors of ritual activity on Delos, if we may judge from dedications. With Naxos now conquered, Peisistratos perhaps fashioned himself as the new principal sponsor of Delian Apollo.[567]

The Peisistratidai held their own collection of oracular poems and responses, which Hippias left on the Acropolis in "the temple"–likely the Athena Polias temple–upon leaving Athens in exile.[568] The oracles convinced the Spartans that they had been wrong to remove the Peisistratidai from Athens, and that they had been deceived by the Delphic oracle, in concert with the Alkmaionidai.[569] Upon discovery of the oracles, the Spartans immediately summoned Hippias to a council of allies to deliberate on the next course of action. Hippias fashioned himself the foremost expert in oracles in Athens, and at the council he tried to use this knowledge to convince the Spartan allies to reinstate him.[570] That having failed, he brought a close family friend and fellow χρησμολόγος, Onomakritos, to Persia to recite carefully pre-selected oracles of Mousaios to Xerxes in an effort to solicit the Persian king's support.[571]

Onomakritos had previously been banished by the family for inserting oracles into lines of Mousaios, a tale that hints at the ease with which oracles could be manipulated.[572] As we saw above, the Alkmaionidai were charged with the manipulation of the Delphic oracle; whether true or not, the story at least suggests that such charges, and therefore such activity, may have been common. At any rate, the Peisistratidai had positioned themselves to replace Delphi as the font of popular wisdom in Attica, in part through their distribution of Herms. They also claimed to be the foremost authorities of oracular interpretation, and held their own collection of oracles, which they used to justify their

567. Parker 1996, pp. 87-88.

568. Cf. Hdt. 5.90.2: ἐκτήσατο δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἐκ τῆς ᾽Αθηναίων ἀκροπόλιος τοὺς χρησμούς, τοὺς ἔκτηντο μὲν πρότερον οἱ Πεισιστρατίδαι, ἐξελαυνόμενοι δὲ ἔλιπον ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ, καταλειφθέντας δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ἀνέλαβε. We should suspect that it was no accident that the Spartan Kleomenes "found" the oracles that Hippias left behind.

569. Hdt. 5.91.

570. Hdt. 5.93.2.

571. Hdt. 7.6.3-5.

572. Cf. Kleon's attempt to use the oracles of Bakis to control the *Demos* in Ar. *Eq*. 997-1099. The plays of Aristophanes have many such unflattering depictions of diviners and oracle-mongers, some of whom had apparently gained a reputation equivalent to the snake oil salesmen of nineteenth century America; cf. Smith 1989.

claims to power both within the *asty* of Athens, and outside of it, in places such as Delos, Boiotia, and even the court of the Great King of Persia.

9. Conclusion

As our discussion thus shows, the socio-religious topography of Athens remained much as it had been in the seventh century. Major ethnic sanctuaries and festivals, such as those at Eleusis and Athens, gained more splendor and ostentation, attracting more participants from Athens and Attica and fostering an ever growing sense of shared identity among the communities. What evidence we do have, in the form of dedicated altars and sponsored building projects, shows that private initiative played a leading role in sponsoring ritual and religious life. It is conceivable, if not probable, that if some of the leading families who sponsored and promoted the festival of Athena Polias were not residents of Athens, they would have found it convenient to maintain a small treasury or eating house on the Acropolis.

That said, private sponsorship was conducted by men in public office. I suggest that one of the expectations for holders of some public positions may have been that they have the ability and willingness to pay for public works, such as tracks for the games, from their own resources. For the Panathenaia and the sanctuary of Athena Polias, boards were set up that appear to have consisted of two members from each of the four tribes. There was, at any rate, something of a tendency for holders of office to sponsor religious activity, such as racetracks and altars. The evidence hints that members of these offices were chosen in part because of their ability to fund sacrifices and sanctuary maintenance. Private initiative, in other words, while the main source of sponsorship and funding for Athenian religious life, worked both outside and within state institutions.

Chapter Seven: From Kleisthenes to Perikles

1. Introduction

With the reforms of Kleisthenes in 508/7, all of Attica became politically unified as a polis. The role that this new, centralized state apparatus would have on religion by the late fifth century is striking. By that time, the eponymous archon, archon basileus, and polemarch oversaw the city's grandest festivals, including the Dionysia, Eleusinian Mysteries, and funerary games for the war dead.[573] Sacred matters were always the first topic of discussion in the *Ekklesia*.[574] Boards such as the ταμίαι, ἐπιστάται, and ἱεροποιοί, officials accountable only to the *Demos*, were assigned to oversee the finances and organization of some of Athens' most important sanctuaries and festivals, including those of Athena Polias, Artemis Brauronia, and the Eleusinian Mysteries. Regulations and sacrificial calendars were inscribed by the state for all to see and inspect.[575] These and other examples of state religious authority have led most modern scholars to adopt a rather romantic narrative, in which almost every religious building or festival that arose after the Kleisthenic reforms is interpreted as an act of the democracy itself, as though the very *form* of government oversaw and directed the religious life of Athens.[576] State control over religious life is often implied by this narrative, if not outrightly asserted.[577]

In this chapter we present the ancient narrative, drawn from the archaeological, literary, and epigraphic evidence for state control of the religious life of Athens in the Early Classical period, i.e., before the Periklean building program. The questions we will examine are the following: What is our evidence for centralized, state sponsored festivals and sanctuaries? What, on the other hand, is our evidence for private sponsorship

---

573. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56-58; cf. 54.6-8, for other boards who are selected to oversee festivals and rites.

574. Aeschin. *In Tim.* 23: ἐπειδὰν τὸ καθάρσιον περιενεχθῇ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ τὰς πατρίους εὐχὰς εὔξηται, προχειροτονεῖν κελεύει τοὺς προέδρους περὶ ἱερῶν τῶν πατρίων καὶ κήρυξι καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ ὁσίων, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπερωτᾷ ὁ κῆρυξ: "τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται τῶν ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων;"

575. E.g., *IG* i^3 230-235; Sokolowski 1962, no. 10; Sokolowski 1969, no. 17 B, C.

576. E.g. Hurwit 1999, p. 121: "Between 508 and 490, the democracy deliberately and thoroughly put its stamp upon the religious spaces of Athens, using architecture and art to remake the city and shape a new civic identity."

577. Cf. the discussion of the "polis religion" model in the Introduction, pp. 1-3.

and funding? To answer these questions, let us examine the archaeological, literary, and epigraphic record in chronological order, beginning with festivals and sanctuaries associated with the Athenian Acropolis.

2. Athens and the Athenian Acropolis

2.1. Temples and Sanctuaries

Within a decade of the reforms of Kleisthenes, the Athenian Acropolis was once more the site of a new, grand construction project, on a scale not seen since the second quarter of the sixth century. A new temple for Athena Polias, the so-called *Archaios Neos*, or Old Athena Temple, occupied the foundations called the Dörpfeld Foundation.[578] One of the pediments was filled with the Gigantomachy, with Athena at center, her first appearance on an Acropolis temple.[579] In addition, a continuous frieze may have been carved along the top of the exterior cella walls, only fragments of which have been preserved. If so, then this Ionic feature on a Doric building would have been an innova-

578. For the argument that construction on the *Archaios Neos* was begun by the 520's, cf. Boersma 1970, pp. 20-21; Croissant 1993; Ridgway 1993, pp. 291-295. For a date of ca. 510-500, cf. Stewart 1990a, p. 130; Childs 1994; Hurwit 1999, pp. 121-124. These foundations were first discussed by Dörpfeld 1885, 1886, 1887a, and so informally named after him. Cf. Wiegand 1904, pp. 115-126, for the original publication of the architectural remains, and more recent discussions by Travlos 1971b, p. 143; Childs 1994; Hurwit 1999, pp. 121-124; Ferrari 2002. This new temple certainly replaced an older Athena temple, though whether it was a seventh-century, mostly wooden temple, or the Bluebeard Temple is contested; for discussion over the debate concerning the location of the Bluebeard temple, see n. 464, p. 118.

579. This new temple, much like the sixth-century Bluebeard Temple in dimensions, was over forty meters long and twenty-three meters wide, with a peristyle of six Doric columns by twelve. The temple was mostly poros limestone, with marble superstructure, such as the roof tiles, the plain metopes, simas with lion-head spouts, and probably its akroterion. The pedimental sculpture on one side was occupied with two lions devouring a bull, the same motif found on the Bluebeard Temple. The pediment with the lions is poorly preserved, and what occupied the corners of the pediment is lost. Much of the Gigantomachy has also been lost, leading to a variety of conjectures as to the original composition of both pediments; cf., e.g., Stähler 1972; 1978; Moore 1995; Marszal 1997.

tion that influenced the decorative scheme of the Parthenon.[580] There is no evidence for who funded the temple.

Two or three small buildings, or *oikemata*, were also constructed somewhere on the Acropolis sometime between 500-480; these buildings probably served the same function as their sixth-century predecessors, though whether these were small temples, treasuries, or dining rooms remains unknown.[581] Dating to around the same time, ca. 500, is Building B, which was larger than the usual *oikema*, apsidal in plan, and tristyle in antis. Where on the Acropolis it stood, or how it functioned, is unknown.[582] Two other building projects appear to date to ca. 500. The first is a cistern located in the northwest part of the Acropolis, under the later Northwest Building;[583] the second is a small spring house on the south slope of the Acropolis in the area of the sanctuary of the Nymphs.[584]

The miraculous victory over the Persians at Marathon in 490 was marked at a number of sanctuaries. In commemoration of the runner Philippides' encounter with Pan, for example, a sanctuary to the god was established in caves along the northwest slope of

---

580. Fragments of frieze blocks have been recovered from the Acropolis; they include depictions in low relief of a charioteer, another with a figure, possibly Hermes, and a third featuring a seated figure. Their size, ca. 1.21 meters high, and stylistic date have led most to associate the frieze with the *Archaios Neos*; cf. Stewart 1990a, p. 130; Ridgway 1993, pp. 395-397; Hurwit 1999, p. 123. Childs 1994, p. 6, n. 59, is skeptical.

581. The evidence for these buildings are terracotta antefixes and roof tiles, for which see Winter 1993, pp. 228-231, nos. 16-18.

582. Parts of Building B were built into the foundations of the Classical Propylaia, suggesting to many that the building once stood on the spot occupied by the later northwest wing of the Propylaia. Cf. Boersma 1970, pp. 35, 233; Travlos 1971b, p. 61; Klein 1991, pp. 30-31; Tanoulis 1992a; Hurwit 1999, p. 124. Contra, Eiteljorg 1995, p. 58, n. 104.

583. Tanoulis 1992b, 1994; Wright 1994, pp. 349-358.

584. Spring: Travlos 1971b, pp. 138-139. Seventh-century evidence for the sanctuary of the Nymphs is discussed in Appendix 1. It has been suggested that the wide forecourt built before west entrance to the Acropolis, and constructed in part from the marble metopes of now dismantled Bluebeard Temple, dates to ca. 500. A date in the 480's for this project is not impossible, however. For discussion of the chronological problems associated with the forecourt, cf. Hurwit 1999, p. 125, n. 102, who, however, supports the ca. 500 date. For a date in the 480's, cf. Dinsmoor 1980, pp. 27-31; Eiteljorg 1995, p. 85.

the Acropolis, as were annual sacrifices and a torch race in his honor.[585] It is unknown whether these rites for Pan were initially funded and organized by the state.

The state certainly became involved with the Herakleia games at Marathon soon after 490.[586] *IG* i³ 3, dated to the 480's, records the appointment by *athlothetai* of thirty men, three from each tribe, who are to arrange the games. These games are attested by Pindar, but when they were initially founded is not known.[587] It is generally assumed, however, that the games of what were once a local festival for the Marathonian Tetrapolis were now made pan-Attic.[588] We should note, however, that much of the inscription is missing. Did the sacrifices of the festival outside of the games remain in local hands? In addition, were the thirty that the *athlothetai* chose expected to fund the games? If so, we would have an excellent example of private initiative operating through the machinations of the state apparatus. In other words, the state and private initiative, far from representing opposing sources of sponsorship and funding, worked at times hand-in-hand. At the very least, this inscription marks the early involvement of the state in raising the profile and importance of the games for all Athenians, something that the members of the Marathonian Tetrapolis may have welcomed.[589]

Meanwhile, new construction on the Acropolis continued. Construction on the first all marble temple was begun in the area where the Classical Parthenon would be built. The date for the start of construction for this so-called Older Parthenon is debated, but

---

585. Hdt. 6.105; cf. Borgeaud 1988, pp. 133-136. We know nothing of the annual sacrifices and torch race outside of the passage in Herodotus. It is also suggested by Hurwit 1999, p. 30, that the bronze dedication of the Marathonians of Theseus' capture of the Marathonian Bull, seen by Paus. 1.27.9-10, commemorated the battle of Marathon; contra, Shapiro 1988, who dates the group to ca. 500.

586. These games were funded, no doubt, to commemorate the fact that the Athenians camped in the precinct of Herakles just before their victory at Marathon; cf. Hdt. 6.108, 116.

587. Pind. *Ol.* 9.89, 13.110; *Pyth.* 8.79.

588. See, e.g., Vanderpool 1942; Kyle 2007, p. 167. The connection between the Marathonian Tetrapolis and Herakleia is assumed, not demonstrable. For more on the religious activities of the Tetrapolis, the evidence for which is mostly late, cf. Parker 1996, pp. 331-332.

589. Paus. 1.14.5, mentions in passing a shrine to Eukleia near the City Eleusinion in Athens, which he says was built from the spoils of Marathon. If the shrine was built shortly 490, we should suspect that it was burned in 480 by the Persians, and then rebuilt. Boersma 1970, pp. 62-63, prefers to date the shrine to ca. 479 or shortly thereafter. Our earliest secure evidence for this shrine, which Eukleia shares with Eunomia, dates to the first century A.D., seen, e.g., in *IG* ii² 4193.13. Cf. Wycherley 1957, p. 58. Lacking the material remains for the temple, all dates for its construction are guesswork.

is generally assumed to be shortly after Marathon, ca. 489 or 488.[590] The foundations for this temple were massive. They consisted of around eight thousand two-ton blocks of limestone, set eleven meters deep in some areas.[591] Had it been completed, the Older Parthenon would have been the largest temple on the Greek mainland, aside from the (also incomplete) Olympieion. Construction advanced only as far as a few lower courses of the cella blocks, and two or three unfluted column drums, before the temple was burned by the Persians during their sacks of the city in 480 and 479.[592]

It is also possible that a new main entrance was designed to replace the long-standing Mycenaean gateway for the Acropolis.[593] This so-called Older Propylon is thought to have had four exterior columns, front and back, and six columns along the main entrance route, and crosswall with five doors allowing access within the Acropolis.[594] As with the Older Parthenon, this building was destroyed by the Persian sacks before it was completed. These construction projects would have been expensive, and required a large labor force. Who funded construction for the Older Parthenon and Propylon is unfortunately not recorded.

The state does make an appearance on the Acropolis in the years immediately after the reforms of Kleisthenes. We have secure evidence that the *Demos* placed at least five items on the Acropolis in the years ca. 510-479:

---

590. Dinsmoor 1934; 1935; Dörpfeld 1935; Boersma 1970, pp. 38-39; Hurwit 1999, p. 130. Bundgaard 1976, pp. 138-139, argues for a date of ca. 454, a view generally rejected; cf., e.g., Thompson 1978. For general discussion of the architecture of the Older Parthenon, cf. Travlos 1971b, p. 444; Korres 1995; Hurwit 1999, pp. 130-135.

591. Tolle-Kastenbein 1994, pp. 61-62, argues that the platform originally served to raise up and level off the Acropolis in this area, in order to serve as a defensive work in ca. 500. Even if this is the case, the platform eventually served as the foundation for both the start of the Older, and completion of the Classical, Parthenon. Cf. Korres 1994, p. 56.

592. For discussion of *Perserschutt* deposits from Athenian Agora and Acropolis, see especially Hurwit 1989; Shear Jr. 1993.

593. Dinsmoor 1980; Hurwit 1999, pp. 130-132.

594. Eiteljorg 1995, however, in his recent study of the evidence has deemed the "Older Propylon" a myth; in his view, the old Mycenaean entrance remained until replaced by the Classical Propylon, built ca. 437-432.

1. The stele that commemorated the ἀδικία, or crimes of the Peisistratidai, with a list of their names.[595]

2. A bronze plaque similarly condemning the actions of the followers of Isagoras.[596]

3. A decree of ca. 510-500, *IG* i³ 1, regulating the conduct and obligations of Athenian settlers on Salamis.[597] The provisions include a tax and military service upon the Athenians on the island of Salamis, a demand that they provide their own arms at a cost of up to thirty *drachmai*, regulations concerning to whom they may lease their land, and the responsibilities of the archon of the island.

4. A monument commemorating the Athenian victory over the Chalkidians and Boiotians in 506. This monument stands as the earliest state dedication in Athenian his-

595. Thuc. 6.55.1-2, speaking of Hippias: παῖδες γὰρ αὐτῷ μόνῳ φαίνονται τῶν γνησίων ἀδελφῶν γενόμενοι, ὡς ὅ τε βωμὸς σημαίνει καὶ ἡ στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἀδικίας ἡ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἀκροπόλει σταθεῖσα, ἐν ᾗ Θεσσαλοῦ μὲν οὐδ᾽ Ἱππάρχου οὐδεὶς παῖς γέγραπται, Ἱππίου δὲ πέντε, οἳ αὐτῷ ἐκ Μυρρίνης τῆς Καλλίου τοῦ Ὑπεροχίδου θυγατρὸς ἐγένοντο: εἰκὸς γὰρ ἦν τὸν πρεσβύτατον πρῶτον γῆμαι. καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ στήλῃ πρῶτος γέγραπται μετὰ τὸν πατέρα, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀπεοικότως διὰ τὸ πρεσβεύειν τε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ τυραννεῦσαι.

596. Schol. Ar. *Lys*. 273: Κλεομένης: Λακεδαιμόνιος ὢν στρατηγὸς, ἐπιστρατεύσας τῇ Ἀττικῇ μετά τινων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τυραννίδι, τὴν ἀκρόπολιν κατέσχε, πολιορκηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἀφεθεὶς ὑπόσπονδος, ἀπιὼν οἴκαδε πάλιν Ἐλευσῖνα κατέσχε. τῶν δὲ μετὰ Κλεομένους Ἐλευσῖνα κατασχόντων Ἀθηναῖοι τὰς οἰκίας κατέσκαψαν καὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἐδήμευσαν, αὐτῶν δὲ θάνατον ἐψηφίσαντο. καὶ ἀναγράψαντες εἰς στήλην χαλκῆν ἔστησαν ἐν πόλει παρὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον νεών.

597. For discussion of this inscription, and the status of these Athenians, cf. Meiggs and Lewis 1988, pp. 25-27, no. 14; Lambert 1997, p. 97.

tory.[598] According to Herodotus, the Athenians captured seven hundred prisoners in this campaign, each of whom was ransomed for two minae.[599] The chains were displayed on a wall on the Acropolis, and part of the ransom was spent on a bronze four-horse chariot.[600] The marble base for the chariot was inscribed with a dedication, which Herodotus recorded.[601]

---

598. The only competition for this honor of place is the bronze statue group for the Tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, set up in the Athenian Agora at some point before the Persian sack of 480; cf. Paus. 1.8.5, who tells us the statue group was the work of Antenor; Plin. *HN* 34.17, who dates the statues to ca. 510, and mistakenly attributes the work to Praxiteles. Cf. Wycherley 1957, pp. 93-98, nos. 256-280, for all ancient testimonia concerning this Tyrannicide statue group, as well as a second group set up in ca. 477, when the Persians carried off the original as a spoil of war in 480. The exact date when the original statue group was erected has been an interminable debate among modern scholars, though most agree that the group was in place by 500. For a date before ca. 500: Brunnsåker 1971, pp. 97-98; Taylor 1981, pp. 14-15; Thomas 1989, pp. 257-258; Castriota 1992, pp. 213-215; Rausch 1999, pp. 42-45. For a date in the 480's: Richter 1950, p. 200; Morris 1992, pp. 298-299. Fragments of the epigram inscribed upon the base of the monument survive; cf. Agora I 3872 = *IG* i^3 502; Meritt 1936, pp. 355-358, no. 1. By the fourth century, the polemarch was in charge of making offerings at the gravesite of the Tyrannicides; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 58.1. When offerings were first made by the state is not known, but it is possible that they began before ca. 500; cf. Jacoby 1944, p. 50; Fornara 1970; Taylor 1981, pp. 6-8; Rausch 1999, pp. 59-61.

599. Hdt. 5.77.

600. Hdt. 5.77.3 reported that in his day (the 440's) the chains could still be seen hanging from walls still charred from Persian fires, opposite the "megaron" that faces west: αἵ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι, κρεμάμεναι ἐκ τειχέων περιπεφλευσμένων πυρὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μήδου, ἀντίον δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἑσπέρην τετραμμένου. The citing of this monument has been the subject of much debate for scholars of the topography of the Early Archaic Acropolis. For various opinions, cf. Bancroft 1979, pp. 5-6; Robertson 1996, p. 42; Hurwit 1999, p. 145.

601. Hdt. 5.77.4: ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες/ παῖδες Ἀθηναίων ἔργμασιν ἐν πολέμου,/ δεσμῷ ἐν ἀχλυόεντι σιδηρέῳ ἔσβεσαν ὕβριν:/ τῶν ἵππους δεκάτην Παλλάδι τάσδ᾽ ἔθεσαν. The base survives, as does an earlier version, in which the first lines of each couplet quoted by Herodotus are reversed, indicating that the dedication that Herodotus saw was a replacement for the original that was damaged by the Persians in 480. See *IG* i^3 501 A and B; cf. discussion in Raubitschek 1949, pp. 191-194, 201-205, nos. 168, 173; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, pp. 28-30, no. 15.

5. The two so-called Hekatompedon Decrees, *IG* i³ 4, dated perhaps to ca. 485/4.[602] The decrees concern themselves with the duties of the *tamiai*, who levy fines in order to protect the temples and the *oikemata*, presumably treasuries, in the Hekatompedon on the Akropolis.[603] Among the regulations were the demand that the *oikemata* be opened at least three times a month for inspection by a quorum of *tamiai*; the prohibition against making bread or using the storeroom by the priestess or the *zakoroi*; regulations on tents for ritual meals; regulations on where fires can be lit; a prohibition against the disposal of animal waste in the sanctuary; and an order for the presiding prytanis to levy fines when necessary.[604]

To judge from this list, it would appear that the first generation or two of the newly organized state was concerned more with military matters than with asserting any control over religion. Two of the decrees are condemnations of Athenians who, with the help of foreign military aid, were a threat to Athens, while the dedication of the chains marked a significant military victory. *IG* i³ 1–one of possibly two pre-450 decrees that do not deal explicitly with religious matters–is concerned in large part with arming and organizing Athenian soldiers on the island.[605] This concern for defenses is also seen in

---

602. For recent editions and discussion of these decrees, see Jordan 1979, pp. 1-55; Koerner 1993, nos. 3-4; Effenterre and Ruze 1994, no. 96; Németh 1997, who proposes a date of ca. 500-490. The date of ca. 485/4 is accurate only if the missing archon's name is Philokrates, as it is usually restored. The date of these decrees is uncertain, however; cf. Lipka 1998.

603. Hurwit 1999, p. 115, suggests that if the *oikemata* can be identified with the small poros structures that dotted the Acropolis beginning in the sixth century, then the Hekatompedon of these decrees must be an open-air precinct, likely in the spot that the Parthenon stood. If so, and the decree does date to ca. 485/4, how do we fit both these buildings and an Older Parthenon that began to be constructed in the same spot a few years before? One solution would be to accept the earlier ca. 500 date for the platform suggested by Tolle-Kastenbein 1994, pp. 61-62, and a date for the Older Parthenon later than the Hekatompedon Decrees, i.e., later than ca. 485. In this case, the Parthenon, which served as the treasury for Athena, would be seen as a replacement for the individual, smaller treasuries previously on the spot.

604. Figueira 1986, p. 269, suggests that the prytanis on this stone is probably a treasurer. By the fourth century, there were ten treasurers of Athena, one allotted per tribe; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 47.1. It is likely that with the creation of ten Kleisthenic tribes in place of four, the board of treasurers increased from eight (two per tribe) to ten. On the eight treasurers before the tribal reforms, cf. Chapter Six, pp. 115-116.

605. The other, *IG* i³ 2, dated to ca. 500, also does not seem to deal with religious matters, though in its fragmentary state, the subject is difficult to recover. Interestingly, it was inscribed on a stele, the opposite face of which was later inscribed with the Herakleia inscription of ca. 485, *IG* i³ 3.

the construction of the massive fortification wall around Eleusis, discussed below. As for the Hekatompedon Decrees of ca. 485, the overall impression that one gets is that the *Demos* was attempting to bring order to what was becoming a contentious area. What we do not know is whether the state was passing a set of new regulations with this decree, or codifying old rights and customs.

Argumenta ex silentio are always perilous, but given the emerging epigraphic habit of the democracy, the lack of inscriptional evidence for any state funded religious building projects during these years, coupled with silence in our literary sources, tempts us to consider the possibility that most, if not all, pre-480 construction projects on the Acropolis were privately funded. Such a conclusion may seem startlingly speculative; the laying of 8000 foundation blocks for the Older Parthenon certainly seems to smack of state investment. Indeed, it would surprise no one if we should learn from a future inscription that the Older Parthenon was sponsored by the state in its zeal to commemorate its victory at Marathon. The shear scope of the building, however, is not decisive; the Olympieion, after all, was funded by one family, the Peisistratidai. More than this we cannot say; evidence for private funding of the *Archaios Neos*, Older Propylon, Older Parthenon, or any other buildings is lacking.

The entire Acropolis was set afire during the first sack of 480, and during the second sack the following year, Mardonios burned or tore down every wall, house, or temple left standing in Athens.[606] Many more temples throughout Attica and the Greek world had likewise lain in ruins for decades. According to ancient testimony, the Greek forces marshaled at Plataea in 479 swore not to rebuild the sanctuaries until revenge had been exacted upon Persia; until this happened, the sanctuaries were to remain in their ruined state as a memorial of Persian impiety.[607] The oath may be apocryphal.[608] Be

606. Hdt. 8.51-53; 9.3-13. For other ancient accounts of the Persian destruction of Athens and Attica in 480 and 479, cf. Thuc. 1.89.3, 90- 93.2, 95-96; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 23.4-5; Plut. *Them.* 19.1-2; *Arist.* 23-24; Diod. 11.28.1-2; 1.26.4; 1.27.6 Paus. 1.23.1-2, 26.4, 27.6.

607. Versions of the oath are given in Diod. 11.29.2-3; Lycurg. *Leok.* 80-81. The Oath of Plataea is also recorded on a 4th c. inscription from Menidhi, for which see Robert 1938, pp. 307-308, pl. II; Sealey 1960; Meiggs 1972, pp. 504-507, 597; Siewert 1972; Rhodes and Osborne 2003, no. 88.22-51, pp. 440-449. More recently, van Wees 2006, has argued that the inscription records a modification of a traditional Spartan oath. Krentz 2007, however, argues that the inscription records the Oath of Marathon, not of Plataea. For other references to both the oath and other Greek sanctuaries that remained in ruins decades after the Persian invasion, see also Isoc. *Paneg.* 156; Plut. *Per.* 17; Cic. *Rep.* 3.9; Paus. 10.35.2-3.

608. Already by the 4th c. doubts on the authenticity of the oath were raised by the historian Theopompus, who claimed in his *Philippika* (= *FGrH* 115 F 153-4), that both the Oath of Plataea and the later Peace of Kallias were examples of Athenian lies.

that as it may, the sanctuaries on the Acropolis and elsewhere in Greece remained as the Persians had left them for decades after the sacks.[609] The charred *Archaios Neos*, in fact, appears to have been used in its charred state throughout antiquity, a memorial of the impious sacks of the Persians.[610]

That said, there were building projects on the Acropolis in the 470's and 460's. During the 470's and 460's, some *oikemata* were repaired, and new ones constructed during this period; a small shrine or *naiskos* was also constructed on the spot of the Older Parthenon, and later incorporated within the Periklean Parthenon.[611] On the northwest slope of the Acropolis, a fountain house was built in the 460's for the Klepsydra spring.[612] It is possible that a pre-Erechtheion precinct was constructed sometime in the 470's, consisting of two stoas and a small *naiskos*.[613] Aside from these modest building projects, however, the ruinous state of the sanctuary was preserved until the advent of the Periklean building program, over thirty years later.

In contrast to the period before the Persian sacks, we do know how some of these projects were funded. The sale of spoils won during Kimon's successful campaigns in the 460's allowed the *Demos* to fund the rebuilding of the defensive walls around the Acrop-

---

609. Shear Jr. 1993.

610. It is generally assumed that the *Archaios Neos* was dismantled ca. 421, when the Classical Erechtheion replaced it in name and function; cf. the discussion in Hurwit 1999, pp. 200-202, with bibliography. Ferrari 2002, resurrecting an idea first postulated by Dörpfeld 1887a, 1887b, 1890, 1897, has recently argued that the burned cella, as well as perhaps some of the peristyle and pronaos of the temple stood throughout antiquity, and retained its function as the Temple of Athena Polias. The argument is convincing, but even if the temple did not remain in use after the Persian destruction, the site of the temple does appear to have remained untouched throughout antiquity.

611. Naiskos: Korres 1994, p. 46. The evidence for the *oikemata* is primarily in the form of terracotta antefixes, simas, and roof tiles dated to ca. 480-450; cf. Dinsmoor 1947, pp. 125-127; Boersma 1970, pp. 62, 237; Klein 1991, pp. 32-33; Vlassopoulou and Touloupa 1993, pp. viii, xxiii-xxx, nos. 41-63; Hurwit 1999, p. 142. One new structure, Building V, was replaced in the Classical period by an open-air complex, Building IV, that has various been identified as either a sanctuary to Pandion, or a workshop; cf. Bundgaard 1976, pp. 77-78; Hurwit 1989, pp. 44-45, 63.

612. Travlos 1971b, p. 323; Smithson 1982.

613. Boersma 1970, p. 181; Mark 1993, p. 133; Hurwit 1999, pp. 144-145.

olis, as well as later finish the "Long Walls" to Peiraieus.[614] We might suspect that Kimon worked with the *Ekklesia* on this project. Not only were the funds the result of his campaigns, but Kimon was particularly associated with public works, and personally funded a number of projects, including the laying of the first foundations for the "Long Walls," planting of trees in the Agora, and converting the area of Academy into a grove that was provided with clear roads and footpaths.[615] Kimon's family was also responsible for the construction of the Stoa Poikile during the same period.[616] These acts of sponsoring public works, αἱ κοιναὶ λῃτουργίαι, were also practiced in his deme of Lakiadai, where he won renown for opening up his land for his demesmen to use in times of need, and fed some of them at personal expense.[617]

Since the Archaic practice of private funding of public works continued well into the fifth century, we should not be surprised that public religious monuments profited from private initiative, as well. Sometime around or just after the year 476/5, Kimon brought back to Athens the bones of Theseus, which he recovered from the island of Skyros.[618]

---

614. Plut. *Cim.* 13.6-7. Pausanias only mentions the south wall of the Acropolis in this passage, though sections of the north wall may have been rebuilt at the same time; cf. Boersma 1970, pp. 46, 162, who notes similarities in the construction of the two walls, including the incorporation of architectural elements from the *Archaios Neos* and Older Parthenon. Dinsmoor 1980, pp. 62-64, suggests that the Older Propylon was repaired in the 460's; Mark 1993, pp. 64-65, 132-133, prefers a date of ca. 450 for the earliest post-Persian sack repairs. As noted by Hurwit 1999, p. 143, n. 27, however, a repair in ca. 450 would be a curious time for a repair, for it would have occurred at about the same time as the Mnesikles' Propylaia would have been begun.

615. Plut. *Cim.* 13.7-8: λέγεται δὲ καὶ τῶν μακρῶν τειχῶν, ἃ σκέλη καλοῦσι, συντελεσθῆναι μὲν ὕστερον τὴν οἰκοδομίαν, τὴν δὲ πρώτην θεμελίωσιν εἰς τόπους ἑλώδεις καὶ διαβρόχους τῶν ἔργων ἐμπεσόντων ἐρεισθῆναι διὰ Κίμωνος ἀσφαλῶς, χάλικι πολλῇ καὶ λίθοις βαρέσι τῶν ἑλῶν πιεσθέντων, ἐκείνου χρήματα πορίζοντος καὶ διδόντος. πρῶτος δὲ ταῖς λεγομέναις ἐλευθερίοις καὶ γλαφυραῖς διατριβαῖς, αἳ μικρὸν ὕστερον ὑπερφυῶς ἠγαπήθησαν, ἐκαλλώπισε τὸ ἄστυ, τὴν μὲν ἀγορὰν πλατάνοις καταφυτεύσας, τὴν δ' Ἀκαδήμειαν ἐξ ἀνύδρου καὶ αὐχμηρᾶς κατάρρυτον ἀποδείξας ἄλσος ἠσκημένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δρόμοις καθαροῖς καὶ συσκίοις περιπάτοις. The δρόμοι may be racetracks for sacred games, though the context seems to indicate that these were roads. Of course, δρόμοι could be both, as seen with the Panathenaic Way.

616. The stoa was originally called the Stoa Peisianakteios, named for Kimon's brother-in-law Peisianax. The testimony is collected in Wycherley 1957, pp. 31-45.

617. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 27.3.

618. Plut. *Cim.* 8.5-6; Plut. *Thes.* 36; Paus. 1.17.6. For the date of the return of the bones, cf. discussion in Barron 1972, pp. 20-21.

The arrival of the bones was a celebrated event, and a building was erected within the precinct of the Theseion to house the bones.[619] Whether the Theseion was already established at the time is not known; the return of the hero's bones, however, certainly made the sanctuary one of the most prominent in Athens.[620] It is tempting to assume that the Theseia were established at the same time.[621] Other families were directly involved in funding religious projects during the 470's. Themistokles, for example, dedicated a temple to Artemis Aristoboule in Athens, and a temple of Aphrodite at Peiraieus.[622] The Archaic pattern of religious authority, in other words, was alive and well in the early years of the democracy.

2.2. Festivals

Though we know much about the architectural development of the Acropolis in the early years of the democracy, we know comparatively little about contemporary innovations in the form, organization, and funding of the Panathenaia. Aristotle informs us that the *Demos* instituted the presence of arms during the procession, presumably a ref-

---

619. Paus. 1.17.6, specifically links the return of the bones with the building of a shrine in the Theseion to house the bones.

620. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.4, believes that the Theseion precinct stood by the time of Peisistratos; cf. Rhodes 1981, ad loc, who believes that this may be anachronistic. On the other hand, Aristotle's account does not indicate that there were any buildings in the precinct; perhaps the return of the bones inaugurated a new building, and the Theseia festival. There is scant evidence that the Phytalidai, a *genos* that was based in Kimon's Lakiadai deme, had a role in sacrifices to Theseus, though much more than this we cannot say; cf. Plut. *Thes.* 23.5, and the discussion in Parker 1996, pp. 168-170, 318.

621. The earliest extant mention of the Theseia is Ar. *Pl.* 628, composed in the early fourth century. Our best evidence for the festival is a list of victors from the Theseia, *IG* ii^2 956, that dates to the second century. By this time, the games were organized by *agonothetai*, and most events were limited to Athenian citizens. The events included torch races, *euandriai* ("manliness" contests), *euhoplai* ("good equipment" contests), javelin-throwing, foot races, and equestrian contests. On the festival, cf. Deubner 1966, pp. 224-226; Parke 1977, pp. 81-82; Kyle 1987, pp. 40-41. Recent discussion of the location of the Theseion, with bibliography: Schmalz 2006, pp. 38-40.

622. Artemis Aristoboule: Plut. *Them.* 22.2-3; Threpsiades and Vanderpool 1964. Temple of Aphrodite at Peiraieus: Ammonios, *FGrH* 361 F 5.

erence to the inclusion of hoplites, and perhaps the first martial games.[623] It more likely, however, that the first "warrior" contests were introduced ca. 500.[624] The evidence mostly comes from painted depictions on pottery. For example, images of the famed *apobates* contest, in which individuals competed in a contest of jumping out of a moving chariot and running to the finish line, date from ca. 500, and gain in popularity over the course of the first quarter of the fifth century; images of awards ceremonies for the *euandria*, or contests of "manly excellence," date from the late sixth century; depictions of the pyrrhic dance first appear on pottery ca. 500; the first image of a mounted javelin thrower dates to ca. 500; and images of the ship contests first appear in ca. 480-460, perhaps an indication that these contests were not introduced until this time.[625]

The introduction of martial contests at the Panathenaia would have served an important function for the recently formed army of the new democracy; introducing contests that were conducted by teams of tribes would have encouraged strong bonds among members of these newly formed tribes.[626] Oversight of these contests at this time may have been conducted much as we find for the Herakleia games in *IG* i³ 3, in which a board of *athlothetai* chose members from each tribe to conduct the games. As we discussed above, whether those chosen were expected to meet the expenses of the contests is not known. Aside from these martial contests, the role that the state may have played in regulating other aspects of the Panathenaia is not known. Certainly by the time Athens had moved the Delian treasury to the Acropolis in ca. 454/3, the state had great-

---

623. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 18.4, in an apparent correction of Thuc. 6.56.203, 58.1-2, who attributes this innovation to the Peisistratidai. On the contradiction between these two sources, cf. Robertson 1992, pp. 115-116.

624. The "warrior" contests are best attested in a fragmentary prize list for the Panathenaia, *IG* ii² 2311.58-82, dated to ca. 370. Listed under the heading of games πολεμιστηρίοις are 1. contests for individuals, such as horse races, two-horse chariot races, and javelin-throwing from horseback; 2. contests for teams arranged by Kleisthenic tribe, such as the pyrrhic dance for boys, youths, and men, a contest of "manly excellence," εὐανδρία, a torch race, and a ship contest.

625. The evidence is collected by Neils 1994, who notes that the earliest images of torch races date to the Classical period. The *apobates* contest is not recorded in *IG* ii² 2311, but may have been on a now missing part of the inscription. On the pyrrhic dances, cf. now Ceccarelli 2004, pp. 93-99, who prefers a pre-Kleisthenic date for their introduction to the Panathenaia.

626. Reed 1998, argues that martial contests such as those conducted at the Panathenaia were also a crucial part of military training. For the connection between armed dances and battlefield war in ancient sources, cf. Pl. *Leg*. 7.815a; Ath. 14.628f; Dio Chrys. 2.60-61; Lucian, *Salt*. 14.

ly expanded its authority to oversee what was becoming in part an imperial festival by the late 450's.[627]

As we argued in Chapter Six, it is also ca. 500 that we should date the advent of tragedy at the City Dionysia, and it may well be the date of the first temple to Dionysos Eleutherios on the south slope of the Acropolis; it is also likely that the wooden statue of the god was obtained by the precinct only after the defeat of the Boiotians and Chalkidians in 506.[628] What role the *Demos* initially played in these developments, if any, is not known. It was also in the last decade of the fifth century that the first archaeologically attested temple of Artemis was built at Brauron; the pre-Classical history of both the Brauronia procession from Athens to Brauron, as well as the Brauronia sanctuary atop the Acropolis, is unknown.[629] Finally, towards the end of the sixth century and beginning of the fifth century, the City Eleusinion in Athens was also subject to a major expansion project, which in effect doubled the size of the precinct. It is to the City Eleusinion and Eleusis that we now turn.

3. Eleusis and City Eleusinion

Much as we saw with the Acropolis, the City Eleusinion was the site of accelerated growth and expansion. This process began in the late sixth century with the demolition of the houses that previously occupied the middle terrace of the City Eleusinion, just north of the Archaic peribolos wall. The area was then leveled and graded, and this new extension was enclosed with a peribolos wall.[630] Around the year 500, construction on the foundations for a new temple to Triptolemos was begun in the newly cleared area;

627. Or so we may judge from a decree, *IG* i^3 14, ordering Erythrai, an Ionian city to send offerings of grain for the Great Panathenaia. Cf. discussion in Meiggs and Lewis 1988, pp. 89-94, no. 40.

628. See pp. 126-129, for discussion.

629. See pp. 119-122, for discussion.

630. Miles 1998, pp. 28-33. The lower terrace may not have been an attractive one for builders; stratified sandy layers dating from the seventh through sixth centuries suggests that the area was often the site of standing water, indicating a drainage problem. Later building activity has made interpretation of late sixth-century and early fifth-century building activity on the lower terrace difficult, though it appears to have been the site of houses at the end of the sixth century.

the marble superstructure for the testrastyle amphiprostyle Ionic temple was completed some time later, in the second quarter of the fifth century.[631]

The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis was likewise the site of an expansion project. The "Solonian Telesterion" was demolished, and the terrace upon which it stood was extended and enclosed with a new wall. Upon the new terrace was built a new, much larger telesterion made almost entirely of poros stone, and provided with a front portico. The main hypostyle hall measured over twenty-five long by twenty-seven meters wide, within which were twenty-two columns that supported the roof. The building and wall have usually been attributed to either Peisistratos or his sons, but recent research has shown that a late sixth-century or early fifth-century date is more appropriate.[632] Dating to about the same period is an impressive fortification wall that served to enclose the entire sanctuary.[633] A new and larger telesterion was planned a few decades later, this one roughly the same width as its predecessor, but about twice as long, its roof to be supported by twenty-one interior columns. This so-called "Kimonian telesterion" was never finished.[634]

The work at both sanctuaries would have entailed a significant investment in resources and labor. We are not informed, however, about the source of funds that allowed for these architectural developments in Eleusis and the City Eleusinion. It is tempting to see the state as the main authority behind the renovations. The reason lies in the actions of the Spartan king Kleomenes only a few years before. Kleomenes, driven out of the Acropolis during his attempt to install Isagoras in Athens during the tumultuous days following the fall of the Peisistratidai, seized Eleusis on his way back to Sparta in 507. Afterwards, the Athenians passed a decree ordering that the homes of those Athenians who supported Kleomenes in his attack on Eleusis be razed, their property confiscated, and that they be put to death. These enactments were engraved on a bronze

---

631. Miles 1998, pp. 38-48. It is possible that a temple for Demeter and Kore, mentioned by Paus. 1.14.1 was also built at this time, if not earlier; the discovery of this temple awaits further excavation of the area.

632. For discussion of architectural remains of the telesterion and Peisistratid date: Mylonas 1961, pp. 77-105; Boersma 1970, pp. 24-25, 185. Hayashi 1992, pp. 19-29, argues convincingly that architectural elements of the "Peisistratid Telesterion" have close architectural affinities with the Old Bouleuterion and the Old Athena Temple, both constructions of ca. 500.

633. For a discussion of the wall with bibliography, see Giraud 1991, pp. 9-17.

634. Architectural details: Noack 1927, pp. 93-106; Mylonas 1961, pp. 111-113. Both date the start of construction to after the Persian sack of 480. Shear Jr. 1982, for the argument that the "Kimonian telesterion" was never completed; he dates the start of construction to just before 480.

plaque and set up by the old temple of Athena Polias.[635] Our sole source for this tale is a late scholiast, but the citation of the bronze inscription gives us confidence that he relied upon a reliable earlier source with access to the inscription.[636] Kleomenes invaded Attica again the following year with a large army, intent once more on installing Isagoras and driving out Kleisthenes. His army reached and occupied Eleusis, but Kleomenes' army abruptly dissolved just as the Athenians advanced on Eleusis.[637]

It was during one of these two occupations of Eleusis that Kleomenes destroyed the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore.[638] Certainly the state held a great interest in what happened at Eleusis, as is evident by the harsh enactments passed against those Athenians who took part in the invasion with Kleomenes during the first occupation. It would therefore have made sense for the *Demos* to decide, so soon after the Kleomenes disaster, to spend public funds and oversee the rites and the sanctuary itself. The reason would have been two-fold. First, with Eleusis having been occupied twice in a year, it is possible that pro-democracy families suffered materially; there may have been a shortage among those who usually could or had sponsored building or ritual activities previously. In helping to quickly reestablish the sanctuary, the *Demos* was in effect taking the role of a sponsoring family, in an effort to ensure that this important sanctuary and its festivals, including the Mysteries, were able to carry on in an even grander form than before.[639]

---

635. Schol. Ar. *Lys*. 273.

636. Cf. Tritle 1988.

637. Hdt. 5.74-76. A late sixth-century dedication inscribed upon a *koiniskos* from Thebes, recently published by Aravantinos 2006, shows that the Boiotians were also involved in this assault upon Eleusis, a point not mentioned by Herodotus.

638. Hdt. 6.75.3, makes clear that Kleomenes was in the habit of laying waste to sacred land: Κλεομένης δὲ παραλαβὼν τὸν σίδηρον ἄρχετο ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἑωυτὸν λωβώμενος: ἐπιτάμνων γὰρ κατὰ μῆκος τὰς σάρκας προέβαινε ἐκ τῶν κνημέων ἐς τοὺς μηρούς, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μηρῶν ἔς τε τὰ ἰσχία καὶ τὰς λαπάρας, ἐς ὃ ἐς τὴν γαστέρα ἀπίκετο, καὶ ταύτην καταχορδεύων ἀπέθανε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ, ὡς μὲν οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσι Ἑλλήνων, ὅτι τὴν Πυθίην ἀνέγνωσε τὰ περὶ Δημαρήτου λέγειν γενόμενα, ὡς δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι μοῦνοι λέγουσι, διότι ἐς Ἐλευσῖνα ἐσβαλὼν ἔκειρε τὸ τέμενος τῶν θεῶν, ὡς δὲ Ἀργεῖοι, ὅτι ἐξ ἱροῦ αὐτῶν τοῦ Ἄργου Ἀργείων τοὺς καταφυγόντας ἐκ τῆς μάχης καταγινέων κατέκοπτε καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἄλσος ἐν ἀλογίῃ ἔχων ἐνέπρησε.

639. The funds may have come in part from the sale of the property of those Athenians who had sided with Kleomenes during his occupation of Eleusis.

Second, surrounding the sanctuary with an imposing fortification wall in effect provided the Athenians with a stronger outpost against invading armies.[640] In the span of five years, the Spartans had invaded Attica four times.[641] Fortifying Eleusis, in effect making the city a garrison outpost in northeast Attica, would have been paramount to defending against the initial brunt of armies marching into Attica from the Peloponnese. The sheer scale of the fortification would have required substantial funding; it is conceivable, though not inevitable, that the state funded the project, particularly if wealthy families in the area had suffered financially.[642]

We should like to have more than a reasonable narrative for evidence of state sponsorship of the Eleusinian Mysteries in the early sixth century, for such sponsorship would have been accompanied by committees and rules to make sure the public funds were appropriately spent, as well as a considerable expansion of the religious authority of the state. We must, however, admit to having no evidence to support these claims. In fact, the evidence provides hints to the contrary. The earliest surviving decree from Eleusis, *IG* i³ 5, dating to ca. 500, concerns the regulation of sacrifices during the Mysteries, but records no involvement of the *Demos* in the funding or oversight of the festival or the sanctuary.[643] Rather, the state's involvement was limited to confirming that the sacrifices were to be conducted by ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσινίων, i.e., *hieropoioi* appointed by or from among the Eleusinians themselves.[644] Fees for initiations are not mentioned, nor do we see the role of the priestess of Demeter, the Eumolpidai and Kerykes *gene*, or any other officials familiar to us from inscriptions of the second half of the fifth century. At about the same time that *IG* i³ 5 was erected at Eleusis, *IG* i³ 231, a set of regulations apparently concerning the Mysteries, was inscribed on a large base or altar in the City

640. On this point, cf. Clinton 1994, p. 162; Lang 1996, p. 96.

641. 1. An unsuccessful attempt to drive out Hippias in 511; Hdt. 5.62. 2. Successful attempt to drive out Hippias in 510; Hdt. 5.64-65. 3. Attempt to install Isagoras, but driven out in 507; Hdt. 5.70-72. 4. Invasion of Attica, only get as far as Eleusis in 506; Hdt. 5.74-76.

642. As we noted earlier, for example, the rebuilding of the walls leading to Peiraieus were funded by Kimon himself, not the state; Plut. *Cim*. 13.6-8.

643. According to Andoc. 1.111, ἡ γὰρ βουλὴ ἐκεῖ καθεδεῖσθαι ἔμελλε κατὰ τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον, ὃς κελεύει τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ τῶν μυστηρίων ἕδραν ποιεῖν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ. Presumably the law dictating that the Boule meet in the City Eleusinion to review any infractions that occurred during the Mysteries. If the law is historical, and the Boule really was to review conduct at the Mysteries, then it would stand as the earliest law concerning the rites.

644. For discussion of this inscription, with bibliography, cf. Simms 1975; Clinton 1979; 2005, pp. 16-18, no. 13; Cavanaugh 1996, p. 74.

Eleusinion.[645] Unfortunately, too little is preserved on the stone to determine the authority upon which these regulations were enacted.

That said, our earliest evidence for direct state involvement in the conduct and funding of the Mysteries is not found until after the Persians Wars. In a decree of ca. 470-460, *IG* i³ 6, a board of *hieropoioi* was assigned by the state to oversee the sacred money of the Eleusinian *aparche* on the Athenian Acropolis.[646] The amount that each initiate was to pay the priestess of Demeter during the Lesser and Greater Mysteries, and the fees that the Eumolpidai and Kerykes could charge for performing initiations is also legislated. The earliest accounts or inventories from the sanctuary appear only after the passage of *IG* i³ 6: *IG* i³ 395 (ca. 450-445), *IG* i³ 384 (ca. 450-430), and *IG* i³ 398 (ca.

---

645. Dated ca. 510-500. Another inscription of approximately the same date, *IG* i³ 232, may also deal with sacrifices at the Mysteries, though it is even more fragmentary than *IG* i³ 231, and any reconstruction of the text is difficult. For discussion of these two inscriptions, see Jeffery 1948, pp. 86-111, nos. 66-67; 1990, pp. 75-76; Clinton 1974, pp. 10-13, 69, 95; 2005, pp. 13-14, no. 7; Miles 1998, pp. 200-201, nos. 39, 40.

646. Clinton 1974, pp. 10-12; 2005, pp. 21-30, no. 19; Simms 1990; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-74; Miles 1998, p. 201, no. 41. The decree was found in the City Eleusinion, but was undoubtedly a copy of an identical decree set up at Eleusis, and now lost. *Hieropoioi* may appear again on a fragmentary inscription, dated ca. 450-445, of accounts from the sanctuary, *IG* i³ 395.3, though *epistatai* is also possible; cf. Clinton 2005, pp. 32-34, no. 23; Cavanaugh 1996, p. 2, n. 1. In the decree regulating the offering of "first-fruits" at Eleusis, *IG* i³ 78, we find the ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσινόθεν performing the administration of, and sacrifices from, the Eleusinian *aparche*. The date for the "First-fruits" decree is contested; for a date of ca. 440-435, with extensive bibliography and discussion of debates over the date, cf. Clinton 2005, pp. 37-40, no. 28; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 73-95. *IG* i³ 32, a decree of ca. 432/1 that was to be put up at both the City Eleusinion and Eleusis (where it was recovered), records the decision by the Boule to establish a board of *epistatai,* chosen from all Athenians, to oversee the property and income of the Demeter and Kore sanctuary. The *hieropoioi* are also mentioned, though the fragmentary stone does not record their role; cf. Clinton 1987, pp. 254-262; 2005, pp. 40-42, no. 30; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 19-27, 84-95; Miles 1998, p. 202, no. 42. *IG* i³ 391.15-16, a decree of ca. 422/1-419/8, records the receipt of money by the *epistatai* from the *aparche* from the ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσῖνι, whose role in administering the sanctuary funds now appears to have become diminished; cf. Clinton 2005, pp. 56-57, no. 45; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 74-79. The *epistatai* assumed complete control over the finances by the end of the fifth century, to judge from the absence of the *hieropoioi* in the 408/7 accounts of the ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσῖνι, *IG* i³ 386-387; Clinton 2005, pp. 64-70, no. 52; Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 99-209.

445-430).[647] Of the funding of the Eleusinia games we hear nothing, though two discus dedications in ca. 520-500, *IG* i³ 989 and 991, undoubtedly come from the games.[648]

In fact, *IG* i³ 395 and *IG* i³ 398 are our first records of direct funding by the state of any building projects at Eleusis, presumably overseen by the state-appointed *epistatai*.[649] Most of *IG* i³ 398 is lost, but apparently recorded the expenses for the building of a tower and gate; where this tower and gate were located is not precisely known, but it may have been the precinct wall that surrounded the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.[650] The accounts recorded on *IG* i³ 395 are also fragmentary, though they do concern the expenses for the cutting and transportation of stone for some building project, possibly the "Periklean Telesterion."[651] The earliest inscribed account that can be associated with a state funded building project at the City Eleusinion is *IG* i³ 50, dated to ca. 434; the Eleusinion is not directly attested by the surviving fragments, however, and the association remains only a tentative, if plausible, suggestion.[652]

---

647. Cf. Clinton 2005, pp. 32-34, 34-35, 36, nos. 23, 25, and 27, respectively.

648. Clinton 2005, p. 9, no. 1, and p. 13, no. 6, respectively. Similar discus dedications have also been found at Peiraieus (*IG* i³ 1393, ca. 510-500); at Athens (*IG* i³ 1394-1396, ca. 525-500; *IG* i³ 1398, ca. 450-400); and at Anavyssos (*IG* i³ 1397, ca. 500). These marble discoi likely were prizes for victory, which were then inscribed and dedicated to the patron deity of the games, though in some cases (e.g. *IG* i³ 1397), they appear to have been included among the victor's burial package.

649. Other fifth-century inscriptions that indicate publicly funded construction projects include the building of a footbridge over Rheitos lake, *IG* i³ 41, constructed from blocks taken from the then late sixth-century telesterion, ἐκ τοῦ νεὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίο. Many of the architectural elements from this telesterion and other building projects were in fact kept by in storage, and recorded in the accounts of the *epistatai*, as seen, e.g., *IG* i³ 386-387, dated to ca. 408/7. A wealth of material was preserved from the Archaic telesterion, including 1750 pairs of marble roof tiles, 54 column drums, 16 Ionic bases, 21 wooden epistyles, 18 wooden rafters, 3 pairs of doors, and 10 roof timbers. The abundance of the material supports the idea, first posited by Shear Jr. 1964; 1982, that the Archiac telesterion was not destroyed by the Persians in 480, as suggested in a passage from Hdt. 9.65.2, but rather was purposefully dismantled in anticipation of building the "Kimonian" telesterion. For a thorough discussion of the building materials from this and other building projects listed in these accounts, cf. Cavanaugh 1996, pp. 99-209.

650. Boersma 1970, p. 163.

651. Shear Jr. 1966, pp. 163-175, 338; Clinton 1987, pp. 259-260; Cavanaugh 1996, p. 2, n. 1.

652. Wycherley 1957, p. 81, no. 220; Miles 1998, pp. 193-194, no. 25.

At any rate, all these building accounts date comfortably within the period of the Periklean building program, at which time the construction of a new telesterion at Eleusis was certainly publicly funded, as ancient sources themselves confirm.[653] Before ca. 450, there is no evidence of state-funding building programs at either sanctuary. Nor is there any evidence that the state was directly involved in managing a share of the rites and finances of the Mysteries before the 460's decree of *IG* i³ 6.[654]

4. Attica outside of Eleusis and Athens

In the first decades of the democracy, before the Persian sack, temples were also built at sanctuaries elsewhere in Attica, such as Apollo Zoster on Cape Zoster, Nemesis or Themis at Rhamnous, and two temples within the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion.[655] The funding for these temples is not recorded. Sometime between 460-450, a colonnade was added to a temple of Athena at Sounion, itself built sometime after 479.[656] Who built this temple is unknown, though the *Demos* had some involvement in the sanctuary by the 450's, to judge from a fragmentary decree, *IG* i³ 8, that regulates the payment of fees by sailors to the sanctuaries at Sounion.[657] That said, private initia-

---

653. Plut. *Per*. 13.3-9, links the construction of a new Telesterion at Eleusis with Perikles' other building initiatives, such as the Parthenon, Propylaia, and Odeon. Plutarch cites Koroibos as the initial architect, who got as far as setting the columns on the floor and connecting the capitals with the architraves; he died before finishing the work, which was completed by Metagenes. This same Koroibos is ordered to report to the City Eleusinion in a decree of ca. 432/1, *IG* i³ 32.23-28. According to Strabo 9.1.12, and Vitr. 7 praef. 16, the architect was Iktinos, one of the architects of the Parthenon.

654. Other than the early decrees inscribed in *IG* i³ 5 and *IG* i³ 231, fourteen other inscriptions from Eleusis that date to ca. 575-475, i.e., were inscribed earlier than *IG* i³ 6. Of these, one preserves only a single letter; the remaining thirteen are dedications (*IG* i³ 988; *IG* i³ 989; *IG* i³ 990; *IG* i³ 991; *IG* i³ 992; *IG* i³ 993; *IG* i³ 995; *IG* i³ 996; *IG* i³ 997; *IG* i³ 998; *IG* i³ 1000; *IG* i³ 1001; *IG* i³ 1006), ten of which were dedicated ca. 510-475. Cf. Clinton 2005, pp. 9-20, nos. 1-6, 8, 10-12, 14-18. At the City Eleusinion, *IG* i³ 231 and *IG* i³ 232 are the only inscriptions so far recovered that predate *IG* i³ 6.

655. Apollo Zoster: Kourouniotes 1927; Boersma 1970, pp. 36, 173; Camp 2001, p. 316. Nemesis or Themis at Rhamnous: Boersma 1970, pp. 35-36, 197; Petrakos 1987, pp. 299-205; 1991, p. 20; Miles 1989, pp. 137-139; Camp 2001, p. 301. Poseidon at Sounion: Stais 1920; Boersma 1970, pp. 36-37, 197; Goette 2000; Camp 2001, pp. 307-308. It was destroyed before completion, presumably during the Persian sack.

656. Stais 1920; Boersma 1970, pp. 61-62, 184; Goette 2000; Camp 2001, pp. 306-307.

tive was active in the Attica, to judge from the telesterion at Phlya that Themistokles constructed sometime in the 470's.[658]

5. Conclusion

As our review of the archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence shows, secure evidence for state involvement in the religious life of Early Classical Athens is quite limited in comparison with the second half of the fifth century. State authority over festivals, games, or sacrifices before the Persian sacks of 480 and 479 is seen in two instances: 1. In ca. 485, a board of *athlothetai* assigned management of the Herakleia games to a board of thirty members drawn from the tribes. 2. Perhaps the creation and sponsorship of martial contests at the Panathenaia. The assumption of authority by the state over a third festival, the Mysteries, dates first to the 460's. The Hekatompedon decrees, as well as the pre-480 decrees concerning the Mysteries found at Eleusis and the City Eleusinion, appear to be evidence not for the assumption of state rights over the festival but a codification of the rights and privileges previously held by the Kerykes, Eumolpidai, and other religious personnel who oversaw the rites during the Archaic period.

This seems also to be the case for the so-called Praxiergidai decree, *IG* i^3 7, dated to sometime in the 450's.[659] Here we find that the *genos* had obtained permission from the *Demos* to inscribe an oracle from Delphi concerning their privileges, and a list of their *patria*. Much of the decree is missing, so what exactly their *patria* consisted of is not entirely clear, but they seem to have involved certain sacrifices, and well as the production of the peplos of Athena Polias. We should suspect that the need for the decree arose when some aspect of the rites they had long held, their *patria*, had been threatened, perhaps by incursions of the state before this time. Part of the decree requires the epony-

657. Parker 1996, p. 125.

658. Plut. *Them.* 1.3.

659. On the religious duties held by the Praxiergidai, see Parker 1996, pp. 307-308. For discussion of the decree, cf. Lewis 1954, pp. 17-21; Ostwald 1986, pp. 145-148.

mous archon to hand over something to the Praxiergidai, perhaps a key to the temple.[660] We do not know which rites of the Praxiergidai were threatened; it is likely that whatever the problem, the *genos* had inscribed all of their privileges and *patria*, even those that had not been challenged, in an effort to stave off future arrogations of its authority. The date of the Praxiergidai decree falls just at the beginning of what would become a period of increased religious activity on the part of the state; the decree may mark a transition point, in which this increased religious activity of the state began to clash with the *patria* of the *gene*.

Our earliest evidence for state funded religious building projects dates to ca. 450, i.e., roughly the same period as the Periklean building program. On the other hand, we do have records of wealthy individuals or families founding sanctuaries and shrines, as well as building temples and sacred structures in the first half of the fifth century. As we saw above, Themistokles is credited with building a temple to Artemis Aristoboule, a telesterion at Phlya, and a temple of Aphrodite at Peiraieus in the 470's, and Kimon brought back the bones of Theseus, establishing the Theseion. Individual or family funded public works were not limited to temples or sanctuaries. The recent beautification projects in the Agora and Academy of the 460's discussed above, as well as the rebuilding of the walls leading to Peiraieus, were funded in whole or part by Kimon himself. Temple building by wealthy families or individuals, in other words, fits within a wider pattern in which public works were commonly initiated and funded privately.

The reason that we find so little state involvement in these first generations of democracy may be that there was little need for it. State involvement in religion was always an *ad hoc* action for a particular reason, established to 1. complement the rights retained by preexisting authorities, or 2. fulfill duties that the preexisting authorities no longer could, or that were established by *Demos* itself. While the *Demos* could add new martial games to the Panathenaia in order to display the new, unified military, such an action did not threaten the rights of any *genos* or family that held the right over other aspects of the festival or sanctuary. In fact, there is no recorded instance in which the state forcefully arrogated the rights and privileges of any family, *genos*, or other corporate religious group.

---

660. Lines 20-23. For this reading, cf. the restoration of Lewis 1954, pp. 17-21. Two other inscriptions dating to ca. 480-460 deal with religious matters, but are more difficult to interpret the state's involvement, if any. The first is *IG* i^3 234, a fragment of a calendar of sacrifices at several sanctuaries. The authority upon which the calendar was published, most likely either the *Demos* or a deme, is not preserved. The second is *IG* i^3 243, which appears to record a decree of the *Demos* and of the deme Melite regarding sacred regulations. Our only other deme decree of this date, *IG* i^3 244, is from the deme of Skambonidai, and concerns the regulations of sacrifices, and an oath to be sworn by officials of the deme. Cf. Rhodes 2009, p. 3, for discussion of all three inscriptions.

Concluding Remarks: Private Initiative and the State

The present study of the archaeological, literary, and epigraphic evidence has demonstrated the leading role that private initiative and funding played in the religious and ritual life of Early Athens. We began with an examination of the religious authority held by the leading individuals and families of Athens and Attica during the Geometric Period and seventh-century. As the institutions of the Athenians polis began to gradually emerge, private initiative remained the principal source of funding and oversight for Athenian religious life. The evidence for state sponsorship and authority over festivals and sanctuaries was comparatively slight, and began to gradually increase after the reforms of Kleisthenes. That said, private initiative was not antithetical to state institutions. In the seventh century, questions of religious transgressions could be addressed by the leading families of Athens by convening *ad hoc* institutions, such as the court of three hundred that exiled the Alkmaionidai. In the sixth century, a polemarch and a treasurer each dedicated an altar, and an archon dedicated a racepost and racetrack for the Eleusinia.[661] In each case, these men chose to emphasize the office that they held when they made their religious benefactions. This is especially clear in the case of the Altar of the Twelve Gods, which Peisistratos the Younger dedicated as a *memorial* of his archonship. Such evidence suggests that some offices, particularly those that ranked among the most prestigious, were granted to individuals who could afford to sponsor religious activity.

The wealth qualifications for holding office in Early Athens support this idea. Before Drakon, an archonship was reserved for those of sufficient wealth and birth.[662] After Drakon, both archons and *tamiai* had to possess unencumbered estates worth ten minae.[663] At the beginning of the sixth century, the treasurers, and perhaps the archons, had to be from the highest property class, the *pentakosiomedimnoi*.[664] By the first half of the fifth century, the office of archon was open to the first two property classes, the *pen-*

661. A chart summarizing our evidence for private funding and oversight of sanctuaries and festivals is provided at the end of this discussion.

662. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 3.1, 6.

663. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 4.2.

664. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 7.3-8.1.

takosiomedimnoi and the *hippeis*.[665] Treasurers, however, were still drawn only from the top property class, a qualification that remained in Aristotle's time.[666]

We suggest, therefore, that the treasurers who dedicated a bronze plaque to Athena in the second quarter of the sixth century, as well as the *hieropoioi* who built the racetrack and organized the games for the Panathenaia in the same period, were eligible for their offices precisely because they could afford to fund and conduct religious activities on behalf of the entire community.[667] In other words, while private initiative was the primary source of religious sponsorship, such funding was conducted both within and outside of state institutions.

Our earliest evidence for the public funding of religious building projects dates to ca. 450, i.e., roughly the same period as the Periklean building program.[668] This is no coincidence. The age of Perikles would mark a shift in involvement of the state in the religious life of Athens. This period lies outside the parameters of this study, but let us briefly note that the transfer of the Delian League treasury to the Athenian Acropolis in ca. 454/3, the same year that Athenian allies began to contribute their *aparchai* to Athena, both of which provided the state with an enormous reserve of funds.[669] If Perikles stands at the forefront of the shift in state involvement in Athenian religion, it is because it is he who pushed to use these funds to rebuild sanctuaries across Athens and Attica in the second half of the fifth century. The increased state involvement in Athenian religion

---

665. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 26.2-3.

666. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 8.1, where we learn that this qualification still stood in the fourth century.

667. The same considerations hold for the thirty chosen by the *athlothetai* to oversee the Herakleia games in a decree of ca. 485, *IG* i³ 605.

668. *IG* i³ 395 and *IG* i³ 398, from Eleusis.

669. The transfer of the Delian treasury certainly occurred before 447, when the Periklean building program began, though the exact year in which the transfer took place is debated. Our chief literary source, Plut. *Arist.* 25.2-3, refers only to the proposal for the transfer, not the date that it actually occurred. By the fourth century, ancient testimony associates the transfer with Perikles; cf. Diod. 12.38.2; 12.54.3, 13.21.3 (who, as seen in 12.41.1, relied upon Ephoros); Isoc. 8.126-127; 15.234. The consensus view is that the transfer took place ca. 454/3; cf. Meritt et al. 1950, pp. 262-264; Samons 2000, pp. 92-106. Perikles was serving as general in 454/3; cf. Fornara 1971, pp. 46-47. For a date in the early 460's, see Pritchett 1969. For a date in the late 460's, cf. Robertson 1980; Figueira 1998, pp. 267-268. The so-called Athenian Tribute Lists, which record the *aparchai* that the Athenian allies paid to Athena, begin in ca. 454/3, *IG* i³ 249. The most influential study of these lists is the four volume work by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, 1939-1950.

went beyond funding building projects, however. Festivals that state officials had previously been expected to sponsor themselves now were funded by the state.[670] During the years 430-350, for example, the estimated state expenditure on festivals was around one hundred talents per year, about thirty-five percent of which were spent on the City Dionysia and Panathenaia, alone.[671]

In light of our study of Early Athens, we are better able to understand the difficulties Perikles first experienced in 447 when he introduced his ambitious plan to publicly fund the rebuilding of sanctuaries and temples on the Acropolis and elsewhere.[672] Ancient sources record that out of all of Perikles' public measures, none sparked more slander and outrage than his proposals to use public monies to fund the building of temples and sanctuaries.[673] Thucydides, son of Melesias, Perikles' main rival in the 440's, attacked the plan primarily on financial grounds, bemoaning what he saw as an ostentatious waste of public funds.[674] The assembly at times agreed, clamoring that the expendi-

---

670. Note also that in ca. 457/6, the wealth qualifications for the office of archon were relaxed, and *zeugetai* were able to serve for the first time; cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 26.2-3.

671. For a detailed account of these expenditures, see Pritchard 2010, forthcoming.

672. This program, according to Plutarch, included the public funding and oversight of the building of the Parthenon, the telesterion at Eleusis, part of the Long Walls, the Odeion, the Propylaia, and the Athena Parthenos statue. Plut. *Per.* 13.7-14. Also in Plutarch's list of initiatives is a musical contest at the Panathenaia, which Perikles himself oversaw performed in the new Odeion. The financing of the rebuilding program as a whole was complex, drawing on a mixture of funds from the annual tribute from allies, the *hellenotamiai*, or treasurers of the Delian League, the *tamiai*, or treasurers of Athena, a silver mine in Laurion, and other public revenue sources, such as harbor taxes, rents, court fees, etc. For the financing of the building program as a whole, see Meiggs 1972, pp. 154-155, 515-518; Kallet-Marx 1989; Samons 1993.

673. Plut. *Per.* 12.1: ὃ δὲ πλείστην μὲν ἡδονὴν ταῖς Ἀθήναις καὶ κόσμον ἤνεγκε, μεγίστην δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔκπληξιν ἀνθρώποις, μόνον δὲ τῇ Ἑλλάδι μαρτυρεῖ μὴ ψεύδεσθαι τὴν λεγομένην δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἐκείνην καὶ τὸν παλαιὸν ὄλβον, ἡ τῶν ἀναθημάτων κατασκευή, τοῦτο μάλιστα τῶν πολιτευμάτων τοῦ Περικλέους ἐβάσκαινον οἱ ἐχθροὶ καὶ διέβαλλον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, βοῶντες ὡς ὁ μὲν δῆμος ἀδοξεῖ καὶ κακῶς ἀκούει τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρήματα πρὸς αὑτὸν ἐκ Δήλου μεταγαγών... Cf. Plut. *Per.* 14.1.

674. Plut. *Per.* 14.1; cf. 12.1-2.

tures were too extravagant, and demanding that the funding program cease.[675] No doubt some of this opposition was political posturing. Though the funding and oversight was ultimately the responsibility of the polis, the program was nonetheless "Periklean," and therefore subject to the ire of his opposition. The proposal for such a large-scale outlay of public funds for the building of temples and sanctuaries would have been unprecedented.

In the face of opposition in the assembly, Perikles countered that he would pay for the buildings himself, and put his own name on the dedicatory inscriptions. The assembly, naturally enough, took his threat seriously, and now shouted in support of funding the project.[676] Shortly thereafter, the ostracism of his rival Thucydides in 443 removed one of his most influential critics, and opposition thereafter was finally quieted.

Sanctuaries could still be founded by private initiative afterwards; one thinks immediately of Telemachos' founding of the Asklepios sanctuary in 420/19, for example. Individuals still funded public works out of their pocket; Perikles, for example, built a grain warehouse, the gymnasium at Lykeion, and offered to construct a public springhouse.[677] Perikles' initiatives, however, would mark an important moment in the Athenian religious life. Hereafter, the state would definitively outpace any family or individual as a sponsor of sanctuaries and festivals in Athens.

---

675. Plut. *Per*. 14.1-2. Perikles' interest in sanctuary building even had opposition outside of Athens. When he invited representatives from other Greek states to convene in Athens to discuss, in part, what to do about Hellenic sanctuaries that the Persians had burned, no one came. Cf. Plut. *Per*. 17, who records that the meeting failed to materialize primarily due to the opposition of the Spartans.

676. Plut. *Per*. 14.1-2, who suggests that the *ekklesia* voted in favor of funding the works either out of admiration for his magnanimity, or in order to have a share in the credit and glory.

677. Warehouse: schol. Ar. *Ach*. 548. Gymnasium at Lykeion: Paus. 1.29.16; Harpokration, s.v. Lykeion. *Contra* Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F 136, who says that Peisistratos built it. Springhouse: *IG* i^3 49.

SUMMARY OF PRIVATE FUNDING OR OVERSIGHT:
MYTHOLOGICAL OR SEMI-MYTHOLOGICAL PERIOD

Founder/Funding/Oversight	**Sanctuary/Festival**	**Source**
Triptolemos	Mysteries	Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.6.
Eumolpos	Mysteries	Marmor Parium (= FGrH 239 A 15); schol. Soph. OC 1053; cf. Eur. *Erechtheus* fr. 65.100.
Orpheus	Mysteries	Dem. 25.11; Eur. *Rhes.* 943-944.
Orestes and Iphigeneia	Artemis at Halai, Brauron	Eur. *IT* 1450-1457.
Deucalion	Olympieion	Paus. 1.18.7-8.
Erechthonios	Panathenaia	Harp. s.v. Παναθήναια; Androtion *FGrH* 324 F 2; Hellanikos *FGrH* 323a F 2; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.14.6; Eratosth. *Cat.* 13; *Marm. Par.*, *FGrH* 239 A 10; schol. Pl. *Parm.* 127a; schol. Aristid. *Panath.* 13.189.4-5.
Pegasos	Dionysos Eleuthereus	Paus. 1.2.5, 1.38.8; schol. Ar. *Ach.* 243a
Theseus	Aphrodite Pandemos	Plut. 1.22.3.
Theseus	Peitho	Plut. 1.22.3.
Theseus	Synoikia	Thuc. 2.15.2; cf. Plut. *Thes.* 24.4.
Theseus	Panathenaia	Plut. *Thes.* 24.3; Istros *FGrH* 334 F 4, cited by Harp. s.v. Παναθήναια; Paus. 8.2.1.

SUMMARY OF PRIVATE FUNDING OR OVERSIGHT: CA. 600-510

Founder/Funding/Oversight	**Sanctuary/Festival**	**Source**
Epimenides	Shrines in Athens	Paus. 12.4-6.
Solon	Aphrodite Pandemos	Suda, s.v. Πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη; Harp., s.v. Πάνδημος Ἀφροδίτη; Ath. 569d (= *Deip*. 13.25).
Solon	Temple of Enyalios	Plut. *Sol*. 9.4.
Family of Isagoras	Zeus of Caria	Hdt. 5.66.1.
Gephyraioi	Achaean Demeter	Hdt. 5.61.2.
Charmos, polemarch	Altar of Eros	Paus. 1.30.1; Kleidemos *FGrH* 323 F 15.
Chairion, treasurer	Altar?	*IG* i^3 590.
Alkiphron, archon	Eleusinia; Racepost and Dromos	*IG* i^3 991.
Patrokledes	Altar of Athena Nike	*IG* i^3 596.
Peisistratos[678]	Panathenaia	Schol. Aristid. *Panath*. 13.189.4.
Peisistratos	Temple at Brauron	Phot. s.v. Βραυρωνία.
Peisistratidai	Olympieion	Arist. *Pol*. 1313b; Vitr. *De Arch*. 7, praef 15.
Peisistratos the Younger	Altar of Twelve Gods	Thuc. 6.54.6; *IG* i^3 948.
Hippias and Hipparchos	Panathenaia	Thuc. 6.56; Arist. *Ath. Pol*. 18; Pl. *Hipparch*. 228b.

678. The Pythion, also attributed to Peisistratos, is excluded from this list because it is reported to have been funded through public revenues: Phot. s.v. Πύθιον; Suda, s.v. Πύθιον, s.v. Ἐν Πυθίῳ κρεῖττον ἦν ἀποπατῆσαι; Zen. *Codex Athous* 2.94: ἐπὶ Πυθίωι κρεῖττον ἦν ἀποπατῆσαι; Hsch. s.v. ἐν Πυθίῳ χέσαι.

SUMMARY OF PRIVATE FUNDING OR OVERSIGHT: CA. 510-450

Founder/Funding/Oversight	**Sanctuary/Festival**	**Source**
Chaireleides, Thopeithes, et al.	Altar on Acropolis	*IG* i³ 605.
Themistokles	Telesterion at Phye	Plut. *Them*. 1.3.
Themistokles	Artemis Aristoboule	Plut. *Them*. 22.2-3.
Themistokles	Aphrodite, Peiraieus	Ammonios, *FGrH* 361 F 5.
Kimon	Bones of Theseus; Theseion	Plut. *Cim*. 8.5-6; Plut. *Thes*. 36; Paus. 1.17.6.
Praxiergidai	Athena Polias	*IG* i³ 7.

Works Cited

Abramson, H. 1978. "Greek Hero-Shrines" (diss. University of California at Berkeley).

Abramson, H. 1979. "A Hero Shrine for Phrontis At Sounion?," *CSCA* 12, pp. 1-19.

Adshead, K. 1986. *Politics of the Archaic Peloponnese: The Tradition From Archaic to Classical Politics*, Avebury.

Ahlberg, G. 1971. *Prothesis and Ekphora in Greek Geometric Art*, Göteborg.

Ainian, A. M. 1987. "From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples. A Study of the Origins of Greek Religious Architecture in the Protogeometric and Geometric Periods" (diss. University of London).

Ainian, A. M. 1994. "Λαθούριζα: Μία Αγροτική Εγκατάσταση των Πρώιμων Ιστορικών Χρόνων," in *Structures Rurales et Sociétés antiques. Actes du Colloque de Corfu, 14-16 mai 1992*, ed. P. Doukellis, and L. Mendoni, Paris, pp. 65-80.

Ainian, A. M. 1995. "New Evidence for the Study of the Late Geometric-Archaic Settlement At Lathouriza in Attica," in *Klados: Essays in Honour of J.N. Coldstream*, ed. C. Morris, and J. N. Coldstream, London, pp. 143-155.

Ainian, A. M. 1997. *From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples: Architecture, Religion and Society in Early Iron Age Greece (1100-700 B.C.)*, Jonsered.

Akurgal, E. 1983. *Alt-Smyrna*, Ankara.

Alcock, S. E., and R. Osborne. 1994. *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, Oxford; New York.

Aleshire, S. 1994. "Towards a Definition of "State Cult" for Ancient Athens," in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence: Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 November 1991*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 9-16.

Aloni, A. 2000. "Anacreonte a Atene: Datazione Significato di Alcune Iscrizioni Tiranniche," *ZPE* 130, pp. 81-94.

Anderson, G. 2003. *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C*, Ann Arbor, MI.

Anderson, G. 2005. "Before Turannoi Were Tyrants: Rethinking a Chapter of Early Greek History," *ClAnt* 24, pp. 173-222.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, Lanham, MD.

Antoniou, A. 1990. "Βραυρών. Συμβολή στην Ιστορία του Ιερού της Βραυρωνίας Αρτέμιδος" (diss. University of Thessaloniki).

Aravantinos, V. L. 2006. " A New Inscribed Kioniskos From Thebes," *BSA* 101, pp. 369-377.

Arnush, M. F. 1995. "The Career of Peisistratos Son of Hippias," *Hesperia* 64, pp. 135-162.

Austin, C. 1968. *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin.

Badian, E. 1993. *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia*, Baltimore.

Balanos, N. 1937. "Ἡ Νέα Ἀναστήλωσις τοῦ Ναοῦ Ἀθηνᾶς Νίκας (1935-1939)," *ArchEph* pp. 776-807.

Bancroft, S. 1979. "Problems Concerning the Archaic Acropolis" (diss. Princeton University).

Barron, J. P. 1972. "New Light on Old Walls: The Murals of the Theseion," *JHS* 92, pp. 20-45.

Basch, L. 1987. *Le Musee Imaginaire de la Marine Antique*, Athens.

Beazley, J. D. 1956. *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters*, Oxford.

Behrwald, R. 2000. *Der lykische Bund: Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*, Bonn.

Bell, C. M. 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, New York, N.Y.

Bell, C. M. 1997. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, New York; Oxford.

Bell, C. M. 1998. "Performance," in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, ed. M. C. Taylor, Chicago, pp. 205-224.

Benton, S. 1934. "Excavations in Ithaca III: The Polis Cave I," *BSA* 35, pp. 45-73.

Bérard, C. 1970. *L'Hérôon à la Porte de l'Ouest*, Berne.

Binder, J. 1998. "The Early History of the Demeter and Kore Sanctuary At Eleusis," in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice From the Archaeological Evidence. Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized By the Swedish Institute At Athens, 22-24 October 1993*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 131-139.

Binford, L. 1971. “Mortuary Practices: Their Study and Their Potential,” in *Approaches to the Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices*, ed. J. A. Brown, Washington, pp. 6-29.

Bingen, J., J. De Geyter, G. Donnay, T. Hackens, and H. Mussche. 1967a. *Thorikos II, 1964*, Bruxelles.

Bingen, J., J. De Geyter, A. Gautier, T. Hackens, H. Mussche, J. Servais, and P. Spitaels. 1967b. *Thorikos III, 1965*, Bruxelles.

Bingen, J., G. Donnay, H. Mussche, R. Paepe, and J. Servais. 1969. *Thorikos IV, 1966/1967*, Bruxelles.

Bingen, J., H. Mussche, J. Servais, and P. Spitaels. 1984. *Thorikos VIII, 1972/1976*, Gent.

Bintliff, J. L. 1992. “Review of Morris 1990 (Paperback edn. of Morris 1987),” *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 2, pp. 286-289.

Blackman, D. 2000. “Archaeology in Greece 1999-2000,” *AR* 46, pp. 3-151.

Blegen, C. 1934. “Inscriptions on Geometric Pottery From Hymettos,” *AJA* 38, pp. 10-28.

Blegen, C. W. 1952. “Two Athenian Grave Groups of About 900 B.C,” *Hesperia* 21, pp. 279-294.

Bloch, M. 1977. “The Past and Present in the Present,” *Man* 12, pp. 278-291.

Blok, J. 2006. “Solon’s Funerary Laws: Questions of Authenticity and Function,” in *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, ed. J. Blok, and A. Lardinois, Leiden; Boston, pp. 197-247.

Boardman, J. 1954. “Painted Votive Plaques and an Early Inscription From Aegina,” *BSA* 49, pp. 183-201.

Boardman, J. 1963. *Island Gems. A Study of Greek Seals in the Geometric and Early Archaic Periods*, London.

Boardman, J. 1968. “Island Gems Aftermath,” *JHS* 88, pp. 1-12.

Boardman, J. 1972. “Herakles, Peisistratos, and Sons,” *AA* 1972, pp. 57-72.

Boardman, J. 1975. “Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis,” *JHS* 95, pp. 1-12.

Boardman, J. 1988. “Sex Differentiation in Grave Vases,” *AION* 10, pp. 171-179.

Boardman, J. 2001. *Greek Gems and Finger Rings: Early Bronze Age to Late Classical*, New York.

Boersma, J. 1970. *Athenian Building Policy From 561/0 to 405/4 B.C*, Groningen.

Bohen, B. 1997. "Aspects of Athenian Grave Cult in the Age of Homer," in *New Light on a Dark Age: Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, ed. S. H. Langdon, Columbia, MO, pp. 44-55.

Bohen, B. 1988. *Die Geometrischen Pyxiden*, Berlin.

Borgeaud, P. 1988. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*, Chicago.

Bourriot, F. 1976. *Recherches sur la Nature du Genos: Etude d'Histoire Sociale Athenienne, Periodes Archaique et Classique*, Lille.

Bouzek, J. 1974. *The Attic Dark Age Incised Ware*, Prague.

Bowden, H. 2003. "Oracles for Sale," in *Herodotus and His World: Essays From a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, ed. P. Derow, and R. Parker, Oxford; New York, pp. 256-274.

Brann, E. 1960. "Late Geometric Grave Groups From the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 29, pp. 402-416.

Brann, E. 1961a. "Late Geometric Well Groups From the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 30, pp. 93-146.

Brann, E. 1961b. "Protoattic Well Groups From the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 30, pp. 305-379.

Brann, E. T. H. 1962. *The Athenian Agora, Vol. 8. Late Geometric and Protoattic Pottery, Mid 8th to Late 7th Century B.C*, Princeton, N.J.

Brock, J. K., and G. Young 1949. "Excavations on Siphnos," *BSA* 44, pp. 1-92.

Broneer, O. 1942. "Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora," *Hesperia* 11, pp. 128-161.

Brookes, A. C. 1982. "The Chronology and Development of Daedalic Sculpture" (diss. University of Pennsylvania).

Brouskari, M. 1979. Από τον Αθηναϊκό Κεραμεικό του 8ου αι. π.Χ, Athens.

Brouskari, M. S. 1974. *The Acropolis Museum: A Descriptive Catalog*, Athens.

Brückner, A., and E. Pernice 1893. "Ein attischer Friedhof," *AM* 18, pp. 73-191.

Brulotte, E. L. 1994. "The Placement of Votive Offerings and Dedications in the Peloponnesian Sanctuaries of Artemis" (diss. University of Minnesota).

Brunnsåker, S. 1971. *The Tyrant-Slayers of Kritios and Nesiotes a Critical Study of the Sources and Restorations*, Stockholm.

Bundgaard, J. 1976. *Parthenon and the Mycenaean City on the Heights*, Copenhagen.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, Oxford.

Burkert, W. 1995. "Greek Poleis and Civic Cults: Some Further Thoughts," in *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, ed. M. H. Hansen, and K. Raaflaub, Stuttgart, pp. 201-210.

Burkert, W. 1996. "Greek Temple Builders: Who, Where and Why?," in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16-18 October 1992*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 21-29.

Burnett, A. P. 2003. "The First Tragic Contest: Revision Revised," in *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold on the Occasion of His Retirement and His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, ed. G. W. Bakewell, and J. P. Sickinger, Oxford, pp. 173-182.

Burr, D. 1933. "A Geometric House and a Proto-Attic Deposit," *Hesperia* 2, pp. 542-640.

Buschor, E. 1930. "Heraion von Samos: Frühe Bauten," *AM* 55, pp. 1-99.

Cadoux, T. J. 1948. "The Athenian Archons From Kreon to Hypsichides," *JHS* 68, pp. 70-123.

Callipolitis-Feytmans, D. 1963. "Tombes de Callithéa en Attique," *BCH* 87, pp. 404-413.

Callipolitis-Feytmans, D. 1965. *Les 'Louterias' Attiques*, Athens.

Camp, J. M. 1979. "A Drought in the Late Eighth Century B.C," *Hesperia* 48, pp. 397-411.

Camp, J. M. 1986. *The Athenian Agora. Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, London.

Camp, J. M. 1994. "Before Democracy: Alkmaionidai and Peisistratidai," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy: Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held At the American School of Classical Studies At Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, ed. W. D. E. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. L. J. Shear, A. Shapiro, and F. J. Frost, Oxford, pp. 7-12.

Camp, J. M. 2001. *The Archaeology of Athens*, New Haven; London.

Cannon, A. 2005. "Gender and Agency in Mortuary Fashion," in *Interacting With the Dead: Perspectives on Mortuary Archaeology for the New Millennium*, ed. G. F. M. Rakita, Gainesville, pp. 41-65.

Cannon, A. 1989. “The Historical Dimension in Mortuary Expressions of Status and Sentiment,” *Current Anthropology* pp. 437-458.

Carlier, P. 1984. *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg.

Casson, S., and D. L. B. Nicholson. 1912. *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum, Volume 2*, Cambridge.

Castriota, D. 1992. *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*, Madison, WI.

Catling, H. W. 1975. “Archaeology in Greece, 1975-76,” *AR* pp. 3-33.

Catling, H. W. 1976. “Excavations At the Menelaion, Sparta, 1973-1976,” *AR* pp. 24-42.

Catling, H. W., and H. Cavanagh 1976. “Two Inscribed Bronzes From the Menelaion,” *Kadmos* 15, pp. 145-157.

Cavanagh, W. G. 1977. “Attic Burial Customs, C. 2000-700 B.C.” (diss. University of London).

Cavanaugh, M. 1996. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion, and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C*, Atlanta.

Ceccarelli, P. 2004. “Dancing the *Pyrrhiche* in Athens,” in *Music and the Muses: The Culture of ‘Mousik*ē*’ in the Classical Athenian City*, ed. P. Murray, and P. Wilson, Oxford, pp. 91-117.

Chadwick, E. 1843. *Report on the Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain. A Supplementary Report on the Results of a Special Inquiry Into the Practice of Interment in Towns. Made At the Request of Her Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department*, London.

Cherici, A. 1989. “Granaî O Arnie? Considerazioni su una Classa Fittile Attica tra IX e VIII sec. A.C,” *RendLinc* 44, pp. 215-230.

Childs, W. A. P. 1994. “The Date of the Old Athena Temple,” in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy: Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held At the American School of Classical Studies At Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, ed. W. D. E. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. L. J. Shear, A. Shapiro, and F. J. Frost, Oxford, pp. 1-6.

Christiansen, J. 2000. *The Iron-Age Peak Sanctuary*, Marburg; Lahn.

Clinton, K. 1971. “Inscriptions From Eleusis,” *ArchEph* pp. 81-136.

Clinton, K. 1973. “Apollo, Pan, and Zeus, Avengers of Vultures: Agamemnon, 55-59,” *AJP* 94, pp. 282-288.

Clinton, K. 1974. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia.

Clinton, K. 1979. “*IG* i² 5, the Eleusinia, and the Eleusinians,” *AJP* 100, pp. 1-12.

Clinton, K. 1982. “The Nature of Late Fifth-Century Revision of the Athenian Law Code,” in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography: Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*, Princeton, N.J, pp. 27-37.

Clinton, K. 1987. “The Date of the Classical Telesterion At Eleusis,” in Φίλια Έπη εις Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνάν δια τα Εξήντα Έτη του Ανασκαφικού του Έργου II, pp. 254-262.

Clinton, K. 1992. *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Stockholm.

Clinton, K. 1993. “The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore At Eleusis,” in *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, ed. N. Marinatos, and R. Hägg, London; New York, pp. 110-124.

Clinton, K. 1994. “The Eleusinian Mysteries and Panhellenism in Democratic Athens,” in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy: Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held At the American School of Classical Studies At Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, ed. W. D. E. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. L. J. Shear, A. Shapiro, and F. J. Frost, Oxford, pp. 161-172.

Clinton, K. 2005. *Eleusis, the Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*, Athens.

Cohen, A. 1981. *The Politics of Elite Cultures: Explorations in the Dramaturgy of Power in Modern African Culture*, Berkeley.

Cohen, E. E. 1992. *Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective*, Princeton, N.J.

Coldstream, J. N. 1968. *Greek Geometric Pottery. A Survey of Ten Local Styles and Their Chronology*, London.

Coldstream, J. N. 1976. “Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer,” *JHS* 96, pp. 8-17.

Coldstream, J. N. 1995. “The Rich Lady of the Areiopagos and Her Contemporaries: A Tribute in Memory of Evelyn Lord Smithson,” *Hesperia* 64, pp. 391-403.

Coldstream, J. N. 2003. *Geometric Greece: 900-700 B.C.*, London.

Cole, S. G. 1984. “The Social Function of Rituals of Maturation: The Koureion and the Arkteia,” *ZPE* 55, pp. 233-244.

Cole, S. G. 1995. “Civic Cult and Civic Identity,” in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, ed. M. H. Hansen, Copenhagen, pp. 292-325.

Connelly, J. B. 2007. *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton.

Connor, W. R. 1990. “City Dionysia and the Athenian Democracy,” in *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, ed. W. R. Connor, M. H. Hansen, K. A. Raaflaub, and B. S. Strauss, Copenhagen, pp. 7-32.

Connor, W. R. 1993. “The Ionian Era of Athenian Civic Identity,” *PAPS* 137, pp. 194-206.

Connor, W. R. 1996. “Civil Society, Dionysiac Festival, and the Athenian Democracy,” in *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*, ed. J. Ober, and C. Hedrick, Princeton, N.J, pp. 217-226.

Conomis, N. C., K. F. Scheibe, and F. Blass. 1970. *Oratio in Leocratem, cum Ceterarum Lycurgi Orationum Fragmentis*, Leipzig.

Cook, A. B. 1914. *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, Cambridge.

Cook, J. M. 1962. *The Greeks in Ionia and the East*, London.

Cook, J. M. 1934. “Protoattic Pottery,” *BSA* 35, pp. 165-220.

Cook, J. M. 1952. “Archaeology in Greece, 1951,” *JHS* 72, pp. 92-112.

Cook, J. M. 1953. “The Agamemnoneion,” *BSA* 48, pp. 30-68.

Cornell, T. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome From the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (C. 1000-264 B.C.)*, London; New York.

Croissant, F. 1993. “Observations sur la Date et le Style du Fronton de la Gigantomachie,” *REA* 95, pp. 61-77.

Cromey, R. D. 1991. “History and Image: The Penelope Painter’s Akropolis (Louvre G372 and 480/79 B.C.),” *JHS* 111, pp. 165-174.

D’Agostino, B., and A. -M. D’Onofrio 1993. “Review: Ian Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State* (Cambridge,1987),” *Gnomon* 65, pp. 41-51.

D’Onofrio, A. -M. 1997. “The 7th Cent. B.C. In Attica: The Basis of Political Organization,” in *Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries B.C.*, ed. H. D. Anderson, H. W. Horsnaes, S. Houby-Nielsen, and A. Rathje, pp. 63-88.

Darque, P. 1981. “Les Vestiges Mycéniens Découverts sous le Télestérion d’Éleusis,” *BCH* 105, pp. 593-605.

Daux, G. 1960. *BCH* 84, p.658.

Daux, G. 1963. “La Grande Démarchie: Un Nouveau Calendrier Sacrificiel d’Attique (Erchia),” *BCH* 87, pp. 603-634.

Davaras, K., and N. Verdeles 1966. “Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀναβύσσου,” *ArchDelt* 21, pp. 97-98.

Davidson, G. 1952. *Corinth, Vol. 12. The Minor Objects*, Princeton.

Davies, J. K. 2007. “Pythios and Pythion: The Spread of a Cult Title,” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22, pp. 57-69.

Davison, J. A. 1958. “Notes on the Panathenaea,” *JHS* 78, pp. 23-42.

Davison, J. M. 1961. *Attic Geometric Workshops*, New Haven.

Desborough, V. R. d. A. 1972. *The Greek Dark Ages*, New York.

Desborough, V. R. d. A. 1952. *Protogeometric Pottery*, Oxford.

Detienne, M. 1981. “The ‘Sea-Crow’,” in *Myth, Religion and Society: Structuralist Essays*, ed. R. L. Gordon, Cambridge, pp. 16-42.

Detienne, M. 1989. “The Violence of Well-Born Ladies: Women in the Thesmophoria,” in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks*, ed. M. Detienne, and J. P. Vernant, Chicago, pp. 129-147.

Deubner, L. 1966. *Attische Feste*, Hildesheim.

Develin, R. 1989. *Athenian Officials, 684-321 B.C*, Cambridge.

Devillers, M. 1988. *An Archaic and Classical Votive Deposit From a Mycenaean Tomb At Thorikos*, Gent.

Diamant, S. 1982. “Theseus and the Unification of Attica,” in *Hesperia Suppl. 19: Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*, pp. 38-47.

Dillery, J. 2005. “Chresmologues and Manteis: Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority,” in *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination*, ed. S. I. Johnston, and P. T. Struck, Leiden; Boston, pp. 167-231.

Dinsmoor, W. 1934. “The Date of the Older Parthenon,” *AJA* 38, pp. 408-448.

Dinsmoor, W. 1947. “The Hekatompedon on the Athenian Akropolis,” *AJA* 51, pp. 109-151.

Dinsmoor, W. 1975. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of Its Historic Development*, New York.

Dinsmoor, W. 1980. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis. Volume One: The Predecessors*, Princeton, N.J.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1971. *Sounion*, Athens.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1935. "The Older Parthenon: Additional Notes," *AJA* 39, pp. 508-509.

Dodwell, E. 1819. *A Classical and Topographical Tour Through Greece, During the Years 1801, 1805, and 1806*, London.

Donlan, W. 1997. "The Relations of Power in the Pre-State and Early State Polities," in *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, ed. L. G. Mitchell, and P. J. Rhodes, London; New York, pp. 39-48.

Dörpfeld, W. 1885. "Der alte Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis zu Athen," *AM* 10, pp. 275-277.

Dörpfeld, W. 1886. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis," *AM* 11, pp. 337-351.

Dörpfeld, W. 1887a. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis II," *AM* 12, pp. 25-61.

Dörpfeld, W. 1887b. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis III," *AM* 12, pp. 190-211.

Dörpfeld, W. 1890. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis IV," *AM* 15, pp. 420-439.

Dörpfeld, W. 1897. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis V," *AM* 22, pp. 159-178.

Dörpfeld, W. 1935. "Parthenon I, II und III," *AJA* 39, pp. 497-507.

Dow, S. 1959. "The Law Codes of Athens," *Proceedings of Massachusetts Historical Society* 71, pp. 3-36.

Dow, S. 1960. "The Athenian Calendar of Sacrifices: The Chronology of Nikomakhos' Law Code," *Historia* 9, pp. 270-293.

Dow, S. 1961. "The Walls Inscribed With Nikomakhos' Law Code," *Hesperia* 30, pp. 58-73.

Dow, S. 1965. "The Greater Demarkia of Erkhia," *BCH* 89, pp. 180-213.

Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden: Girls' Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*, London.

Drerup, H. 1969. *Griechische Baukunst in geometrischer Zeit*, Göttingen.

Drews, R. 1983. *Basileus. The Evidence for Kingship in Geometric Greece*, New Haven.

Dunbabin, T. J. 1936. "Ἔχθρη Παλαίη," *BSA* 37, pp. 83-91.

Dunbabin, T. J. 1950. "An Attic Bowl," *BSA* 45, pp. 193-202.

Eder, W. 1992. "Polis und Politai. Die Auflösung des Adelsstaates und die Entwicklung des Polisbürgers," in *Euphronios - Maler Und Töpfer*, ed. W. -D. Heilmeyer, and I. Wehgartner, Berlin, pp. 24-38.

Edmonson, C. 1964. "Κοίτη Ἀκταίωνος," *JHS* 84, pp. 153-154.

Edmonson, C. 1968. "Brauronian Artemis in Athens," *AJA* 72, pp. 164-165.

Edwards, C. M. 1985. "Greek Votive Reliefs to Pan and the Nymphs" (diss. New York University).

Effenterre, H., and F. Ruze. 1994. *Nomima: Recueil d'Inscriptions Politiques et Juridiques de l'Archaïsme Grec*, Roma.

Eiteljorg, H. 1995. *The Entrance to the Athenian Acropolis Before Mnesicles*, Dubuque IA.

Eliot, C. W. J. 1962. *Coastal Demes of Attika. A Study of the Policy of Kleisthenes*, Toronto.

Ervin, M. 1958. "The Sanctuary of Aglauros on the South Slope of the Akropolis: And Its Destruction in the First Mithridatic War," *Archeion Pontou* 22, pp. 126-166.

Ervin, M. 1959. "Geraistai Nymphai Genethliai and the Hill of the Nymphs," *Platon* 11, pp. 146-159.

Eustratiou, K. 1991a. "Ο Ναός Της Ταυροπόλου Αρτέμιδος Στη Λούτσα," Αρχαιολογία 39, pp. 72-73.

Eustratiou, K. 1991b. "Ο Ιερό Της Αρτέμιδος Στη Βραυρώνα," Αρχαιολογία 39, pp. 74-82.

Fagerström, K. 1988a. "Finds, Function and Plan: Iron Age Nichoria," *OpAth* 17, pp. 33-50.

Fagerström, K. 1988b. *Greek Iron Age Architecture. Developments Through Changing Times*, Göteborg.

Faraone, C. 2003. "Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis: Female Initiation Or Substitute Sacrifice?," in *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*, ed. D. Dodds, and C. Faraone, London and New York, pp. 43-68.

Feaver, D. 1957. "Historical Development in the Priesthoods of Athens," *YCS* 15, pp. 123-158.

Ferguson, W. 1932. *The Treasurers of Athena*, Cambridge, MA.

Ferguson, W. S. 1938. "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion," *Hesperia* 7, pp. 1-68.

Ferrari, G. 2002. "The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis At Athens," *AJA* 106, pp. 11-35.

Figueira, T. 1985. "Herodotus on the Early Hostilities Between Aegina and Athens," *AJP* pp. 49-74.

Figueira, T. 1998. *The Power of Money: Coinage and Politics in the Athenian Empire*, Philadelphia.

Figueira, T. J. 1986. "Xanthippos, Father of Perikles, and the "Prutaneis" of the "Naukraroi"," *Historia* 35, pp. 257-279.

Filis, K. 1994. *ArchDelt* 49, pp. 71-73.

Filis, K. 1997. *ArchDelt* 52, pp. 90-92.

Fingarette, A. 1971. "A New Look At the Wall of Nikomakhos," *Hesperia* 40, pp. 330-335.

Finley, M. I. 1981. *Early Greece: The Bronze and Archaic Ages*, New York.

Foley, H. P. 1994. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays*, Princeton, N.J.

Fontenrose, J. 1948. "The Sorrows of Ino and of Procne," *TAPA* 79, pp. 125-167.

Fontenrose, J. E. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle, Its Responses and Operations, With a Catalogue of Responses*, Berkeley.

Fornara, C. 1971. *The Athenian Board of Generals From 501 to 404*, Wiesbaden.

Fornara, C. W. 1970. "The Cult of Harmodios and Aristogeiton," *Philologus* 114, pp. 155-180.

Fornara, C. W., and L. J. Samons. 1991. *Athens From Cleisthenes to Pericles*, Berkeley.

Freitag, K., P. Funke, and M. Haake. 2006. *Kult, Politik, Ethnos: Überregionale Heiligtümer im Spannungsfeld von Kult und Politik : Kolloquium, Münster, 23.-24. November 2001*, Stuttgart.

French, E. B. 1989. "Archaeology in Greece 1989-1990," *AR* 36, pp. 2-82.

Freytag, B. 1974. "Ein spätgeometrisches Frauengrab vom Kerameikos," *AM* 89, pp. 1-25.

Frost, F. J. 1990. “Peisistratos, the Cults, and the Unification of Attica,” *Ancient World* 21, pp. 3-9.

Frost, F. J. 2005. *Politics and the Athenians: Essays on Athenian History and Historiography*, Toronto.

Frost, F. J. 1984. “The Athenian Military Before Cleisthenes,” *Historia* 33, pp. 233-294.

Frost, F. J. 1996. “Faith, Authority, and History in Early Athens,” in *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993*, ed. P. Hellström, and B. Alroth, Uppsala Stockholm, pp. 83-90.

Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. 1864. *The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome*, Baltimore.

Gadbery, L. M. 1992. “The Sanctuary of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora: A Revised View,” *Hesperia* 61, pp. 447-489.

Gadolou, A. 1996. “Χάλκινα καὶ Σιδερένια Ὅπλα ἀπὸ τὸ Ἱερὸ στὸ Ἄνω Μαζαράκι (Ρακίτα) Ἀχαΐας,” Πρακτικά του Ε΄Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακών Σπουδών 2, pp. 51-72.

Gagarin, M. 1981a. *Drakon and Early Athenian Homicide Law*, New Haven.

Gagarin, M. 1981b. “The Thesmothetai and the Earliest Athenian Tyranny Law,” *TAPA* 111, pp. 71-77.

Gallia, A. B. 2004. “The Republication of Draco’s Law on Homicide,” *CQ* 54, pp. 451-460.

Garland, R. 1984. “Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens,” *BSA* 79, pp. 75-123.

Garland, R. 1989. “Review: Burial and the Polis,” *CR* 39, pp. 66-67.

Garland, R. 1990. “Priests and Power in Classical Athens,” in *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. M. Beard, and J. A. North, Ithaca, N.Y, pp. 75-91.

Garland, R. 1992. *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*, Ithaca, N.Y.

Garland, R. 1996. “Strategies of Religious Intimidation and Coercion in Classical Athens,” in *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993*, ed. P. Hellström, and B. Alroth, Uppsala Stockholm, pp. 83-90.

Gawlinski, L. 2007. “The Athenian Calendar of Sacrifices: A New Fragment From the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 76, pp. 37-55.

Geddes, A. G. 1987. “Rags and Riches: The Costume of Athenian Men in the Fifth Century,” *CQ* pp. 307-331.

Gentili, B., and F. Perusino, eds. 2002. *Le Orse di Brauron: Un Rituale di Iniziazione Femminile nel Santuario di Artemide*, Pisa.

Giraud, D. 1991. Ἐλεύσις, Ἡ Κυρία Ἐίσοδος τοῦ Ἱεροὺ τῆς Ἐλευσίνος, Athens.

Goette, H. R. 1995. “Studien zur historischen landeskunde Attikas 4: Der Hügel der Panagia Thiti bei Vari und seine Inschriften,” *AM* 109, pp. 235-246.

Goette, H. R. 2000. Ὁ Ἀξιόλογος Δῆμος Σούνιον*: Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika*, Rahden/Westf.

Goette, H. R. 2005, “Überlegungen zur Topothese von Gebäuden im antiken Brauron,” *AA*, pp. 25-38.

Goldhill, S., and R. Osborne, eds. 1999. *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge.

Goldstein, L. 1980. *Mississippian Mortuary Practices: A Case Study of Two Cemeteries in the Lower Illinois Valley*, Evanston, Ill.

Gomme, A. 2003. *Introducton and Commentary on Book I*, Oxford.

Gorton, A. F. 1996. *Egyptian and Egyptianizing Scarabs. A Typology of Steatite, Faience, and Paste Scarabs From Punic and Other Mediterranean Sites*, Oxford.

Graef, B., and E. Langlotz. 1909. *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen*, Berlin.

Hägg, R. 1987. “Gifts to the Heroes in Geometric and Archaic Greece,” in *Gifts to the gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985*, ed. T. Linders, and G. Nordquist, Uppsala, pp. 93-99.

Hall, J. 1995. “How Argive Was the “Argive” Heraion? The Political and Cultic Geography of the Argive Plain, 900-400 B. C.,” *AJA* 99, pp. 577-613.

Hall, J. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.

Hall, J. 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago.

Hamilton, R. 1989. “Alkman and the Athenian Arkteia,” *Hesperia* 58, pp. 449-472.

Hammer, D. C. 1997. “”Who Shall Readily Obey?”: Authority and Politics in the “Iliad”,” *Phoenix* 51, pp. 1-24.

Hanfmann, G. 1962. “A Syrian From Sounion,” *Hesperia* 31, pp. 236-237.

Hansen, M. 1990. “Solonian Democracy in Fourth-Century Athens,” in *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, ed. W. R. Connor, M. H. Hansen, K. A. Raaflaub, and B. S. Strauss, Copenhagen, pp. 71-99.

Hansen, M. 2006. *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*, Oxford.

Hansen, M., and T. H. Nielsen. 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford.

Harris-Cline, D. 1999. “Archaic Athens and the Topography of the Kylon Affair,” *BSA* 94, pp. 309-320.

Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass.; London.

Harrison, E. 1965. *Athenian Agora Vol. 11. Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture*, Princeton, N.J.

Hayashi, T. 1992. *Bedeutung und Wandel des Triptolemosbildes vom 6.-4. Jrh. v. Chr.*, Würzburg.

Hedreen, G. 1991. “The Cult of Achilles in the Euxine,” *Hesperia* pp. 313-330.

Hellström, P., and B. Alroth. 1996. *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993*, Uppsala Stockholm.

Henrichs, A. 2003. “Writing Religion: Inscribed Texts, Ritual Authority, and the Religious Discourse of the Polis,” in *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, ed. H. Yunis, Cambridge, U.K.; New York, pp. 38-58.

Herington, C. J. 1955. *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias. A Study in the Religion of Periclean Athens*, Manchester.

Hignett, C. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C*, Oxford.

Hirvonen, K. 1968. *Matriarchal Survivals and Certain Trends in Homer’s Female Characters*, Helsinki.

Höckmann, U. 1991. “Zeus besiegt Typhon,” *AA* 1991, pp. 11-23.

Hollinshead, M. 1980. “Legend, Cult, and Architecture At Three Sanctuaries of Artemis” (diss. Bryn Mawr College).

Hood, M. 1959. *AR* p.8.

Hopper, R. J. 1963. “Athena and the Early Acropolis,” *Greece Rome* pp. 1-16.

Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. 1*, Oxford.

Houby-Nielson, S. 1992. “Interaction Between Chieftans and Citizens? 7th Cent. B.C. Burial Customs in Athens,” in *Ancient Portraiture: Image and Message*, ed. T. Fischer-Hansen, Copenhagen, pp. 343-374.

Houby-Nielson, S. 1995. “’Burial Language’ in Archaic and Classical Kerameikos,” *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens* 1, pp. 129-191.

Houby-Nielson, S. 1996. “The Archaeology of Ideology in the Kerameikos,” in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16-18 October 1992*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm, pp. 41-54.

Humphreys, S. C. 1978. *Anthropology and the Greeks*, London; Boston.

Humphreys, S. C. 1980. “Forward,” in *The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome*, Baltimore, pp. 15-23.

Humphreys, S. C. 1983. “Fustel De Coulanges and the Greek Genos,” *Sociologia del diritto* 8, pp. 35-44.

Humphreys, S. C. 1988. “The Discourse of Law in Archaic and Classical Greece,” *Law and History Review* 6, pp. 465-493.

Humphreys, S. C. 1990a. “Phrateres in Alopeke, and the Salaminioi,” *ZPE* 83, pp. 243-248.

Humphreys, S. C. 1990b. “Review: Ian Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State* (Cambridge,1987),” *Helios* 17, pp. 263-268.

Humphreys, S. C. 1980. “Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition Or Traditionalism?,” *JHS* pp. 96-126.

Hurwit, J. 1989. “The Kritios Boy: Discovery, Reconstruction, and Date,” *AJA* 93, pp. 41-80.

Hurwit, J. M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology From the Neolithic Era to the Present*, Cambridge.

Iakovides, S. 2006. *The Mycenaean Acropolis of Athens*, Athens.

Jacoby, F. 1902. “Die attische Königsliste,” *Klio* 2, pp. 406-439.

Jacoby, F. 1944. “Γενέσια: A Forgotten Festival of the Dead,” *CQ* 38, pp. 65-75.

Jacoby, F. 1949. *Atthis, the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford.

Jacoby, F. 1954. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: Dritter Teil, Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern. Supplement: A Commentary on the Ancient Historians of Athens (Nos. 323a-334)*, Leiden.

Jahn, O., and A. Michaelis. 1901. *Arx Athenarum a Pausania Descripta*, Bonnae.

Jameson, M. 1965. "The Sacrificial Calendar From Erchia," *BCH* 89, pp. 154-172.

Jameson, M. 1999. "The Spectacular and the Obscure in Athenian Religion," in *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, ed. S. Goldhill, and R. Osborne, Cambridge, pp. 321-340.

Jameson, M., D. Jordan, and R. Kotansky. 1993. *A Lex Sacra From Selinous*, Durham N.C.

Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and Its Development From the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.*, Oxford.

Jeffery, L. H. 1948. "The Boustrophedon Sacral Inscriptions From the Agora," *Hesperia* 17, pp. 86-111.

Jenkins, R. J. H. 1936. *Dedalica. A Study of Dorian Plastic Art in the Seventh Century B. C*, Cambridge.

Jordan, B. 1979. *Servants of the Gods: A Study in the Religion, History and Literature of Fifth-Century Athens*, Göttingen.

Judeich, W. 1931. *Topographie on Athen*, Munchen.

Kahil, L. 1963. "Quelques Vases du Sanctuaire d'Artémis à Brauron," *AntK* Suppl. 1, pp. 5-29.

Kahil, L. 1965. "Autour de l'Artemis Attique," *AntK* 8, pp. 20-33.

Kahil, L. 1977. "L'Artemis de Bravron: Rites et Mystere," *AntK* 20, pp. 86-98.

Kahil, L. 1981. "Le "Craterisque" D'Artemis et le Brauronion de l'Acropole," *Hesperia* 50, pp. 253-263.

Kakavoyanni, O. 1984. "Ανάβυσσος: Οικισμός Ατε," *ArchDelt* 39, pp. 43-45.

Kakavoyanni, O. 1986. "Δύο Νέα Μνημεία Υστεροαρχαϊκής Πλαστικής από τις Πρασιές," in *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik: Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums, vom 22.-25. April 1985 in Athen. Vol. 1*, ed. H. Kyrieleis, Mainz am Rhein, pp. 171-175.

Kakavoyanni, O. 1987. "Παλαιά Φώκαια," *ArchDelt* 42, pp. 96-97.

Kallet-Marx, L. 1989. “Did Tribute Fund the Parthenon?,” *ClAnt* 8, pp. 252-266.

Kandara, C. 1960. “Πυκινός Δόμος και Παναθηναϊός Πέπλος. Ο Πυκινός Δόμος του Ερεχθείου,” *ArchEph* pp. 165-184.

Kavoulaki, A. 1999. “Processional Performance and the Democratic Polis,” in *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, ed. S. Goldhill, and R. Osborne, Cambridge, pp. 293-320.

Kearns, E. 1985. “Change and Continuity in Religious Structures After Cleisthenes,” in *Crux. Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. De Ste. Croix on His 75th Birthday*, ed. P. A. Cartledge, and F. D. Harvey, London, pp. 189-207.

Kearns, E. 1995. “Order, Interaction, Authority: Ways of Looking At Greek Religion,” in *The Greek World*, ed. A. Powell, London; New York, pp. 511-529.

Keesling, C. M. 2005. “Patrons of Athenian Votive Monuments of the Archaic and Classical Periods: Three Studies,” *Hesperia* 74, pp. 395-426.

Kiilerich, B. 1988. “Bluebeard – a Snake-Tailed Geryon?,” *OpAth* 17, pp. 123-136.

Kindt, J. 2009. “Polis Religion – a Critical Appreciation,” *Kernos* 22, pp. 1-21.

Kirchner, J. -S., and S. Dow 1937. “Inschriften Vom Attischen Lande,” *AM* 62, pp. 1-12.

Kirk, G. S. 1949. “Ships on Geometric Vases,” *BSA* 44, pp. 93-153.

Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I, Books 1-4*, Cambridge; New York.

Kissas, K. 2008. *Archaische Architektur Der Athener Akropolis: Dachziegel, Metopen, Geisa, Akroterbasen*, Wiesbaden.

Klein, N. 1991. “The Origin of the Doric Order on the Mainland of Greece: Form and Function of the Geison in the Archaic Period” (diss. Bryn Mawr).

Knigge, U. 1980. *Rundbauten im Kerameikos*, Berlin.

Koerner, R. 1993. *Inschriftliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis*, Köln.

Kokkou-Vyridi, K. 1999. Πρώιμες Πυρές Θυσιών στο Τελεστήριο της Ελευσίνας, Athens.

Kolb, F. 1977. “Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden,” *JdI* 92, pp. 99-138.

Kolb, F. 1981. *Agora und Theater: Volks- und Festversammlung*, Berlin.

Kontis, J. 1967. “ Άρτεμις Βραυρωνία,” *ArchDelt* 22, pp. 156-206.

Korres, M. 1995. *From Pentelicon to the Parthenon: The Ancient Quarries and the Story of a Half-Worked Column Capital of the First Marble Parthenon*, Athens.

Korres, M. 1994. “The History of the Acropolis Monuments,” in *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, ed. R. Economakis, London, pp. 35-51.

Korres, M. 1992. “From Stavros to the Ancient Agora,” ΗΟΡΟΣ 10-12, pp. 83-104.

Kourouniotes, K., and J. Travlos 1937. “Ἀνασκαφὴ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι,” *Prakt* pp. 42-52.

Kourouniotes, K., and J. Travlos 1938. “Ἀνασκαφὴ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι,” *Prakt* pp. 35-40.

Kourouniotes, K. 1927. “Τὸ Ἱερὸν τοῦ Απόλλωνος τοῦ Ζωστῆρος,” *ArchDelt* 11, pp. 8-53.

Kourouniotes, K. 1940a. “Ἀνασκαφὴ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι,” *Prakt* pp. 15-16.

Kourouniotes, K. 1940b. “Συμβολή εις την Ιστορίαν της Ελευσινιακής Λατρείας,” *PraktAkAth* 15, pp. 272-278.

Kowalzig, B. 2007. *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Oxford.

Krause, G. 1975. *Untersuchungen zu den ältesten Nekropolen am Eridanos in Athen*, Hamburg.

Krentz, P. 2007. “The Oath of Marathon, Not Plataia?,” *Hesperia* 76, pp. 731-742.

Kroeber, A. L. 1927. “Disposal of the Dead,” *American Anthropologist* pp. 308-315.

Kübler, K. 1943. *Kerameikos 4. Die Nekropole des 11. bis 10. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin.

Kübler, K. 1954. *Kerameikos 5.1. Die Nekropole des 10. bis 8. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin.

Kübler, K. 1959. *Kerameikos 6.2. Die Nekropole des späten 8. bis Frühen 6. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin.

Küpper, M. 1990. “Frühattische ‘Stempelidole’ von Kiapha Thiti,” in *Kiapha Thiti: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen III.2*, Marburg, pp. 17-29.

Kurtz, D. C., and J. Boardman. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs*, Ithaca, N.Y.

Kyle, D. G. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, Leiden.

Kyle, D. G. 2007. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*, Oxford.

Lalonde, G. V. 2006. *Horos Dios. An Athenian Shrine and Cult of Zeus*, Leiden; Boston.

Lalonde, G. V. 1968. “A Fifth Century Heiron Southwest of the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 37, pp. 123-133.

Lambert, S. D. 1993. *The Phratries of Attica*, Ann Arbor.

Lambert, S. D. 1999. “*IG* ii^2 2345, Thiasoi of Herakles and the Salaminioi Again,” *ZPE* 125, pp. 93-130.

Lambert, S. D. 2002. “Pererga III: The Genesia, Basile and Epops Again,” *ZPE* 139, pp. 75-82.

Lambert, S. D. 1997. “The Attic Genos Salaminioi and the Island of Salamis,” *ZPE* 119, pp. 85-106.

Lambert, S. D. 1999. “The Attic Genos,” *CQ* 49, pp. 484-489.

Lambert, S. D. 2002. “The Sacrificial Calendar At Athens,” *BSA* 97, pp. 353-399.

Lang, F. 1996. *Archaische Siedlungen in Griechland: Struktur und Entwicklung*, Berlin.

Lang, M. L. 1961. “Epigraphical Note,” *AJA* 65, p.62.

Langdon, M. 1997. “Cult in Iron Age Attica,” in *New Light on a Dark Age: Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, ed. S. H. Langdon, Columbia, MO, pp. 113-124.

Langdon, M. K. 1976. *Hesperia Supplement 16: A Sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Hymettos*, Princeton, N.J.

Langdon, S. 1993. “The Rituals of Death,” in *From Pasture to Polis: Art in the Age of Homer*, ed. S. H. Langdon, Columbia, pp. 83-87.

Langdon, S. 2003. “Views of Wealth, a Wealth of Views: Grave Goods in Iron Age Attica,” paper, Cambridge, Mass, 2003.

Lardinois, A. 2006. “Have We Solon’s Verses?,” in *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, ed. J. Blok, and A. Lardinois, Leiden; Boston, pp. 15-35.

Larson, J. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*, Oxford.

Larson, J. 2007. *Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide*, New York.

Lauter, H. 1985a. *Der Kultplatz auf dem Turkovuni*, Berlin.

Lauter, H. 1985b. *Lathuresa: Beiträge zur Architektur und Siedlungsgeschichte in spätgeometrische Zeit*, Mainz am Rhein.

Hanauer, R., G. v. Alberti, and W. Böser, eds. 1986. *Ein attisches Höhenheiligtum bei Varkiza*, Karlsruhe.

Lavelle, B. 1985. “Hipparchos’ Herms,” *Echoes du Monde Classique* 4, pp. 411-420.

Leahy, D. 1958. “The Spartan Defeat At Orchomenos,” *Phoenix* 12, pp. 141-165.

Lemos, I. S. 2002. *The Protogeometric Aegean: The Archaeology of the Late Eleventh and Tenth Centuries B.C*, Oxford; New York.

Lévy, E. 1978. “Notes sur la Chronologie Athénienne au Vie Siècle,” *Historia* 27, pp. 513-521.

Lewis, D. M. 1954. “Notes on Attic Inscriptions,” *BSA* 49, pp. 17-50.

Lipka, M. 1998. “Anmerkungen zur Hekatompedon-Inschrift: Eine Revision,” *ZPE* pp. 79-80.

Liston, M., and J. K. Papadopoulos 2004. “The “Rich Athenian Lady” Was Pregnant: The Anthropology of a Geometric Tomb Reconsidered,” *Hesperia* 73, pp. 7-38.

Lohmann, H. 1993. Ατήνη. *Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*, Köln.

Lolling, H. G. 1880. *Das Kuppelgrab bei Menidi*, Athens.

Lorimer, H. L. 1950. *Homer and the Monuments*, London.

Luyster, R. 1965. “Symbolic Elements in the Cult of Athena,” *History of Religions* 5, pp. 133-163.

MacDonald, W. A., W. D. E. Coulson, and J. Rosser. 1983. *Excavations At Nichoria in Southwest Greece 3. Dark Age and Byzantine Occupation*, Minneapolis.

Mann, M. 1986. *The Sources of Social Power. Vol. I*, Cambridge.

Manville, P. B. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*, Princeton, N.J.

Marconi, C. 2007. *Temple Decoration and Cultural Identity in the Archaic Greek World: The Metopes of Selinus*, Cambridge.

Marinatos, N. 1941. “Cult of Cretan Caves,” *Review of Religion* 5, pp. 123-136.

Marinatos, N. 2002. “The Arkteia and the Gradual Transformation of the Maiden Into a Woman,” in *Le Orse di Brauron: Un Rituale di Iniziazione Femminile nel Santuario di Artemide*, ed. B. Gentili, and F. Perusino, Pisa, pp. 29-42, 207-209.

Mark, I. S. 1993. *Hesperia Supplement 26: The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural Stages and Chronology*, Princeton, N.J.

Marszal, J. 1997. “The Sculptural Program of the Old Athena Temple At Athens,” *AJA* 101, p.346 (abstract).

Mastrokostas, E. 1983. “Αλάβαστρα του 700 π.Χ. εκ της Ανασκαφής του Βωμού του Διός στην Κορυφή της Πάρνηθος,” *ASAtene* 45, pp. 339-344.

Matthaiou, A. 2003. “Ἀπόλλων δ᾽Ἥλιος ἐν Ἀθήναις,” in *Lettered Attica: A Day of Attic Epigraphy. Proceedings of the Athens Symposium, March 2000*, ed. D. Jordan, and J. Traill, Athens, pp. 85-93.

Maurizio, L. 1997. “Delphic Oracles as Oral Performances: Authenticity and Historical Evidence,” *ClAnt* 16, pp. 308-334.

McInerney, J. 1999. *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*, Austin.

McInerney, J. 2001. "Ethnos and Ethnicity in Early Greece," in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, ed. I. Malkin, Washington, D.C.; London,

Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford.

Meiggs, R., and D. M. Lewis. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C*, Oxford.

Meritt, B., H. Wade-Gery, and M. McGregor. 1950. *The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. 3*, Princeton N.J.

Meritt, B. D. 1936. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 5, pp. 355-430.

Mersch, A. 1996. *Studien zur Siedlungsgeschichte Attikas von 950 bis 400 v. Chr.*, Frankfurt.

Mersch, A. 1997. "Urbanization of the Attic Countryside From the Late 8th Cent. To the 6th Cent," in *Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th Centuries Bc*, ed. H. D. Anderson, H. W. Horsnaes, S. Houby-Nielsen, and A. Rathje, pp. 45-62.

Miles, M. M. 1989. "A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis At Rhamnous," *Hesperia* 58, pp. 133-249.

Miles, M. M. 1998. *The Athenian Agora, Vol. 31. The City Eleusinion*, Princeton, N.J.

Miller, S. G. 1995. "Architecture as Evidence for the Identity of the Early Polis," in *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, ed. M. H. Hansen, Copenhagen, pp. 201-242.

Mitsos, M. 1957. "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν," *ArchEph* pp. 44-49.

Moggi, M. 1976. *I Sinecismi Interstatali Greci*, Pisa.

Mondi, R. 1980. "Σκηπτούχοι Βασιλείς. Divine Kingship in Early Greece," *Arethusa* 13, pp. 203-216.

Moore, M. 2004. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Fasc. 5: Greek Geometric and Protoattic Pottery*, New York.

Moore, M. B. 1995. " The Central Group in the Gigantomachy of the Old Athena Temple on the Acropolis," *AJA* 99, pp. 633-639.

Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century Bc*, Cambridge; New York.

Morgan, C. 1991. "Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives," *PCPS* 37, pp. 131-163.

Morgan, C. 2003. *Early Greek States Beyond the Polis*, London; New York.

Morgan, C., and T. Whitelaw 1991. "Pots and Politics: Ceramic Evidence for the Rise of the Argive State," *AJA* 95, pp. 79-108.

Morgan, C. H. 1935. "The Terracotta Figurines From the North Slope of the Acropolis," *Hesperia* 4, pp. 189-213.

Morris, I. 1987. *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State*, Cambridge; New York.

Morris, I. 1988. "Tomb Cult and the 'Greek Renaissance': The Past in the Present in the 8th Century Bc," *Antiquity* 62, pp. 750-761.

Morris, I. 1991. "The Archaeology of Ancestors: The Saxe/Goldstein Hypothesis Revisited," *CAJ* 1, pp. 147-169.

Morris, I. 1993. "Response to Papadopoulos (I): The Kerameikos Stratigraphy and the Character of the Greek Dark Age," *JMA* 6, pp. 207-221.

Morris, I. 1995. "Burning the Dead in Archaic Athens: Animals, Men and Heroes," in *Culture et Cité: L'Avènement d'Athénes à l'Époque Archaïque: Actes du Colloque International Organisé à l'Université Libre de Bruxelles du 25 Au 27 Avril 1991 par l'Institut des Hautes Études de Belgique et la Fondation Archéologique de L'U.L.B*, ed. A. Verbanck-Piérard, and D. Viviers, Bruxelles, pp. 45-74.

Morris, I. 1998. "*Burial and Ancient Society* After Ten Years," in *Nécropoles et Pouvoir*, ed. S. Marchegay, M. -T. Couiloud, and J. -F. Salles, Lyon and Paris, pp. 21-36.

Morris, I. 1999. "Iron Age Greece and the Meanings of 'Princely Tombs'," in *Les Princes de la Protohistoire et l'Émergence de l'Etat: Actes de la Table Ronde Internationale Organisée par le Centre Jean Bérard et l'Ecole Franðaise de Rome, Naples, 27-29 Octobre 1994*, ed. P. Ruby, Naples, Rome, pp. 57-80.

Morris, S. P. 1992. *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, Princeton, N.J.

Morris, S. P. 1984. *The Black and White Style: Athens and Aigina in the Orientalizing Period*, New Haven.

Morris, S. P., and J. K. Papadopoulos 2004. "Of Granaries and Games: Egyptian Stowaways in an Athenian Chest," *Hesperia Supplement* 33, pp. 225-242.

Morrison, J. 1968. *Greek Oared Ships, 900-322 B.C.*, London.

Munn, M. H., and M. L. Zimmerman Munn. 1990. "On the Frontiers of Attica and Boiotia: The Results of the Stanford Skourta Plain Project," in *Essays in the Topography, History and Culture of Boiotia*, ed. A. Schachter, Montreal, pp. 32-40.

Murray, O. 1983. “The Symposion as Social Organisation,” in *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C. Tradition and Innovation: Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1-5 June, 1981*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm Lund, Sweden, pp. 195-199.

Mussche, H. 1974. *Thorikos: A Guide to the Excavations*, Brussels.

Mussche, H. 1998. *Thorikos: A Mining Town in Ancient Attika*, Gent.

Mylonas, G. E. 1953. “Ἀνασκαφὴ Νεκροταφείου Ἐλευσῖνος,” *Prakt* pp. 77-87.

Mylonas, G. E. 1966. “Ο Ϝάναξ τῶν Πινακίδων,” *ArchEph* pp. 127-148.

Mylonas, G. E., and K. Kourouniotes 1933. “Excavations At Eleusis, 1932 Preliminary Report,” *AJA* 37, pp. 271-286.

Mylonas, G. E., and J. Travlos 1952. “Ἀνασκαφὴ ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι,” *Prakt* pp. 53-72.

Mylonas, G. E. 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton, N.J.

Mylonas, G. E. 1966. *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*, Princeton, N.J.

Mylonopoulos, J. 2006. “Greek Sanctuaries as Places of Communication Through Rituals: An Archaeological Perspective,” in *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. E. Stavrianopoulou, Liège, pp. 69-110.

Neils, J., ed. 1992. Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens, Princeton N.J.

Neils, J. 1992. “The Panathenaia: An Introduction,” in *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, ed. J. Neils, Princeton N.J, pp. 13-27.

Neils, J. 1994. “The Panathenaia and Kleisthenic Ideology,” in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica Under the Democracy: Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held At the American School of Classical Studies At Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, ed. W. D. E. Coulson, O. Palagia, T. L. J. Shear, A. Shapiro, and F. J. Frost, Oxford, pp. 151-160.

Neils, J., ed. 1996. *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, Madison.

Neils, J., and S. Tracy. 2004. *Athenian Agora Picture Book 25: The Games At Athens*, Princeton.

Nelson, M. 2006. “The Phantom Stelai of Lysias, Against Nicomachus 17,” *CQ* 56, pp. 309-312.

Németh, G. 1997. *Hekatompedon: Studies in Greek Epigraphy*, Debrecen.

Nicholls, R. V. 1991. “The Early Bejewelled Lady of the Acropolis,” in *Classical Gold Jewellery and the Classical Tradition: Papers in Honour of R.A. Higgins*, ed. J. Ogden, and D. Wakeling, pp. 23-28.

Nilsson, M. P. 1967. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, München.

Nilsson, M. P. 1950. *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and Its Survival in Greek Religion*, Lund.

Noack, F. 1927. *Eleusis, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtumes*, Berlin.

Nylander, C. 1962. “Die Sog. Mykenischen Säulenbasen auf der Akropolis in Athen,” *OpAth* 4, pp. 31-77.

Oikonomakou, M. 1994. “Ἀνάβυσσος, Τρύπια Κορυφή Ἡ Σουβλερό,” *ArchDelt* 49, pp. 67-68.

Oikonomides, A. N. 1964. *The Two Agoras in Ancient Athens: A New Commentary on Their History and Development, Topography and Monuments*, Chicago.

Oikonomos, G. 1939. “Η επί της Ακροπόλεως Λατρεία της Αθηνάς Νίκης,” *ArchEph* pp. 105-107.

Oliver, J. 1950. *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law*, Baltimore.

Oliver, J. H., and S. Dow 1935. “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 4, pp. 5-90.

Orlandini, P. 1960. “Μυρρινοῦς (Μερέντα),” *Ergon* pp. 30-37.

Osborne, M. J. 1993. “Competitive Festivals and the Polis: A Context for Dramatic Festivals At Athens,” in *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis: Papers From the Greek Drama Conference : Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990*, ed. A. Sommerstein, S. Halliwell, J. Henderson, and B. Zimmerman, Bari, pp. 21-38.

Osborne, R. 1987. *Classical Landscape With Figures: The Ancient Greek City and Its Countryside*, New York.

Osborne, R. 1989. “A Crisis in Archaeological History? The Seventh Century B.C. In Attica,” *BSA* 84, pp. 297-322.

Osborne, R. 1993. “Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece,” *CQ* 43, pp. 392-405.

Osborne, R. 1994. “Archaeology, the Salaminioi, and the Politics of Sacred Space in Archaic Attica,” in *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, ed. S. E. Alcock, and R. Osborne, Oxford, pp. 142-160.

Osborne, R. 1996. *Greece in the Making, 1200-479 B.C.*, New York.

Ostwald, M. 1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law*, Berkeley.

Padgett, J. M. 1993. “Granary Models,” in *From Pasture to Polis: Art in the Age of Homer*, ed. S. H. Langdon, Columbia, pp. 72-73.

Padgug, R. A. 1972. “Eleusis and the Unification of Attika,” *GRBS* 13, pp. 135-150.

Palagia, O. 1993. *The Pediments of the Parthenon*, Leiden.

Palaiokrassa, L. 1989. “Neue Befunde aus dem Heiligtum des Artemis Munichia,” *AM* 104, pp. 1-40.

Palaiokrassa, L. 1991a. Το Ιερό της Αρτέμιδος Μουνιχίας, Athens.

Palaiokrassa, L. 1991b. “Το Ιερό της Αρτέμιδος Μουνιχίας,” Αρχαιολογία 39, pp. 91-96.

Papadimitriou, J. 1963. “The Sanctuary of Artemis At Brauron,” *Scientific American* 208/6, pp. 111-120.

Papadopoulos, J. K. 1993. “To Kill a Cemetery: The Athenian Kerameikos and the Early Iron Age,” *JMA* 6, pp. 175-206.

Papadopoulos, J. K. 2003. *Hesperia Supplement 31. Ceramicus Redivivus: The Early Iron Age Potters’ Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora*, Princeton, N.J.

Papazarkadas, N. 2007. “*IG* ii² 2490, the Epakreis and the Pre-Cleisthenic Trittyes,” *CQ* 57, pp. 22-32.

Parke, H. W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, Ithaca, N.Y.

Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.

Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.

Parker, R. 2004a. “Controlling Religion: Greece,” in *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*, ed. S. I. Johnston, Cambridge, Mass, pp. 570-572.

Parker, R. 2004b. “Religion and Politics,” in *Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*, ed. S. I. Johnston, Cambridge, Mass, pp. 556-558.

Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford.

Patterson, C. 2006. “Citizen Cemeteries’ in Classical Athens?,” *CQ* 56, pp. 48-56.

Payne, H. 1962. *Perachora: The Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Limenia. Vol. 2*, Oxford.

Pelon, O. 1976. *Tholoi, Tumuli, et Cercles Funéraires. Recherches sur les Monuments Funéraires de Plan Circulaire dans l’Egée de l’Age du Bronze, 3e et 2e Millénaires av. J.-C.*, Paris.

Pemberton, E. G. 1989. *Corinth Vol. 18.1: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: The Greek Pottery*, Princeton, N.J.

Pendlebury, J. D. S. 1930. *Aegyptiaca. A Catalogue of Egyptian Objects in the Aegean Area*, Cambridge.

Penrose, F. C. 1887. "Excavations in Greece, 1886-1887," *JHS* 8, pp. 269-277.

Penrose, F. 1888. *An Investigation of the Principles of Athenian Architecture*, London.

Pesando, F. 1989. *La Casa dei Greci*, Milano.

Petrakos, B. C. 1987. "Rhamnous," in Φίλια Έπη εις Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνάν δια τα Εξήντα Έτη του Ανασκαφικού του Έργου II, pp. 295-326.

Petrakos, V. 1991. *Rhamnous*, Athens.

Petropoulos, M. 1987. "Τρίτη Ανασκαφική Περίοδος στό Άνω Μαζαράκι," in Πρακτικά Γ' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακών, Καλαμάτα, 8-15 Σεπτεμβρίου 1985 (Πελοποννησιακά 13, Παράρτημα), pp. 81-89.

Petropoulos, M. 2002. "The Geometric Temple At Ano Mazaraki (Rakita) in Achaia During the Period of Colonisation," in *Gli Achei e l'Identità Etnica Degli Achei d'Occidente. Tekmeria 3*, ed. E. Greco, Paestum, Athens, pp. 143-164.

Picard, C. 1940. "L'Hérôon de Phrontis au Sounion," *RA* 16, pp. 5-28.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1946. *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*, Oxford.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1966. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford.

Pierce-Blegen, E. 1936. "Archaeological News, 1936," *AJA* 40, p.265.

Platonos-Giota, M. 1999. *ArchDelt* 54, pp. 105-111.

Pocock, J. 1964. "Ritual, Language, Power: An Essay on the Apparent Meanings of Ancient Chinese Philosophy," *Political Science* 16, pp. 3-31.

Polignac, F. d. 1984. *La Naissance de la Cité Grecque: Cultes, Espace et Société Viiie-Viie Siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris.

Polignac, F. d. 1995. "Sanctuaires et Société en Attique Géométrique et Archaïque: Réflection sur les Critères d' Analyse," in *Culture et Cité : L'Avènement d'Athénes à l'Époque Archaïque: Actes du Colloque International Organisé à l'Université Libre de Bruxelles du 25 au 27 Avril 1991 par l'Institut des Hautes Études de Belgique et la Fondation Archéologique de l'U.L.B.*, ed. A. Verbanck-Piérard, and D. Viviers, Bruxelles, pp. 75-101.

Popham, M. R., L. H. Sackett, and P. G. Themelis. 1980. *Lefkandi I. The Iron Age Settlement. The Cemeteries*, London.

Poulsen, F. 1905. *Die Dipylongräber und die Dipylonvasen*, Leipzig.

Powell, B. B. 1991. *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet*, Cambridge.

Pritchard, D. 2010. "Costing of Festivals and War: Spending Priorities of the Democracy," in *The Business of State: Public Finance in Ancient Athens, 594 Bc to Ad 14*, ed. H. van Wees, P. J. Rhodes, D. Pritchard, P. Fawcett, and G. Oliver, Oxford, p. forthcoming.

Pritchett, W. K. 1957. "New Light on Plataia," *AJA* 61, pp. 9-28.

Pritchett, W. K. 1969. "The Transfer of the Delian Treasury," *Historia* 18, pp. 17-21.

Quinn, J. C. 2007. "Herms, Kouroi and the Political Anatomy of Athens," *GaR* 54, pp. 82-105.

Rakita, G. F. M., and J. E. Buikstra. 2005. "Introduction," in *Interacting With the Dead: Perspectives on Mortuary Archaeology for the New Millennium*, ed. G. F. M. Rakita, J. E. Buikstra, L. A. Beck, and S. R. Williams, Gainesville, pp. 1-11.

Rappaport, R. 1976. "Liturgies and Lies," *International Yearbook for Sociology of Knowledge and Religion* 10, pp. 75-104.

Rappaport, R. 1999. *Holiness and Humanity: Ritual in the Making of Religious Life*, Cambridge.

Raubitschek, A. 1949. *Dedications From the Athenian Akropolis. A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B. C*, Cambridge MA.

Rausch, M. 1999. *Isonomia in Athen: Veränderungen des öffentlichen Lebens vom Sturz der Tyrannis bis zur zweiten Perserabwehr*, Frankfurt am Main.

Reber, K. 1991. *Untersuchungen zur handgemachten Keramik Griechenlands in der submykenischen, protogeometrischen und der geometrischen Zeit*, Jonsered.

Reed, N. 1998. *More Than Just a Game: The Military Nature of Greek Athletic Contests*, Chicago.

Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford.

Rhodes, P. J. 1991. "The Athenian Code of Laws, 410-399 B. C.," *JHS* 111, pp. 87-100.

Rhodes, P. J. 2009. "State and Religion in Athenian Inscriptions," *GaR* 56, pp. 1-13.

Rhodes, P. J., and R. Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 B.C.*, Oxford.

Rhodes, R. F., and J. J. Dobbins 1979. “The Sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia on the Athenian Akropolis,” *Hesperia* 48, pp. 325-341.

Richards-Mantzouliniou, E. 1979. “Μέλισσα Πότνια,” *AAA* 12, pp. 72-92.

Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford New York.

Richter, G. 1950. *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*, New Haven.

Richter, G. M. A. 1960. *Kouroi, Archaic Greek Youths. A Study of the Development of the Kouros Type in Greek Sculpture*, London.

Richter, G. M. A. 1968. *Korai: Archaic Greek Maidens; a Study of the Development of the Kore Type in Greek Sculpture*, London.

Ridder, A. d. 1896. *Catalogue des Bronzes Trouvés sur l’Acropole d’Athènes*, Paris.

Ridgway, B. 1992. *Greek Sculpture as Archaeological Evidence*, Washington, D.C.

Ridgway, B. 1993. *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton N.J.

Robert, L. 1938. *Etudes Epigraphiques et Philologiques*, Paris.

Robertson, N. 1980. “The True Nature of the ‘Delian League’ 478-461 B.C,” *AJAH* 5, pp. 64-96.

Robertson, N. 1986. “Solon’s Axones and Kyrbeis, and the Sixth-Century Background,” *Historia* 35, pp. 147-176.

Robertson, N. 1990. “The Laws of Athens, 410-399 Bc: The Evidence for Review and Publication,” *JHS* 110, pp. 43-75.

Robertson, N. 1992. *Festivals and Legends. The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual*, Toronto.

Robertson, N. 1996. “Athena’s Shrines and Festivals,” in *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, ed. J. Neils, Madison, pp. 27-77.

Robertson, N. 1998. “The City Center of Archaic Athens,” *Hesperia* 67, pp. 283-302.

Robertson, N. 2009. *Religion and Reconciliation in Greek Cities: The Sacred Laws of Selinus and Cyrene*, Oxford; New York.

Robertson, N. D. 1998. “The Two Processions to Eleusis and the Program of the Mysteries,” *AJP* 119, pp. 547-575.

Robinson, D. 1931. “Bouzyges and the First Plough on a Krater By the Painter of the Naples Hephaistos,” *AJA* 35, pp. 152-160.

Roebuck, C. 1940. “Pottery From the North Slope of the Acropolis, 1937-1938,” *Hesperia* 9, pp. 141-260.

Roller, L. E. 1981. “Funeral Games in Greek Art,” *AJA* 85, pp. 107-119.

Romano, I. 1980. “Early Greek Cult Images” (diss. University of Pennsylvania).

Roussel, D. 1976. *Tribu et Cite: Etudes sur les Groupes Sociaux dans les Cites Grecques aux Epoques Archaique et Classique*, Paris.

Runciman, W. G. 1982. “Origins of States: The Case of Archaic Greece,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24, pp. 351-377.

Ruppenstein, F. 1999. “Geschlechtsspezifische Beigabenkombinationen in der submykenischen Kerameikos-Nekropole,” *AM* 144, pp. 12-28.

Ruze, F. 1997. *Deliberation et Pouvoir dans la Cite Grecque: De Nestor a Socrate*, Paris.

Sakellariou, M. 1989. *The Polis-State: Definition and Origin*, Athens; Paris.

Salmon, J. 1997. “Lopping Off the Heads? Tyrants, Politics, and the Polis,” in *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, ed. L. G. Mitchell, and P. J. Rhodes, London, pp. 60-73.

Samons, L. 2000. *Empire of the Owl: Athenian Imperial Finance*, Stuttgart.

Samons, L. J. 1993. “Athenian Finance and the Treasury of Athena,” *Historia* 42, pp. 129-138.

Saxe, A. A. 1970. “Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practice” (diss. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor).

Scafuro, A. 2006. “Identifying Solon’s Laws,” in *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, ed. J. Blok, and A. Lardinois, Leiden, pp. 175-196.

Schachter, A. 1994. “The Politics of Dedication: Two Athenian Dedications At the Sanctuary of Apollo Ptoieus in Boeotia,” in *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, ed. R. Osborne, and S. Hornblower, Oxford, pp. 291-306.

Schattner, T. G. 1990. *Griechische Hausmodelle: Untersuchungen zur frühgriechischen Architektur*, Berlin.

Schein, S. L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer’s Iliad*, Berkeley.

Schmalz, G. C. R. 2006. “The Athenian Prytaneion Discovered?,” *Hesperia* 75, pp. 33-81.

Schweitzer, B. 1971. *Greek Geometric Art*, London.

Schweitzer, B. 1969. *Die geometrische Kunst Griechenlands. Frühe Formenwelt im Zeitalter Homers*, Köln.

Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*, Ithaca.

Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*, Oxford; New York.

Sealey, R. 1960. "Theopompos and Athenian Lies," *JHS* 80, pp. 194-195.

Seiler, F. 1986. *Die Griechische Tholos: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung, Typologie und Funktion kunstmässiger Rundbauten*, Mainz am Rhein.

Servais, J. 1968. *Thorikos 1963. Rapport Préliminaire sur la Premiere Campagne de Fouilles*, Bruxelles.

Seymour, T. D. 1963. *Life in the Homeric Age*, New York.

Shapiro, H. A. 1989. *Art and Cult Under the Tyrants in Athens*, Mainz am Rhein.

Shapiro, H. A. 1992. "*Mousikoi Agones*: Music and Poetry At the Panathenaea," in *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, ed. J. Neils, Princeton N.J, pp. 53-75.

Shapiro, H. A. 1988. " The Marathonian Bull on the Athenian Akropolis," *AJA* 92, pp. 373-382.

Shear Jr., T. L. 1964. "The Demolished Temple At Eleusis," *AJA* 68, p.200 (abstract).

Shear Jr., T. L. 1966. "Studies in the Early Projects of the Periklean Building Program" (diss. Princeton University).

Shear Jr., T. L. 1975. "The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1973-1974," *Hesperia* 44, pp. 331-374.

Shear Jr., T. L. 1978. "Tyrants and Buildings in Archaic Times," in *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis*, ed. W. A. P. Childs, Princeton, N.J, pp. 1-19.

Shear Jr., T. L. 1993. "The Persian Destruction of Athens: Evidence From Agora Deposits," *Hesperia* 62, pp. 383-482.

Shear Jr., T. L. 1982. "The Demolished Temple At Eleusis," in *Hesperia Supplement 20: Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography. Presented to Homer A. Thompson,* Princeton, N.J, pp. 128-140.

Shear Jr., T. L. 1975. "The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1973-1974," *Hesperia* 44, pp. 331-374.

Shear, I. M. 1999. “The Western Approach to the Athenian Akropolis,” *JHS* 119, pp. 86-127.

Siewert, P. 1972. *Der Eid von Plataiai*, Munchen.

Simms, R. 1975. “The Eleusinia in the Sixth to Fourth Centuries B.C,” *GRBS* 16, pp. 269-279.

Simms, R. 1990. “Myesis, Telete, and Mysteria,” *GRBS* 31, pp. 183-195.

Simms, R. 1998. “The Phrearrhian Lex Sacra an Interpretation,” *Hesperia* 67,

Simon, E. 1983. *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison, WI.

Skias, A. N. 1898. “Πανάρχαια Ελευσινιακή Νεκρόπολις,” *ArchEph* pp. 29-122.

Smith, E., and H. Lowry. 1954. “A Survey of Mountain-Top Sanctuaries in Attica” (paper, American School of Classical Studies 1954)

Smith, N. D. 1989. “Diviners and Divination in Aristophanic Comedy,” *ClAnt* 8, pp. 140-158.

Smithson, E. L. 1961. “The Protogeometric Cemetery At Nea Ionia, 1949,” *Hesperia* 30, pp. 147-178.

Smithson, E. L. 1968. “The Tomb of a Rich Athenian Lady, Ca. 850 B.C,” *Hesperia* 37, pp. 77-116.

Smithson, E. L. 1969. “Twin Granaries From Phaleron,” *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 28, pp. 3-14.

Smithson, E. L. 1974. “A Geometric Cemetery on the Areopagus: 1897, 1932, 1947,” *Hesperia* 43, pp. 325-390.

Smithson, E. L. 1982. “The Prehistoric Klepsydra: Some Notes,” in *Hesperia Supplement 20: Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography. Presented to Homer* A. *Thompson*, Princeton, N.J, pp. 152-154.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1964. *Early Greek Armour and Weapons, From the End of the Bronze Age to 600 B.C*, Edinburgh.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1971. *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries B.C.*, Edinburgh.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1977. *Archaeology and the Rise of the Greek State: An Inaugural Lecture*, Cambridge; New York.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1980. *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment*, Berkeley.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1982. “Les Origines du Culte des Héros dans las Grèce Antique,” in *La Mort, les Morts dans les Sociétiés Anciennes*, ed. G. Gnoli, and J. P. Vernant, Cambridge, pp. 107-119.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1983. “Two Demographic Notes,” in *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation: Proceedings of the Second International Symposium At the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1-5 June, 1981*, ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm Lund, Sweden, pp. 167-171.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1987. “The Rural Landscape and Its Political Significance,” *Opus* 6-7, pp. 53-70.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1988. “The Archaeology of the Hero,” *AnnArchStorAnt* 10, pp. 19-26.

Sokolowski, F. 1962. *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques. Supplement*, Paris.

Sokolowski, F. 1969. *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques*, Paris.

Soteriades, G. 1935. “Ἔρευναι καὶ Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐν Μαραθῶνι,” *Prakt* pp. 84-158.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1988a. “Further Aspects of Polis Religion,” *AnnArchStorAnt* 10, pp. 259-274.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1988b. *Studies in Girls’ Transitions: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography*, Athens.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990a. “Ancient Rites and Modern Constructs: On the Brauronian Bears Again,” *BICS* 37, pp. 1-14.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990b. “What is *Polis* Religion,” in *The Greek City: From Homer to Alexander*, ed. O. Murray, and S. R. F. Price, Oxford New York, pp. 295-322.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1993. “Early Sanctuaries, the Eighth Century and Ritual Space: Fragments of a Discourse,” in *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, ed. N. Marinatos, and R. Hägg, London; New York, pp. 1-17.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1997. “Reconstructing Change: Ideology and the Eleusinian Mysteries,” in *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization and the Ancient World*, ed. M. Golden, and P. Toohey, London, pp. 132-164.

Souvinou-Inwood, C. 1994. “Something to Do With Athens: Tragedy and Ritual,” in *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, ed. R. Osborne, and S. Hornblower, Oxford, pp. 269-290.

Spencer, N. 1995. “Early Lesbos Between East and West: A ‘Grey Area’ of Aegean Archaeology,” *BSA* 90, pp. 269-306.

Stahl, M. 1987. *Aristokraten und Tyrannen im Archaischen Athen: Untersuchungen zur Uberlieferung, zur Sozialstruktur und zur Entstehung des Staates*, Stuttgart.

Stähler, K. 1972. "Zur Rekonstruction und Datierung des Gigantomachiegiebels von der Akropolis," in *Antike und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift Hans Erich Stier zum 70. Geburtstag am 25. Mai 1972*, ed. H. Stier, Münster, pp. 88-112.

Stähler, K. 1978. "Der Zeus aus dem Gigantomachiegiebel der Akropolis?," *Boreas* 1, pp. 28-31.

Stais, B. 1920. Το Σούνιον και οι Ναοί Ποσειδώνος και Αθηνάς, Athens.

Stais, B. 1917. "Σουνίου Ανασκαφαί," *ArchEph* pp. 168-213.

Stanton, G. 1990. *Athenian Politics, C. 800-500 B.C.: A Sourcebook*, London; New York.

Stavropoullos, P. 1956. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημεῖας," *Prakt* pp. 45-54.

Stavropoullos, P. 1958. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημεῖας," *Prakt* pp. 5-13.

Stavropoullos, P. 1959. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημεῖας," *Prakt* pp. 8-11.

Stavropoullos, P. 1961a. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημεῖας," *Prakt* pp. 5-13.

Stavropoullos, P. 1961b. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀκαδημεῖας," *ArchDelt* 17, pp. 20-22.

Stavropoullos, P. 1962. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημεῖας," *Prakt* pp. 5-11.

Stehle, E. 2006. "Solon's Self-Reflexive Political Personal and Its Audience," in *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches*, ed. J. Blok, and A. Lardinois, Leiden; Boston, pp. 79-113.

Stewart, A. F. 1990a. *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration. Volume 1, Text*, New Haven.

Stewart, A. F. 1990b. *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration. Volume 2, Plates*, New Haven.

Stikas, E. 1939. "Ἀνασκαφὴ ἐν Ἐλευθεραῖς," *Prakt* pp. 44-52.

Stikas, E. 1940. "Ἀνασκαφὴ ἐν Ἐλευθεραῖς," *Prakt* pp. 16-17.

Strömberg, A. 1993. *Male Or Female? A Methodological Study of Grave Gifts as Sex-Indicators in Iron Age Burials From Athens*, Jonsered.

Strömberg, A. 1998. "Sex-Indicating Grave Gifts in the Athenian Iron Age: An Investigation and Its Results," in *Aspects of Women in Antiquity: Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity*, ed. L. L. Lovén, and A. Strömberg, Jonsered, pp. 11-28.

Stroud, R. S. 1968. *Drakon's Law on Homicide*, Berkeley.

Stroud, R. S. 1978. “State Documents in Archaic Athens,” in *Tyrants and Buildings in Archaic Times*, ed. W. A. P. Childs, Princeton, N.J, pp. 20-42.

Stroud, R. S. 1979. *The Axones and Kyrbeis of Drakon and Solon*, Berkeley.

Styrenius, C. G. 1962. “The Vases From the Submycenaean Cemetery on Salamis,” *OpAth* 4, pp. 103-123.

Suter, A. 2002. *The Narcissus and the Pomegranate: An Archaeology of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Ann Arbor.

Tanoulis, T. 1992a. “Structural Relations Between the Propylaea and the Northwest Building of the Athenian Acropolis,” *AM* 107, pp. 199-215.

Tanoulis, T. 1992b. “The Pre-Mnesiklean Cistern on the Athenian Acropolis,” *AM* 107, pp. 129-160.

Tanoulis, T. 1994. “New Discoveries At the Propylaea,” in *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, ed. R. Economakis, London, pp. 180-183.

Taylor, M. 1981. *The Tyrant Slayers: The Heroic Image in Fifth Century B.C. Athenian Art and Politics*, New York.

Themelis, P. G. 1973. “Ἀνάβυσσου: Γεωμετρικὸ Νεκροταφεῖο,” *ArchDelt* 29, pp. 108-110.

Themelis, P. G. 1970. *Sounion-Thorikos*, Athens.

Themelis, P. G. 1971. *Brauron. Guide to the Site and Museum*, Athens.

Themelis, P. G. 1976. *Frühgriechische Grabbauten*, Mainz am Rhein.

Themelis, P. G. 2002. “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary At Brauron,” in *Le Orse di Brauron: Un Rituale di Iniziazione Femminile nel Santuario di Artemide*, ed. B. Gentili, and F. Perusino, Pisa, pp. 103-116.

Thomas, R. 1989. *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.

Thomas, R. 1996. “Written in Stone? Liberty, Equality, Orality, and the Codification of Law,” in *Greek Law in Its Political Setting: Justifications Not Justice*, ed. L. Foxhall, and A. D. E. Lewis, Oxford New York, pp. 9-31.

Thompson, D. B. 1954. “Three Centuries of Hellenistic Terracottas, I, B and C,” *Hesperia* 23, pp. 72-107.

Thompson, H. 1958. “Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1957,” *Hesperia* 27, pp. 145-160.

Thompson, H. 1968. “Activity in the Athenian Agora: 1966-1967,” *Hesperia* 37, pp. 36-72.

Thompson, H. 1978. “Some Hero Shrines in Early Athens,” in *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis. Papers of a Symposium Sponsored By the Aia, Princeton Society and the Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University*, ed. W. A. P. Childs, Princeton, pp. 96-108.

Thompson, H. A., and R. E. Wycherley. 1972. *The Athenian Agora, Vol. 14. The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape, and Uses of an Ancient City Center*, Princeton, N.J.

Thompson, H. A. 1940. *Hesperia Supplement 4: The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors*, Princeton.

Thompson, H. A. 1947. “The Excavation of the Athenian Agora, 1940-46,” *Hesperia* 16, pp. 193-213.

Thompson, H. A. 1960. “Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1959,” *Hesperia* 29, pp. 327-368.

Thompson, H. A. 1978. Review: Parthenon and the Mycenaean City on the Heights, by Bundgaard, J, in *AJA* 82, pp. 256-258.

Threpsiades, J., and E. Vanderpool 1964. “Themistocles’ Sanctuary of Artemis Aristoboule,” *ArchDelt* 19, pp. 26-36.

Todd, S. 1996. “Lysias Against Nicomachos: The Fate of the Expert in Athenian Law,” in *Greek Law in Its Political Setting: Justifications Not Justice*, ed. L. Foxhall, and A. D. E. Lewis, Oxford; New York, pp. 101-131.

Tolle-Kastenbein, R. 1994. *Das Olympieion in Athen*, Koln.

Touloupa, E. 1972. “Bronzebleche Von Der Akropolis in Athen: Gehämmerte Geometrische Dreifüsse,” *AM* 87, pp. 57-76.

Touloupa, E. 1991. “Early Bronze Sheets With Figured Scenes From the Acropolis,” in *New Perspectives in Early Greek Art*, ed. D. Buitron-Oliver, Hanover; London, pp. 241-271.

Townsend, R. F. 1995. *The Athenian Agora, Vol. 27. The East Side of the Agora: The Remains Beneath the Stoa of Attalos*, Princeton.

Tracy, S. 1991. “The Panathenaic Festival and Games: An Epigraphical Inquiry,” *Nikephoros* 4, pp. 133-153.

Travlos, J. 1971a. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen*, Tübingen.

Travlos, J. 1971b. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London.

Travlos, J. 1976. "Τρείς Ναοί της Αρτέμιδος: Αυλιδίας, Ταυροπόλου και Βραυρώνος," in *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern*, ed. U. Jantzen, Tübingen, pp. 197-205.

Travlos, J. 1983. "Η Αθήνα και η Ελευσίνα στον 8ο και 7ο π.Χ. Αιώνα," *ASAtene* 45, pp. 323-338.

Travlos, J. 1988. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika*, Tübingen.

Travlos, J. 1993. Πολεοδομική Εξέλιξις των Αθηνών: Από των Προϊστορικών Χρόνων μέχρι των Αρχών του 19ου Αιώνος, Athens.

Tritle, L. A. 1988. "Kleomenes At Eleusis," *Historia* 37, pp. 457-460.

Tully, J. 2006. "Democracy in Action: Office-Holding in Fourth-Century Athens. Pytheas of Alopece and the Panathenaic Quadrennium," *Historia* 55, pp. 503-508.

van den Eijnde, F. 2010. "Cult and Society in Early Athens: Archaeological and Anthropological Approaches to State Formation and Group Participation in Attica" (diss. Universiteit Utrecht).

van Gelder, K. 1991. "The Iron-Age Hiatus in Attica and the *Synoikismos* of Theseus," *MeditArch* 4, pp. 55-64.

van Wees, H. 1992. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*, Amsterdam.

van Wees, H. 1998. "Greeks Bearing Arms: The State, the Leisure Class, and the Display of Weapons in Archaic Greece," in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, ed. N. R. E. Fisher, H. v. Wees, and D. D. Boedeker, London, pp. 333-378.

van Wees, H. 2003. "The Invention of the Female Mind: Women, Property and Gender Ideology in Archaic Greece," paper, Cambridge, MA, 2003.

van Wees, H. 2006. "'The Oath of the Sworn Bands': The Acharnae Stela, the Oath of Plataea and Archaic Spartan Warfare," in *Das frühe Sparta*, ed. A. Luther, M. Meier, and L. Thommen, Stuttgart, pp. 125-164.

Vanderpool, E. 1942. "An Archaic Inscribed Stele From Marathon," *Hesperia* 11, pp. 329-337.

Vanderpool, E. 1946. "Some Black-Figured Pottery From the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 15, pp. 120-137.

Vanderpool, E. 1960. "Newsletter From Greece," *AJA* 64, p.269.

Vanderpool, E. 1966. “The Deme of Marathon and the Herakleion,” *AJA* 70, pp. 319-323.

Vanderpool, E. 1974. “The Date of the Pre-Persian City-Wall of Athens,” in *Phoros: Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt*, ed. D. Bradeen, and M. F. McGregor, Locust Valley, N.Y, pp. 156-160.

Vlassopoulou, C., and E. Touloupa 1993. “Decorated Architectural Terracottas From the Athenian Acropolis: Catalogue of Exhibition,” *Hesperia* 59, pp. i-xxxi.

Wade-Gery, H. 1933. “Studies in the Structure of Attic Society II. The Laws of Kleisthenes,” *CQ* 27, pp. 17-29.

Wallinga, H. 1995. “The Ancestry of the Trireme, 1200-525 B.C.,” in *The Age of the Galley: Mediterranean Oared Vessels Since Pre-Classical Times*, ed. R. Gardiner, London, pp. 36-48.

Walter, O. 1940. “Archaologische Funde in Griechenland von Fruhjahr 1939 bis Fruhjahr 1940,” *AA* pp. 177-178.

Welter, G. 1922. “Das Olympieion in Athen,” *AM* 47, pp. 61-71.

West, M. L. 1989. “The Early Chronology of Attic Tragedy,” *CQ* 39, pp. 251-254.

West, M. L. 1992. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*, Oxford.

Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica, 508 7-ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study*, Princeton N.J.

Whitley, A. J. M. 1996. “Gender and Hierarchy in Early Athens: The Strange Case of the Disappearance of the Rich Female Grave,” *Metis* 11, pp. 209-232.

Whitley, J. 1988. “Early States and Hero Cults: A Re-Appraisal,” *JHS* 108, pp. 173-182.

Whitley, J. 1991. *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece: The Changing Face of a Pre-Literate Society 1100-700 B.C.*, Cambridge.

Whitley, J. 2003. “Archaeology in Greece 2002-2003,” *AR* 49, pp. 1-88.

Whitley, J. 2006. “Archaeology in Greece 2005-2006,” *AR* 52, pp. 1-112.

Whitley, J. M. 1994a. “Protoattic Pottery: A Contextual Approach,” in *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies*, ed. I. Morris, Cambridge, pp. 51-70.

Whitley, J. M. 1994b. “The Monuments That Stood Before Marathon: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Archaic Attica,” *AJA* pp. 213-230.

Whitman, C. H. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, Cambridge.

Wickens, J. M. 1986. “The Archaeology and History of Cave Use in Attica, Greece From Prehistoric Through Late Roman Times” (diss. Indiana University).

Wickersham, J. M. 1986. “The Corpse Who Calls Theognis,” *TAPA* 116, pp. 65-70.

Wide, S. 1910. “Gräberfunde aus Salamis,” *AM* 35, pp. 17-36.

Wiegand, T. 1904. *Die archaische Poros-Architektur der Akropolis zu Athen*, Cassel.

Willemsen, F. 1965. “Ostraka,” *AM* 80, pp. 100-126.

Williams, D. 2000. “Of Geometric Toys, Symbols and Votives,” in *Periplous: Papers on Classical Art and Archaeology Presented to Sir John Boardman*, ed. G. R. Tsetskhladze, A. J. N. W. Prag, and A. M. Snodgrass, London, pp. 388-396.

Williams, R. T. 1953. “Early Greek Ships on Two Levels,” *JHS* 78, pp. 120-130.

Winter, F. E. 1982. “Sepulturae Intra Urbem and the Pre-Persian Walls of Athens,” in *Hesperia Supplement 19. Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*, Princeton, N.J, pp. 199-204.

Winter, F. 1903. *Die Typen der figürlichen Terrakotten*, Berlin.

Winter, N. 1993. *Greek Architectural Terracottas: From the Prehistoric to the End of the Archaic Period*, Oxford.

Wolters, P. 1898. “Vasen aus Menidi,” JdI 13, pp. 13-28.

Wolters, P. 1899. “Vasen aus Menidi II,” JdI 14, pp. 103-135.

Wright, J. C. 1994. “The Mycenaean Entrance System At the West End of the Akropolis of Athens,” *Hesperia* 63, pp. 323-360.

Wycherley, R. 1957. *The Athenian Agora, Vol. 3. Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*, Princeton N. J.

Wycherley, R. 1964. “The Olympieion At Athens,” *GRBS* 5, pp. 161-179.

Wycherley, R. E. 1963. “Pausanias in Athens, 2. A Commentary on Book I, Chapters 18-19,” *GRBS* 4, pp. 157-175.

Wycherley, R. E. 1970. “Minor Shrines in Ancient Athens,” *Phoenix* 24, pp. 283-295.

Wycherley, R. E. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*, Princeton, N.J.

Wycherley, R. E. 1963. “The Pythion At Athens Thucydides 2.15.4; Philostratos, Lives of the Sophists 2.1.7,” *AJA* 67, pp. 75-79.

Wycherley, R. E. 1966. “Archaia Agora,” *Phoenix* 20, pp. 285-293.

Yoffee, N. 2005. *Myths of the Archaic State*, Cambridge.

Young, R. S. 1938. "Pottery From a Seventh Century Well," *Hesperia* 7, pp. 412-428.

Young, R. S. 1942. "Graves From the Phaleron Cemetery," *AJA* pp. 23-57.

Young, R. S. 1949. "An Early Geometric Grave Near the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 18, pp. 275-297.

Young, R. S. 1951. "Sepulturae Intra Urbem," *Hesperia* 20, pp. 67-134.

Young, R. S. 1939. *Hesperia Supplement 2: Late Geometric Graves and a Seventh Century Well in the Agora*, Princeton.

Young, R. S. 1940. "Excavation on Mount Hymettos, 1939," *AJA* 44, pp. 1-9.

Yunis, H. 1988. *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama*, Göttingen.

Zaidman, L. B., and P. S. Pantel. 1992. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, Cambridge.

Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Attic Sanctuaries and Shrines for Deities

The following is a catalogue of Attic sanctuaries and shrines that date to the Geometric and Protoattic periods, ca. 1000-600. For ease of reference, the sites are organized into the following regions: the Thriasian Plain, Athenian Plain, Anavyssos Plain, Vari Plain, Cape Sounion, Thorikos Plain, Mesogeion Plain, and the Marathon Plain. The sanctuaries and shrines in this catalogue are those generally accepted as dedicated to deities. Contemporary sites that have been usually interpreted as tomb or hero shrines are treated separately in Appendix 2.

Our understanding of the archaeological record of sanctuaries and shrines is at present far from complete. Many of the following sites were never systematically excavated, and most have yet to be fully published. Even in cases where the sites were well excavated and published, the identity of the deity worshipped at a particular sanctuary is rarely attested by contemporary evidence. For many sites, the earliest secure evidence for the deity or deities worshipped at a particular sanctuary dates to the Archaic or Classical period.

Peak sanctuaries, in particular, are perhaps the least understood of all sites. Of the twelve possible sites, only three have have been fully excavated, and only one, Mt. Hymettos, has been fully published. If we may judge from seventh-century dedications from Mt. Hymettos and Mt. Parnes, Zeus apparently was the deity of peaks in his guise as a weather god. Other peak sanctuaries in Attica that share features with these sites are therefore identified as Zeus sanctuaries in this catalogue, though confirmation that all of them were so dedicated is lacking. Most peak sanctuaries are now closed off to the public, and inaccessible to excavation or survey. Much of what we know today of peak sanctuaries is based on survey work conducted in the 1950's and 1970's.[679]

1. Thriasian Plain

1.1. Eleusis: Demeter

The Site:

679. Smith and Lowry 1954, two student members of the American School of Classical Studies, undertook a survey of many of the peak sanctuaries in 1954. Most of the sites they surveyed have since been taken over by military installations, and are now inaccessible; in these cases, their survey is all the information we have. A second survey of mountain peaks is published in Langdon 1976, who visited the peaks still open to the public.

Directly below the Archaic and Classical Telesterion lies a Bronze Age building, Megaron B, which was abandoned in LH IIIB. In the late eighth-century, a three-room structure, B1-3, was built near Megaron B, along with a retaining wall built to support a new courtyard in front of the new structure. The excavators came to consider B1-3 as an addition to Megaron B, a reconstruction that is generally accepted.[680] There is, however, no material evidence of continuity between Bronze Age and the late eighth and early seventh century activity in the area of the Telesterion. It is much more likely that Megaron B was in ruins by the end of the eight century, and superseded by B1-3.[681]

The new complex was surrounded by a second, larger retaining wall, through which an entrance into the complex was provided. Just to the right of the entrance, a massive sacrificial pyre was found *in situ* (Pyre A). The earliest votive material within the pyre date has been dated to the end of the eighth century, though an early seventh century date is possible.[682] At any rate, the vast majority of the votive material dates to the seventh century. The pyre material, together with the renovation of the complex, provides our earliest secure evidence for cultic activity at the Telesterion site.

Votives – Late eighth-century or early seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: There are two examples, one of which is sitting on a chair or "throne" in the shape of two horses, back-to-back.[683]

2. Gold: Jewelry, such as earrings, and gold sheets.[684]

3. Pottery: The earliest pottery consists mostly of oinochoai.[685]

Votives – Seventh century:

---

680. Mylonas 1961, pp. 37-38, 55. Cf. Travlos 1983; 1988, p. 92; Ainian 1997, pp. 147-150.

681. In their original excavation report, Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, p. 277, report that B1-3 was "built upon parts of Megaron B and its platform," and that while they considered B1-3 "a later addition to Megaron B,...at present their relations cannot be definitely established". Cf. Darque 1981; Binder 1998, pp. 131-132.

682. For the definitive publication of the votives from Pyre A, see Kokkou-Vyridi 1999 pp. 39-44, 197-216, plan 7-8, pl. 7-20; she dates the earliest votive material, including a handful of terracottas, to the end of the eighth century. Noack 1927, pp. 12-13 asserts that the earliest votive material dates to the seventh century, a view supported by Binder 1998, p. 132.

683. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 70-71, pl. 12.

684. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 175-185, 188-189, pl. 56, 58.

685. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 1-11, pl. 7.

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: Varied representations, including standing columnar figurines; flat, plank-like figurines; women holding babies; and enthroned figures.[686]

2. Terracotta Horse Groups: These include chariot groups; horse and riders; individual horses.[687]

3. Other Terracotta Figurines: These include terracotta animals, such as a goat, sheep or bird.[688]

4. Moldmade *Protomai*: Female heads, some pierced with holes for suspension.[689]

5. Terracotta Shields: No terracotta votive shields are reported from Pyre A. One terracotta shield was found during earlier excavations of the sanctuary, however, and three more are in the Eleusis Museum, their provenience unknown.[690]

6. Terracotta Plaques: Thirty-one are reported.[691] Eleven plaques are painted with single tripods, which are the most common decoration, followed by up to seven plaques painted with single birds. Snakes are found on four plaques, two of which also have tripods. Other plaques are decorated with straight lines, abstractly arrayed. Many of the plaques are pierced with suspension holes at the top.

---

686. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 72-132, 136-149, pl. 12-18. Cf. Noack 1927, p. 12, fig. 3; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933, pp. 279-280, fig. 10; Travlos 1983, p. 337, fig. 15. The standing female figurines are sometimes called *Stempelidole*, or πτηνόμορφα, and are handmade. These figurine types have long, cylindrical bodies that flair out at the bottom. Cylindrical or triangular arms lead out, usually horizontally, from the body. Their round heads have been pinched to form a face. Additional facial features are usually lacking. Pigment is preserved on at least a few examples, suggesting that at least some, if not all of the figurines were originally painted. At any rate, this figurine type is by far the most common type of female figurine found at seventh-century sanctuaries in Athens and Attica.

687. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 151-159, pl. 18-19.

688. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 160-162, pl. 19.

689. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 165-174, pl. 20. Seventh-century female *protomai* are typically small, mold-made plaques of a female head. Her features and hair are fashioned in the Daedalic style. The face is most often V-shaped, with a low forehead, and large, protruding eyes. Often the female is wearing a polos. White slip is sometimes found on the hair and head; most examples have no pigment, though it may often be the case that the pigment has not survived. Many of the female protomes are pierced at the top with a hole for suspension.

690. Skias 1898, col. 69; Wolters 1899, p. 120, n. 12-13.

691. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 39-69, pl. 9-11; cf. Noack 1927, pp. 12-13, fig. 4-5; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Eleusis nos. 1-5; Travlos 1983, p. 337, fig. 16.

7. Pottery: Most of the seventh-century pottery consists of small, closed Protoattic and Protocorinthian shapes designed to hold scented oils or perfume, such as alabastra and aryballoi.[692]

8. Lamps: Six terracotta lamps were recovered, all undecorated.[693]

1.2. Eleusis: Artemis and Poseidon?

The Site:

A section of a curving wall is preserved just east of the Roman temple of Artemis Propylaia and Poseidon Pater. The wall appears to be part of an apsidal building, as indicated by a low bench built against its interior face. The wall appears to extend under the north side of the temple of Artemis, perhaps indicating it was a predecessor to the temple. The material associated with the wall has not been published; dates in preliminary reports range from the middle of the eighth century to the beginning of the seventh. "Pyres" are reported within the apsidal building, but the contents of the pyres have not been published, and the association with the wall, if any, is not yet clear. As a result, it is not clear whether the apsidal wall and pyres represent an early sanctuary to Artemis and/or Poseidon.[694]

2. Athenian Plain

2.1. Athens: Apollo?

The Site:

South of the Olympieion, and just north of the Ilissos River, are found the remains of what appears to be a small, rectangular building. A contemporary peribolos wall was also found south of the building, which appears to be a retaining wall for the terrace

692. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 12-31, pl. 7-9.

693. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 32-38, pl. 9.

694. See Kourouniotes 1940b, pp. 277-278, 1940a, p. 15, who dates the wall to ca. 700 based on the (unpublished) pottery. Travlos 1988, p. 92; 1983, p. 337, n. 26, dates the building to the middle of the eighth century, and believes it was a Geometric temple to both Artemis and Poseidon as "chthonic" deities; cf. Ainian 1997, p. 96. Mylonas 1961, p. 60, who also dates the wall to the eighth century, believes that the building was domestic, not sacred. Mylonas also notes that more eighth- and seventh-century walls were discovered during excavations below the nearby Roman *eschara*, but the results of these excavations have not been published, and their association, if any, with the apsidal building is unknown.

upon which the rectangular building sits. The construction of both features has been dated to the middle of the eighth century, though the pottery has not been published.[695]

Near these Geometric remains are what may be the Delphinion law court, dated ca. 500, and the remains of a temple, dated to around the middle of the fifth century, and thought to be shared by Artemis Delphinia and Apollo Delphinios. The evidence for the identification of the later buildings with the Delphinion comes from Pausanias, 1.19.1, who records that the Delphinion was in this area.[696] It has therefore been tempting to identify the eighth-century rectangular building as a Geometric predecessor to the Delphinion, and so perhaps part of an early sanctuary of Apollo.[697] This would accord with ancient accounts that preserve tales of an earlier temple for Apollo Delphinios in this area during the time of Theseus.[698]

The identification of the fifth-century remains as the temple and law court of Delphinion is not certain, however.[699] In addition, no votive material has been reported from the remains of the Geometric building and retaining wall. At this point, the identity and function of the Geometric structure remains unknown.

---

695. See Threpsiades and Travlos, *ArchDelt* 17 (1961/1962) Chron., pp. 9-14, for a Protogeometric date for the pottery; Travlos 1983, p. 326, prefers a middle of the eighth century date.

696. Threpsiades, J. and J. Travlos *ArchDelt* 17 (1961/1962) Chron., pp. 9-14; Travlos 1971b, p. 83.

697. Travlos 1983, p. 326.

698. According to tradition, Theseus arrived in Athens as the temple was being built (Paus. 1.19.1; cf. 1.28.10). The Delphinion was also said to have enclosed the area of Aegeus' home, the scene of Medea's attempted poisoning of Theseus (Plut. *Thes*. 12.2-3; cf. 14.1, 18.1). Cf. Thuc. 2.15.3-6, who reports that this area held Athens' most ancient shrines.

699. Wycherley 1963, pp. 166-168; Ainian 1997, p. 245.

2.2. Athens: Athena Polias[700]

The Site:

According to Pausanias, the worship of Athena Polias began in mythical times, well before the synoikismos, when her olive wood image fell reportedly from the heavens.[701] Homer may preserve our earliest testimony for a sanctuary of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis. The Homeric bards sang that Athena and Erechtheus shared a "rich temple" (*Il.* 2.549: πίων νηός), also described as a "well-built house" (*Od.* 7.81: πυκινός δόμος).[702] We have in these lines, then, evidence for an early proto-Erechtheion on the Acropolis.

---

700. The epithet "Polias" did not arise from Athena's role as patron deity of the political polis, as is sometimes assumed. "Polias" was a locative epithet, denoting her sanctuary's location on "the polis," or Acropolis rock; cf. Paus. 1.26.6. In addition, the epithet appears not to have been in use before the second half of the fifth century, though even then it is still rare. In the majority of epigraphic and literary sources, Athena Polias was simply called "Athena," or ἡ θεός. A handful of financial accounts from the Acropolis preserve the earliest appearance of the epithet. The earliest, *IG* i^3 369, dates ca. 440; the other accounts – *IG* i^3 369, *IG* i^3 373, *IG* i^3 375, *IG* i^3 376, *IG* i^3 377, *IG* i^3 378 – all date to the last quarter of the fifth century. The only other inscription with the epithet, dated by letter form to the fifth century, is a boundary stone for the home of the priestess of Athena Polias, *IG* i^3 1051. The sole literary appearance of the epithet in the fifth century is Hdt. 5.82.3: οἳ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖσδε δώσειν ἔφασαν ἐπ' ᾧ ἀπάξουσι ἔτεος ἑκάστου τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ τε τῇ Πολιάδι ἱρὰ καὶ τῷ Ἐρεχθέι. No Archaic or Classical dedications to Athena record the epithet, and her olive wood statue is only ever called τὸ (ἀρχαῖον) ἄγαλμα, or ἡ θεός. For the uses of the epithet "Polias" in Athens and elsewhere in the Greek world, see especially Herington 1955; Cole 1995, pp. 301-305.

701. Paus. 1.26.6: ἱερὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστιν ἥ τε ἄλλη πόλις καὶ ἡ πᾶσα ὁμοίως γῆ—καὶ γὰρ ὅσοις θεοὺς καθέστηκεν ἄλλους ἐν τοῖς δήμοις σέβειν, οὐδέν τι ἧσσον τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἄγουσιν ἐν τιμῇ—, τὸ δὲ ἁγιώτατον ἐν κοινῷ πολλοῖς πρότερον νομισθὲν ἔτεσιν <ἢ> συνῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν δήμων ἐστὶν Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀκροπόλει, τότε δὲ ὀνομαζομένῃ πόλει: φήμη δὲ ἐς αὐτὸ ἔχει πεσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The antiquity of the sanctuary may also be indicated by the tradition of the contest between Poseidon and Athena for the right to take possession of Attica when Kekrops was king; cf. Hdt. 8.55; Apollod. 3.14.1; Paus. 1.24.3; Hyg. *Fab.* 164. He thrust his trident into the ground on the Acropolis, where a well of sea-water was thereby called forth. Athena countered by creating the olive tree, and so won Attica. Poseidon, indignant at this, caused the country to be inundated.

702. *Il.* 2.546-551: Οἳ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον/ δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὅν ποτ' Ἀθήνη/ θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα,/ κὰδ δ' ἐν Ἀθήνῃς εἶσεν ἑῷ ἐν πίονι νηῷ·/ ἔνθα δέ μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται/ κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν·

The debate is how early. It is commonly assumed that the Homeric epics were "fixed" sometime during the eighth century; a seventh-century date, however, is not out of the question.[703] Even if we knew when the poems were relatively fixed in their present form, it is possible that both lines concerning the proto-Erechtheion were later sixth-century or later interpolations into the poems.[704]

Though it is unknown how early the Homeric references to the Athena sanctuary on the Acropolis date, there is physical evidence, in the form of two poros column bases, that there may have been a temple to Athena on the Acropolis by the second half of the seventh century.[705] Our first recorded historical event, the attempt at tyranny by Kylon ca. 632/1, confirms that a sanctuary of Athena was established on the Acropolis by at least the seventh century. According to Herodotus, 5.71, Kylon took refuge at τὸ ἄγαλμα, "the statue" of Athena. Thucydides, 1.126, writes that Kylon's supporters took refuge at τὸν βωμόν, "the altar" on the Acropolis, and that some were found dying ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, "in the temple" or "sanctuary". Though there is a discrepancy between the accounts, both agree that there was a sanctuary to Athena on the Acropolis at this time.[706]

The earliest archaeological evidence for ritual activity on the Athenian Acropolis dates to the Late Geometric period and continues throughout the seventh century. Interpreting this material is a challenge. Most of this evidence comes from disturbed fills rep-

---

Od. 7.78-81: ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη/ πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον, λίπε δὲ Σχερίην ἐρατεινήν,/ ἵκετο δ' ἐς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην,/ δῦνε δ' Ἐρεχθῆος πυκινὸν δόμον.

703. Powell 1991, pp. 187-220, collects the evidence for the dating of Homer; Powell suggests both poems were composed in the first half of the eighth century. Contra, Osborne 1996, p. 159: "the text of the poems was fixed by c. 650, but not substantially before that date, and it seems reasonable to suggest that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we know them were not composed much before that time". Both suggestions are the fruit of guesswork. The date of Homer and Hesiod was already fiercely debated in antiquity, to the degree that Pausanias, 9.30.3, did not even want to write on the subject: περὶ δὲ Ἡσιόδου τε ἡλικίας καὶ Ὁμήρου πολυπραγμονήσαντι ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον οὔ μοι γράφειν ἡδὺ ἦν, ἐπισταμένῳ τὸ φιλαίτιον ἄλλων τε καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα ὅσοι κατ' ἐμὲ ἐπὶ ποιήσει τῶν ἐπῶν καθεστήκεσαν.

704. Cf. Mylonas 1966, p. 136, for the view that the Homeric lines concerning the proto-Erechtheion are later Athenian interpolations. Contra, Lorimer 1950, pp. 436-437; Kirk 1985, pp. 179-180, 205-207.

705. See especially Nylander 1962, pp. 31-32; Iakovides 2006, pp. 65-68; Kissas 2008. These bases would have supported wooden columns.

706. In the account of Plut. *Sol.* 12, for example, Kylon and his co-conspirators held a rope tied to the statue of Athena as they descended the Acropolis, hoping that this connection to her statue would preserve their lives as suppliants.

resenting several centuries of activity, mixed together and deposited during later cleaning and building operations on the Acropolis. Interpretation is further complicated by the fact that much of the material was recovered during poorly recorded excavations conducted in the nineteenth century, and much of the material remains unpublished.[707] It is certainly possible, if not probable, that the Late Geometric and seventh-century material found in these mixed deposits come from more one sanctuary.

That said, it is reasonable to suggest that the majority of the Late Geometric and seventh-century votives may have originally derived from the sanctuary of Athena. As we saw above, ancient testimony confirms that the sanctuary was active from at least the seventh century, which is the earliest sanctuary for which we have literary evidence. Two seventh-century poros column bases built within the sixth-century "Old Athena Temple," or Dörpfeld foundation south of the Erechtheion, appear to be the earliest surviving remains of a temple of Athena.[708] Also recovered from the Acropolis is a remarkable, near life-size seventh-century terracotta statue of a well dressed and richly adorned woman, discussed below. It is possible, perhaps likely that it is a cult statue of Athena. As a whole, the votives recovered from the Acropolis are those typically associated with goddess sanctuaries.[709]

Votives – Late Geometric:

1. Bronze: Numerous bronze tripods and cauldrons once stood on the Acropolis, as evidenced by over seventy hammered tripod leg and ring-handle fragments, as well as a number of bronze figurines that originally were affixed to the handles or rims of these vessels.[710] The number of bronze tripods is particularly striking when we consider their virtual absence from any other sanctuaries in Attic at this time. Stand-alone bronzes from the Late Geometric period include at least one mythological creature, the mino-

707. For early excavations on the Acropolis, cf. Dinsmoor 1934; Hurwit 1989.

708. Nylander 1962, pp. 31-32; Iakovides 2006, pp. 65-68. These bases would have supported wooden columns. A handful of architectural terracottas, mostly antefixes, have recently been dated to the last quarter of the seventh century, confirming the addition of other small temples, shrines, or treasury-like buildings on the Acropolis by this date. See Vlassopoulou and Touloupa 1993, nos. 1-4. Winter 1993, p. 213, however, dates no architectural terracottas date before 590-580.

709. See the votive charts in the appendix, pp. 296-305.

710. Touloupa 1972.

taur, and several horses.[711] Bronze female statuettes also date to this period, and may be our earliest representations of Athena.[712]

2. Pottery: Over one thousand Late Geometric I sherds are reported from the Athenian Acropolis, mostly within Perserschutt deposits. Fewer than one hundred have been published.[713] A few of the sherds have inscriptions confirming that some of the pots were dedicated to a divinity, though none preserve the name of any deity.[714] Most of the published Late Geometric pottery appears to come from prothesis pots. Without full publication of all the pottery, however, it is difficult to determine the degree to which funerary markers dominate the pottery of the Acropolis.

3. Inscription: Part of an early stone inscription, *IG* i^3 1418, may date to the eighth century. The lines are difficult to interpret, but may be dedicatory, with references to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.[715]

Votives – Seventh century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: Hundreds of seventh-century terracotta figurines are reported from the Acropolis, though publications of these votives have been few and selective. Ninety-four standing terracotta female figurines, with columnar bodies and pinched faces, as well as five seated female figurines are reported in holdings of the Acropolis Museum. A selection has recently been placed on display in the new Acropolis Museum. They were recovered from various deposits on the Acropolis, with an increased concentration of them near the "Old Athena Temple". They have been dated from the seventh to early sixth century, and parallel terracotta figurines found at other

711. Schweitzer 1971, pp. 138-142; Hurwit 1999, pp. 91-94.

712. Ridder 1896, fig. 279; Richter 1968, p. 21, figs. 23-24; *LIMC* II, p. 46, no. 352.

713. Graef and Langlotz 1909, pp. 23-34, pls. 8-11. Based on the archaeological evidence published to date, there appears to have been almost no post-Bronze Age activity on the Acropolis in the centuries leading up to the Late Geometric period. Only one or two sherds can be dated to the Protogeometric period; see Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 7; Desborough 1952, p. 93. Sherds dating to the Early and Middle Geometric period are equally scarce; see Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 272; Coldstream 1968, p. 13, n. 2; Hurwit 1999, pp. 88-89.

714. Graef and Langlotz 1909, p. 11, no. 309 and pl. 13, nos. 368a and 380.

715. Jeffery 1990, pp. 69-70, no. 2.

seventh-century Attic sanctuaries.[716] Excavations of the North Slope produced over one hundred more pinched-face columnar female terracottas, most in fill dumped down from the Acropolis during cleaning operations.[717]

2. Terracotta Female Statue: One of the most striking discoveries from the Acropolis is a near life-size, wheel-made terracotta statue of an elaborately adorned female, dating ca. 680-670.[718] Only five fragments of the upper body of the statue were recovered, which preserve parts of her neck, head, right shoulder and arm. The lower part of her body is completely missing. What little is preserved of the back of the body appears to have been fashioned to meet a vertical surface, suggesting the lady was possibly enthroned, though a standing figure set against a flat surface cannot be ruled out.

Much of the painted decoration of the statue survives, illustrating a richly dressed woman adorned with jewelry. Her long, incised hair is wavy and painted bright red. She appears to have worn a peplos over a chiton. A winged horse decorates the one surviving side of the peplos, and most likely formed part of a heraldic decoration.[719] Additional ornamentation is rendered in relief, including a hair ribbon or diadem and earrings. Other jewelry was painted, including a necklace with suspended pomegranate pendants, and arm bands with suspended buds.

The scale of the statue, as well as the richness of the dress and jewelry, tempts us to consider this an image of Athena herself. Whether the terracotta statue is a similar in

---

716. Jahn and Michaelis 1901, pl. XXXIV, nos. 1, 2, date them to the Mycenaean period; Winter 1903, pl. 24 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, 9, 10, 11; Casson and Nicholson 1912, pp. 318-320, 346-347, note that many of the ninety-four standing female figurines were found northeast of the Propylaia, but no exact number is given. Küpper 1990, p. 20, suggests that over three hundred more, reported as Mycenaean in *AA* 1893, 140-141, are actually seventh-century in date.

717. Morgan 1935, pp. 193-196, fig. 4.

718. These five fragments were published by Nicholls 1991; all now appear to be lost or misplaced.

719. If the winged horses are heraldic decoration, there is space for a large decorative element between them. Cf. Nicholls 1991, p. 24, who tentatively suggests that the central decoration may have been an aegis. Cf. Brock and Young 1949, pp. 19-21, no. 2, pls. 7-8, for a contemporary wheel-made terracotta statuette from Siphnos with similar decoration, which they believe represents Athena.

appearance to the olive wood ἄγαλμα of Athena Polias is impossible to discern, since we know precious little about what the wooden statue looked like.[720]

3. Terracotta Horse Groups and Other Figurines: Horses, single and in teams, lions, snakes, birds, cows, pigs, monkeys, and sphinxes have been recovered from the Acropolis.[721] Acropolis debris found on the North Slope included numerous horse and rider figurines, individual horses, oxen, a monkey, a chicken head, and two fragmentary boats.[722]

4. Moldmade *Protomai*: At least three published female *protomai* appear to date to the seventh-century, at least one of which is pierced at the top for suspension.[723]

5. Terracotta Votive Shields: It is possible, however, that the earliest published shields from the Acropolis appear to date from the middle of the sixth century.[724]

6. Terracotta Votive Plaques: Eleven seventh-century plaques have been reported from Acropolis deposits. One plaque, found among the destruction debris under the Parthenon, portrays a goddess (?) with what appears to be a threshing fork, along with a wreath and a horse. Other plaques include two examples with a ship; one with a four-

---

720. Though the statue is mentioned in a variety of ancient sources, Herodotus, 5.71, being our earliest, almost nothing of its appearance is recorded. We know from a scholiast on Dem. 22.13, that the statue was of olive wood: τρία γὰρ ἀγάλματα ἦν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις, ἓν μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γενόμενον ἐξ ἐλαίας, ὅπερ ἐκαλεῖτο πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς εἶναι τὴν πόλιν... According to Euripides, *El.* 1254-1257, and Plutarch, *Them.* 10.4, the statue was decorated with a circular gorgoneion, presumably an aegis. Tertullian, *Apol.* 16.6, writing in the second century AD, describes the "Pallas Attica" statue perhaps uncharitably as an unfashioned pole or unshaped log: *sine effigie rudi palo et informi ligno [prostat].* We are not told specifically, however, whether the image was seated or standing. For a collection of the evidence for the olive wood statue, see Romano 1980, pp. 42-57.

721. Winter 1903, pl. 25, 2b; Casson and Nicholson 1912, pp. 322, 429-432, who provide a list of animal figurines found in Persershutt. They date what they consider the earliest of the votives, a four-horse group, to the "Geometric" period. The parallel they cite for this date, which comes from Pyre A at the Demeter sanctuary at Eleusis, has now been dated to the first half of the seventh century; see Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, no. A 153, p. 213, pl. 19.

722. Morgan 1935, pp. 196-197, fig. 5. These figurines are listed in Morgan's "Primitive" style, which he dates from the Late Geometric until the early fifth century. Further study is needed to determine which votives specifically belong to which century.

723. See Casson and Nicholson 1912, pp. 325-326, 397-404, who do not illustrate the earliest *protomai*. One of these "*protomai*" is published in Jenkins 1936, pp. 50-51, pl. VI, 8, where it is described as an Attic, handmade Daedalic head of the second half of the seventh century.

724. Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 100, nos. 2484-2492.

horse team; one with a horse and rider; and two with images of soldiers. Several are pierced at the top with holes for suspension.[725]

7. Inscriptions: A handful of fragmentary inscriptions appear to date to the seventh century, including part of a poorly preserved dedicatory inscription from a base, *IG* i³ 589, dating to perhaps the last quarter of the seventh century.[726]

8. Bronze: Evidence of bronze tripods continues into the seventh century, though the number of tripod fragments falls from over seventy in the Late Geometric period to fewer than ten for the seventh century.[727] Small numbers of free standing bronze figurines of males and Daedalic-style females also date to this century.[728]

9. Pottery: Only around one hundred seventh-century sherds have been reported and published, a significant drop-off from the one thousand Late Geometric sherds.[729] The number of seventh-century sherds may be seriously underreported. All published sherds are from decorated Protoattic vessels; any plain seventh-century wares that may have been on the Acropolis would likely go unnoticed or deemed unworthy of mention. Nevertheless, the drop-off in ceramic evidence from the Late Geometric to the seventh century is striking.

2.3. Athens: Athena Nike?

The Site:

Our earliest secure evidence for sanctuary of Athena Nike atop the Acropolis is an inscribed poros altar dedicated to the goddess, *IG* i³ 596, dating to the first half of the

---

725. Goddess with threshing fork: Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 286; Boardman 1954, p. 196, Acropolis no. 4; Hurwit 1999, p. 90, fig. 62b. One ship plaque comes from Well A on the North Slope of the Acropolis, which was filled with debris from cleaning operations on the Acropolis ca. 480: A-P 1682; Boardman 1954, pp. 195-196, fig. 4, Acropolis no. 1; Roebuck 1940, pp. 164-165, no. 25, fig. 14. Another ship plaque now resides in the National Museum, but originally came from the Acropolis Museum: Boardman 1954, p. 196, pl. 16, no. 2, Acropolis no. 2; for the provenience of the National Museum plaque, see Cook 1952, p. 93. Plaque with four-horse team: Boardman 1954, p. 196, Acropolis no. 6. Horse and rider: Boardman 1954, pp. 196-197, Acropolis no. 9; Roebuck 1940, pp. 164-165, no. 26, fig. 14. Armed soldiers: A-P 1939; Boardman 1954, pp. 196, Acropolis no. 6-7.

726. Jeffery 1990, pp. 71, 76, no. 7.

727. Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255.

728. For seventh century bronzes from the Acropolis, see Ridder 1896, figs. 213-214, 282-283. One bronze, seated Daedalic figurine, dated to the first half of the seventh century, is probably of Lakonian origin; see Jenkins 1936, pp. 31, pl. III, 2.

729. Morris 1984, p. 9; Osborne 1989, p. 309.

sixth century. Excavations directly below the Classical Athena Nike temple revealed a sixth-century statue base and altar.[730]

Votives – Seventh century?:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: The date of the sanctuary of Athena Nike may be earlier than the sixth century. Within the hollowed out base of an archaic cult statue were discovered a cache of terracotta female figurines, all apparently set in place at one time, along with some pot fragments and bones.[731] They have never been fully published, nor their date established. Based on photos of the cache *in situ*, they appear to be similar to seventh-century terracotta female figurines found in other goddess sanctuaries of this period.[732] At present, however, both the date of the figurines and their association with a pre-sixth-century sanctuary of Athena Nike must remain a tentative suggestion.[733]

2.4. Athens: Nymphe

The Site:

The shrine to Nymphe is located just southwest of the Athenian Acropolis. There are no literary references to this shrine, but its identification is secured by a fifth-century

---

730. Balanos 1937, p. 785; Oikonomos 1939, pp. 105-107, fig. 2; Mark 1993, pp. 20-30, 66-67, 128, 143, 145; Iakovides 2006, p. 207.

731. Judith Binder, p.c. March 12, 2007, reports that terracotta bulls were also seen when the cache was first discovered. If so, no report of these bulls has made it into any publications of which I am aware. The excavation notes of Balanos, reproduced by Mark 1993, p. 143, describe the figurines simply as "ἀρχαῖα εἰδώλια εἰς διάφορα μεγέθη (0,04-0,10)."

732. Oikonomos 1939, pp. 105-107, fig. 2. These terracottas have since been lost or misplaced. Küpper 1990, p. 20, includes these terracotta figurines among his study of seventh-century Stempelidole, and concludes that in Attica, none belong to the late Archaic period. For a seventh-century date, see also Travlos 1971b, pp. 148-149, fig. 201; Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, p. 275. For a Submycenaean date, see Iakovides 2006, pp. 207-208. Judith Binder, p.c. April 18, 2008, believes the figurines are sixth-century. Mark 1993, pp. 143@31-143@33, who says only that the terracottas were produced during the years 650-480.

733. Even if we were to confirm a seventh-century date for the figurines, we must keep in mind that Athena Nike may have shared the bastion with other shrines as early as the Archaic period. Pausanias, 1.22.8 and 2.30.2, for example, reports that at least in his day, a shrine of the Graces and a shrine for Artemis Epipyrgidai were also located on the bastion. Kandara 1960, suggests that the figurines were dedicated to Erechtheus, whose worship was later moved to the Erechtheion, an improbable suggestion in light of the lack of evidence. It is possible, therefore, that the figurines may have been dedicated to a shrine other than Athena Nike in the seventh century, and were later collected and deposited within the base during a remodeling project in the area.

horos stone, *IG* i³ 1064, as well as dedicatory graffiti on pottery dating from the same period. The earliest architecture, which consists of sections of an elliptical wall for an open-air structure, ca. 12.50 x 10.50 m., dates to the second quarter of the fifth century. It appears that the wall was built on the site of an older altar, as yet undated.[734]

Votives – Seventh-century:

Terracotta Figurines: Of unknown type, reported to date from the middle of the seventh century until the third or second century BC. These have not been published.

Terracotta Plaques: Reported to date from the middle of the seventh century until the third or second century BC. Not published.

Pottery: The immediate area was filled with thousands of potsherds from aryballoi, lekythoi, kylikes, loutrophoroi, plates, and lamps, reportedly ranging in date from the middle of the seventh until the third or second century.

A seventh-century date is secure for a series of loutrophoroi found at the shrine, a shape often associated with newly wed girls. By the Classical period, tradition held that on the day of an Athenian girl's wedding, the bride was to wash herself with water from the spring of Kallirrhoe. This water was brought to her in a loutrophoros by a boy or girl from among the near relatives of the pair. After the wedding ceremony, the bride offered the loutrophoros together with other vases at the special shrine of the Nymphe.[735] The early date of the loutrophoroi suggests that by the seventh-century this shrine may have

734. *PAE* 1955, pp. 50-52; 1956, pp. 262-265; 1957, pp. 23-26; *Ergon* 1957, pp. 5-12; Wycherley 1970, pp. 293-295; 1978, pp. 197-200; Travlos 1971b, pp. 361-364, figs. 464-467; Brouskari 1974, pp. 84-94.

735. Harp. s.v. λουτροφόρος; Hsch. and Phot. *Lex.* s.v. νυμφικὰ λουτρά; Poll. 3.43; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἐννεάκρουνος.

already held a similar function.[736] Iconography on some of the loutrophoroi, which includes processions of women, supports this interpretation.[737]

2.5. Athens: Nymphs

The Site:

The Hill of the Nymphs in Athens is marked with two rupestral inscriptions denoting the boundaries of sanctuaries or shrines. One inscription, near the present-day church of Ayia Marina, marks the shrine of the Nymphs and Demos, *IG* i³ 1065, dated by letter form to the late fifth century. Forty meters below the church is an earlier, perhaps sixth-century inscription marking the sanctuary to Zeus Meilichios, *IG* i³ 1055.[738]

In modern times, pregnant women sometimes slid down the hill in the hopes of promoting an easy birth, a practice witnessed as early as the nineteenth century.[739] This practice, together with the later placement of the church of Ayia Marina, saint of child-

736. Thuc. 2.15.5, attests that the practice of using the water from the Kallirhoe spring before a wedding was of great antiquity in his day. Cf. Travlos 1971b, fig. 467; Larson 2001, pp. 111-112. There have been attempts to associate Nymphe with Oreithuia, Aglauros, or Creousa, and the Bride of Zeus Meilichios. See, for example, Ervin 1958; Oikonomides 1964, pp. 16-17, 22-27, 48; Wycherley 1970, pp. 294-295. No evidence at present suggests that the divinity worshipped at this site was known by or associated with any name other than Nymphe.

737. See, for example, Brouskari 1974, p. 93, for a description of four loutrophoroi with female processions, including one, 1957-Aa 189, that includes scene in which the women are following a flutist and a little girl carrying a loutrophoros upon her head. Affixed to some of the loutrophoroi were plastic snakes and female protomai, both of which are are common in other goddess sanctuaries. One seventh-century loutrophoros is now on display at the new Acropolis Museum.

738. See Lalonde 2006, for a discussion of the horos inscriptions, and the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios, in general.

739. Dodwell 1819, pp. 405-406. According to Ervin 1959, pp. 156-157, the practice had only recently ceased.

birth, has been thought to represent a modern echo of the ancient association of the Nymphs and childbirth.[740]

Votives – Seventh-century:

Terracotta Figurines: A large deposit of terracotta figurines has been recovered near the top of the Hill of the Nymphs. The terracottas, dating from the seventh to the fourth centuries, are thought to be from the shrine of the Nymphs. As yet, no report of the excavations or the finds has yet been published.[741]

2.6. Athens: Demeter

The Site:

The earliest evidence for cultic activity in the area of the City Eleusinian consists of four seventh-century votive deposits, three of which are located within or near the upper terrace.[742] At the point where the upper and middle terraces meet, under the later fifth-century foundations of the Temple of Triptolemos, another pit was found with material dating from the late eighth to mid-seventh century, though the majority of the material dates to ca. 675.[743] The earliest signs of building activity on the upper terrace date to the early sixth century, when a temenos wall of Acropolis limestone was constructed.[744] It seems probable, therefore, that the area was a revered spot since at least the seventh

740. Ervin 1959, who identifies the Nymphs with the daughters of Hyakinthos, and suggests that these Nymphs were known as genethliai, "concerned with childbirth". Cf. Wycherley 1970, p. 287; Larson 2001, p. 131. The Nymphs at this site may also have been connected with abundance and prosperity. A fourth-century relief dedicated to the Νύμφαι Ὄμπνιαι, *IG* II/III² 4647, now in Avignon, France, was reportedly found on the Hill of the Nymphs; see Edwards 1985, pp. 405-412, no. 11.

741. Judith Binder, p.c. March 12, 2007.

742. Agora deposits T 20:2, T 20:3, T 20:4; Miles 1998, pp. 17-23, 24, fig. 4, 109-110, 112. Deposit T 20:4, the closest deposit to the "rocky outcrop," held mostly late sixth-century votive material, but included seventh-century offerings; see Miles 1998, pp. 17-20, table 1, p. 112, pl. 25.

743. Agora deposit T 19:3; Miles 1998, pp. 17-23, 24, fig. 4. Cf. Brann 1962, p. 131, who considers this primarily an early Protoattic deposit, and associated with deposit T 20:2 on the basis of similar figurines.

744. Miles 1998, pp. 25-26.

century, possibly the eighth.[745] A "rocky outcrop" in the upper terrace may have been the initial focus of cultic activity.[746]

Votives – Seventh-century:[747]

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: Nearly one hundred columnar female figures were recovered from the deposits, which constitutes over half of the votive material. A handful of seated female figures were also found. No male figures have been reported.[748]

2. Terracotta Horse Groups: These figurines include chariot groups and individual horses.

3. Other Terracotta Figurines: These are mostly figurines of animals too fragmentary to identify the species.

4. Terracotta Votive Shields: Of the four shields recovered from the deposits, at least two are securely dated to the seventh century.[749]

5. Terracotta Votive Plaques: The decoration of the nine votive plaques has generally been lost, though one has a series of alternating black vertical and red wavy lines. The wavy lines may be snakes.[750]

6. Cut Discs: Seventeen discs cut from seventh-century pottery were found within one deposit.[751]

7. Pottery: Earlier and later wares were found in small numbers in each deposit associated with the City Eleusinian. The Late Geometric and Protoattic pottery consists

---

745. Miles 1998, pp. 12-16. Early to Late Geometric wells have been found in the immediate vicinity of the City Eleusinian. No wells, however, were dug within the upper terrace of the sanctuary, perhaps an indication that the area was sacred even during the Geometric period.

746. Large rocks held cultic significance at a number of Demeter sanctuaries, including Hermione (Paus. 2.34.10); Pheneos in Arcadia (Paus. 8.15.2); Megara (Paus. 1.43.2); and the "Mirthless Rock" at Eleusis, for which see Clinton 1992, pp. 14-27. See also pp. 233-236 for a rocky outcrop at Lathouriza.

747. For a full inventory of deposits, see Miles 1998, 17-23, 109-112, table 1, fig. 4.

748. See Miles 1998, pl. 24-25, for illustrated examples.

749. These come from deposit T 19:3, and are dated in Miles 1998, p. 110, ca. 710-610. The fourth comes from deposit T 20:2.

750. Miles 1998, pl. 24. A well, Deposit M 11:3, found below the Odeion in the Athenian Agora produced several terracotta plaques, figurines and shields of the seventh century, which may also come from the Eleusinion; cf. Boardman 1954, p. 198, Agora nos. 4-5; Thompson 1947, p. 210; Brann 1962, p. 129.

751. Miles 1998, pp. 17, 110, all of which come from deposit T 19:3.

mostly of drinking vessels, including skyphoi, kotylai and other drinking cups, as well as oinochoai and pitchers. Miniature shapes, such as amphoriskoi and skyphoi, were found in two deposits.[752] Other ceramic shapes include lamps, spindle whorls and loomweights.

2.7. Athens: Zeus Meilichios

The Site:

According to Thucydides, 1.126.1-6, a festival for Zeus Meilichios, the Diasia, was being celebrated by the Athenians at the time of Kylon's failed coup attempt in the 630's.[753] This festival is described as one in which all the people, πανδημεί, celebrated with πολλὰ οὐχ ἱερεῖα, ἀλλ' <ἁγνὰ> θύματα ἐπιχώρια, bloodless offerings peculiar to the countryside.[754] The precinct is described only as ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, outside the polis. The shrine may have been located in Agrai, a rural district across the Ilissos River; to date, no archaeological evidence has been found to confirm Zeus Meilichios was worshipped in this area.[755]

2.8. Tourkovounia: Zeus?

The Site:

At the eastern extremity of the summit of Tourkovounia are the remains of an oval building, 7.60 m. wide and 11.50 m. long. The width of the socle, ca. 1.50 m., is assumed to have accommodated both a wall of mudbrick and an interior bench. The floor is of

---

752. Deposits T 19:3 and T 20:3.

753. Euseb. *Chron.*, Ol. 35, dates Kylon's victory of the double-race at Olympia to 640. According to Thuc. 1.126, the coup attempt occurred during an Olympic year; accordingly, 636 is the earliest year that the attempt could have been made. The coup attempt occurred before Drakon's reforms, traditionally dated to the thirty-ninth olympiad, 624/3-621/0; cf. Tatian, *Or. ad Graecos* 41, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.16; Eusebius, *Chron.* 99b; Suda s.v. Δράκων. For a discussion of the date of Drakon, see Stroud 1968, pp. 66-70, who prefers 621/0, and Develin 1989, pp. 30-31. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 4.1, dates Drakon's reforms to the–as yet undated–archonship of Aristaichmos. Lévy 1978, argues for an early sixth century date for the Kylonian conspiracy, ca. 597-595, a position refuted by Gagarin 1981b and Rhodes 1981, pp. 79-84.

754. According to a scholiast, θύματα ἐπιχώρια were τινὰ πέμματα εἰς ζώων μορφὰς τετυπωμένα ἔθυον, cakes molded to resemble animals.

755. See *SEG* 21.541.137-143; Jameson 1965, pp. 154-172; Robertson 1992, pp. 21-22, map 1; Lalonde 2006, pp. 108-109.

fine clay, suggesting that the building was roofed.[756] Pottery associated with the socle and floors suggests the building was constructed in the late eighth century, and continued in use until the end of the seventh.[757]

Whether this building served as a house, shrine, or both is not completely clear. The very location of the building, on a peak overlooking the Athenian plain, may indicate that this was no normal dwelling.[758] Only a handful of objects specifically votive in manufacture have been found at the site. Among the votives, however, are a miniature kotyle with a pierced base, and a terracotta fragment of a centaur, both of which have been interpreted as sufficiently indicative of ritual activity.[759] Large numbers of drinking vessels were recovered from the site; if the building did host ritual activity, drinking banquets apparently played a central role.[760]

Later activity on the site would seem to strengthen the building's identification as a shrine or site of ritual activity. After the building fell into disrepair at the end of the seventh century, an open-air shrine was established on the same spot in the fifth century; by the third quarter of the fourth century, an oval wall was built around the temenos, and an altar constructed. Activity at this shrine lasted until the third century A.D.[761]

Pausanias, 1.32.2, tells us that a sanctuary of Zeus Anchesmos stood on a small mountain near Athens, which he does not name or locate any more precisely. It has been tempting, therefore, to associate the later shrine at Tourkovounia with Zeus Anchesmos, and therefore see the eighth- and seventh century activity as a precursor to this particular shrine.[762] At the moment, however, there remains no conclusive evidence that Zeus

---

756. Lauter 1985a, p. 27; Fagerström 1988b, p. 47, believes the building foundations are for an open-air structure.

757. Lauter 1985a, pp. 24, 27, 122-123, 138-139.

758. Antonaccio 1995, p. 192.

759. Lauter 1985a, p. 130, who finds that these two objects indicate the presence of a "chthonic cult".

760. Ainian 1997, p. 89; Antonaccio 1995, p. 194.

761. Lauter 1985a, pp. 138-148.

762. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 11-12; Langdon 1976, pp. 101-102, n. 9; Lauter 1985a, pp. 149-154; Ainian 1997, p. 89, n. 455.

was the object of worship at this site, nor that the building functioned primarily as a shrine during its use.[763]

Votives – Late eighth- to seventh-century:

1. Pottery: The late eighth- and seventh-century pottery is dominated by drinking vessels, such as skyphoi, kotylai, and cups. Simple household vessels include pitchers, bowls, oinochoe, and cooking pots. Miniature drinking vessels, as well as kalathoi, and small bowls are common throughout the eighth and seventh centuries.[764]

Votives – Seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Horse Groups: Only six small terracotta figurine fragments were recovered during excavations. They include one male leg fragment, one male foot, two horse leg fragments, one fragment of an unidentifable limb, and a front leg fragment of a centaur.[765] It is probable that the horses and males belong to horse and rider groups.

2.9. Mt. Hymettos: Zeus

The Site:

Near the summit of Mt. Hymettos were discovered three structures, all centered around a hollow or depression.[766] Within the hollow was found the foundations of a circular structure, Building C, measuring ca. 2.80 meters in diameter.[767] Above and just west of the hollow were discovered the foundations for a rectangular structure, Building B, measuring ca. 5.80 long on each side. The northern and eastern wall foundations are around two meters thick; the much thinner southern and western foundations are ca.

---

763. Cooking pots recovered from the sanctuary may indicate that a *panspermia* festival was celebrated at this sanctuary, which focused on the offering of boiling seeds in pots; cf. Lauter 1985a, pp. 133-134; Ainian 1997, p. 89. Antonaccio 1995, p. 194, suggests that a *thalysia*, or harvest festival in which first-fruits are offered, was conducted at this site.

764. Lauter 1985a, pp. 70-90, 109-115.

765. Lauter 1985a, pp. 116-117, nos. 451-456, pl. 13.2, who dates all the fragments to the third quarter of the seventh century.

766. Excavations on the peak began in the 1920's, at which time a preliminary article was published on some of the inscriptions; see Blegen 1934; cf. *Art and Archaeology* 16 (1923) 207-208; 17 (1924) 285-286; *AJA* 28 (1934) 337. A preliminary report on the buildings and the votives was published by Young 1940. The site was published in full by Langdon 1976. Cf. Lauter 1985a, pp. 135-136; Ainian 1997, pp. 119, 143-144, figs. 136-138.

767. Young 1940, pp. 1-2, fig. 5, suggests the curved walls were the remains of either an apsidal house or a pit. Langdon 1976, pp. 1, 4, fig. 3, interprets Building C as "perhaps a stone-lined storage pit for votives". Ainian 1994, pp. 65-73; 1997, p. 118 suggests the structure is a model granary, meant to represent successful crop due to Zeus' rains.

0.80 m. thick. In the southwest corner, two or three "paving" slabs were found. A loose pile of stones against the east wall may be what remains of a rustic altar.[768] Further to the north are two parallel stone foundations of a third structure, Building A. The foundations are roughly two meters apart, and almost five meters long. There is no sign of a turned corner at any of the wall ends of Building A.[769]

Pottery, dating from the Late Protogeometric through the Late Roman periods, was dispersed throughout the site, but found in greater numbers in two areas: within the hollow, where Building C is located, and near Building B. Mounds of ash and burned bones were reported among the pots in the hollow, though almost none of the pottery itself has signs of burning.[770] The pottery within the hollow and over Building C was not stratified, though among the jumble was discovered a row of pots near the bottom.[771] The lack of stratification indicates that the depression served as a votive dump for activities associated with Building B, just to the south. The date of Buildings A, B, and C could not be determined, though it is possible they were built to accommodate the increased num-

768. Young 1940, pp. 2-3, fig. 3; Langdon 1976, pp. 1-2, fig. 1. Cf. Lauter 1985a, pp. 135-136, who suggests that the thicker walls along the north and east are indicative of a bench, and believes that building was roofed. Ainian 1997, pp. 143-144 agrees Lauter, and considers Building B a modest structure built to accomodate feasting and drinking. The altar, he suggests, was probably outside of this building.

769. Building A is thought to be an altar for Herakles, due to the presence of one inscribed sherd and one stone inscription found near the structure that possibly have his name inscribed. See Young 1940, pp. 1, 3,; Langdon 1976, pp. 1, 3, fig. 2, p. 15, no. 9, p. 41, no. 173, pp. 97-98. Both inscriptions are fragmentary, however, and it is not inevitable that either records the name Herakles. Ainian 1997, p. 144, n. 988 notes that it is not impossible that this structure was roofed, citing two possible contemporaneous parallels outside Attica, one in Kalapodi and the other in Kommos.

770. Langdon 1976, p. 77.

771. Langdon 1976, p. 51.

ber of visitors to the peak the eighth and seventh centuries, as seen in the increased sherd counts.[772]

The site is identified as a sanctuary to Zeus by a large number of seventh-century dedications to the deity inscribed on pottery. According to Pausanias, 1.32.2, there was in his day a statue to Zeus Hymettios, as well as an altar to Zeus Ombrios on Mt. Hymettos. Pausanias does not provide the exact location of the altar, and none of the dedications recovered from this site record the epithet Ombrios.[773] Nevertheless, this site may well be the location of the Zeus Ombrios altar, particularly since the finds are interpreted as offerings for rain.[774]

Votives – Geometric and seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Horse: A single seventh-century horse is the only terracotta figurine found reportedly found at the site.[775]

2. Metal: Iron objects, possibly dating the seventh century, include a spatula, knife, spit, and needle. Also possibly dating the seventh century are a bronze ring, and bronze chisel.[776]

3. Pottery: The pottery is dominated by open shapes, in particular cups and skyphoi. In the seventh century, kotylai appear for the first and last time, and represent

---

772. Ainian 1997, p. 143. If we may judge activity by sherd count, the Late Protogeometric period was followed by relative lulls of activity in the Early and Middle Geometric I periods. Interest increased in the Middle Geometric II and Late Geometric periods, reaching a relative apex in the seventh-century. The sixth century marks a dramatic decrease in visits, and by the Classical period activity is scant. The sherd counts by date are the following. Late Protogeometric: 69; Early Geometric I: 0; Early Geometric II: 13; Middle Geometric I: 12; Middle Geometric II: 91; Late Geometric I: 82; Late Geometric II: 294; seventh century: 589; sixth century: 109; fifth-first century: scant sherds; Late Roman: a number of lamps. See Langdon 1976, p. 75, table 1-2.

773. The only epithet recorded is for Zeus Semios, which probably refers to his role in providing atmospheric signs as "Sign-Giving Zeus," and so is related to weather. Cf. Zeus Semaleos, whose altar is reported by Pausanias, 1.32.2, to be on Mt. Parnes. It is possible, of course, that the epithet was applied to the Zeus of this sanctuary at a later date; see Langdon 1976, pp. 7, 13-15, no. 2, pl. 2, fig. 6.

774. Langdon 1976, pp. 7, 77-7, 78; cf. Cook 1914, I.124-163, II.Appendix B, 868-987 for Zeus on mountain tops, and III.284-881, esp. 525-570 for Zeus and rain. A small statue base was found at the site, inscribed with four lines of text too faded to read. It is possible that this stele, now lost, held a statue of Zeus known to Pausanias. See Young 1940, pp. 4-5, fig. 7; Langdon 1976, pp. 96-97.

775. Langdon 1976, p. 70, no. 313, pl. 26.

776. Langdon 1976, pp. 70-71, nos. 320-325, pl. 26.

over half the deposit. Of closed shapes oinochoai and jugs prevail, with the exception of one Early Geometric amphora, and two Middle Geometric pyxides. Over one hundred seventy inscriptions were recovered from the deposit, almost all dating from the beginning of the seventh century to the early sixth century. Many are dedicatory inscriptions which expressly name Zeus, while others are abecadaria, dedicant names, and other more fragmentary inscriptions.[777] The pottery appears to have been brought by the dedicants from their home, and not manufactured specifically for votive use.[778]

2.10. Mounychia: Artemis

The Site:

Pottery from excavations of the sanctuary of Artemis at Mounychia Harbor dates from the tenth century, indicating the site may have been sacred from the Protogeometric period. Certainly by the late eighth and seventh centuries, the sanctuary of Artemis Mounychia was the site of ritual activity, as evidenced by terracotta votives from the site.[779] No Geometric or seventh-century architecture has been reported.

Votives – Late eighth- and seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: At least nine columnar female figures have been recovered, most dating to the seventh century.[780]

2. Terracotta Horse Figurine: There is only one fragment of a horse body, which may date to the eighth century.[781]

2. *Protomai*: Three Daedalic female heads date to the seventh century.[782]

4. Pottery: The pottery consists mostly of drinking shapes, such as kraters and skyphoi; pyxides are also reported.[783]

---

777. See Langdon 1976, pp. 9-50, for a complete catalogue.

778. Langdon 1976, pp. 77-78. A kalathos, a miniature cup, and an Argive miniature oinochoe and cup seem to be the only pottery specifically manufactured for votive use (pp. 69-70, nos. 311-317-319, pl. 26). All date to the late eighth or seventh century.

779. *PAE* 1935, 159-195; Travlos 1988, pp. 340-346; Palaiokrassa 1989, 1991a, pp. 53-56, 64-66, 1991b, p. 96.

780. Palaiokrassa 1991a, E 6-15, pl. 12-13.

781. Palaiokrassa 1991a, E 4, pl. 12.

782. Palaiokrassa 1991a, E 16-18, pl. 13.

783. Palaiokrassa 1991a, pp. 64-67, 185, Κα 1-20, pl. 26-28. No terracotta shields, cut disks, or miniature vessels are reported. Four terracotta plaques have been found, all dating to the fifth and fourth centuries (Palaiokrassa 1991a, Π 1-4, pl. 25).

2.11. Trachones: Goddess?

The Site:

On a small hill, located between the modern towns of Trachones and Agios Kosmas, is a Byzantine basilica, under which are reported a rock-cut altar, as well as miniature vessels and a lamp. One Stempelidole is reported from the site, suggesting perhaps a seventh-century beginning for the shrine or sanctuary.[784]

3. Vari Plain

3.1. Lathouriza: Goddess?

The Site:

Lathouriza is located on the spur of a low hill, located just south of the pass leading between the Vari and Halai Aixonides plains. The site itself faces the Vari plain to the east. Though the site was excavated, the original excavation report was only one paragraph long, and the finds have never been fully published.[785] Much of what is known about Lathouriza today is due to subsequent survey work at the site, as well as published accounts of the excavator's notebooks.[786]

The original publication reported that the settlement consisted of twenty-five buildings, or "houses," and a "sanctuary". The date of the earliest material recovered from the site dates to ca. 700; Lathouriza represents, then, the most substantial assemblage of seventh-century architecture in Attica. The site continued to be visited through the late fourth century, at which time it was abandoned.[787] A description of the "sanctuary" was never offered in the original report, but the Tholos, erected on the highest peak of the complex, is the most likely candidate.[788] A large *eschara* filled with ashes and bones takes up the northeastern half of the Tholos.[789] A rocky outcrop takes up much of the southeastern half, around which were found hundreds of seventh-century terracotta vo-

---

784. Küpper 1990, p. 20; Mersch 1996.

785. Walter 1940, col. 178.

786. Survey work, and republishing of architecture: Lauter 1985b. Study of the excavator notebooks: Ainian 1994, 1995.

787. Lauter 1985b, p. 52.

788. Lauter 1985b, pp. 43-55; Seiler 1986, pp. 7-24.

789. Ainian 1995; 1997, pp. 116-119, 235-239.

tive figurines, the earliest dating to ca. 700.[790] Among the votives were fragments of a large terracotta female idol.[791] The large female idol parallels that found on the Athenian Acropolis, and may portray the goddess of the site.

The Tholos has long been thought to have been contemporary with the rest of the settlement, and so constructed around 700, a date consistent with that of the earliest votives found within the building.[792] The Tholos, however, is the only building at the site constructed of polygonal masonry, a construction technique that suggests a date closer to ca. 600; sixth-century material found under a bench that runs along the interior walls of the building seems to confirm this later date.[793] It appears, then, that during the seventh century, ritual activity at this sanctuary was originally open-air, and centered around the *eschara* and the rocky outcrop.

The object of worship at Lathouriza is unknown. Based on the large number of terracotta female figurines and the recovery of fragments of a large female idol, a female deity seems likely. Since the site overlooks the fertile plain of Vari, this goddess was probably associated with fertility and agriculture.[794] A possible connection with Demeter is suggested by the centrality of a rocky outcrop within the Tholos, a feature found at other Demeter sanctuaries in the Greek world.[795] Votives were found in other areas

---

790. Ainian 1995, p. 146. Though the largest concentration of terracotta votive figurines is found within the Tholos, it appears that figurines were found scattered in smaller numbers throughout the site.

791. Ainian 1995, p. 148; 1997, pp. 118-119. The idol is not dated, nor published. A possible parallel is recorded in Nicholls 1991, who reports a near life-size, seventh-century terracotta statue of a female (goddess?) found on the Athenian Acropolis.

792. Lauter 1985b, pp. 48-50. Seiler 1986, pp. 17-24, provides the same date for the Tholos, and considers it the earliest example of a tholos in the Greek world.

793. Ainian 1994; 1995; 1997, pp. 118-119.

794. Ainian 1994, pp. 68-70; 1995, p. 155; 1997, p. 119. Contra Lauter 1985b, pp. 48-50 and Seiler 1986, pp. 17-24, who assume the sanctuary was the focus of a hero shrine to the founder of the community.

795. See n. 746, p. 226.

throughout the site; it is possible, therefore, that the entire settlement was a sanctuary, or collection of shrines to different deities.[796]

Votives – Seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: The vast majority, if not all, of the hundreds of figurines are female, both columnar and flat-bodied types. Some are seated, the majority are standing. Most of the figurines are dated to the sixth century, but the "earliest" are described as columnar, and dated ca. 700. Many of the figurines were found associated with a large rock, located within the circuit of the Tholos.[797]

2. Terracotta Female Statue: Beside a cavity of the rock within the Tholos, perhaps enclosed by what may have originally been a small stone-built structure, four or five fragments of a large female "idol" were discovered. No dates, images, or descriptions are provided.[798]

3. Moldmade *Protomai*: Female *protomai* appear are reported, though dates and descriptions are lacking.[799]

4. Metal: Metal finds include rings, fibulae, armbands, and earrings of silver, bronze, iron and lead. Of particular interest are miniature lead jewels, which appear to have decorated the heads of some of the terracotta figurines. Specific dates for the metal are lacking in reports.[800]

---

796. Antonaccio 1995, pp. 195-197, suggests that Lathouriza was constructed to accommodate seasonal ritual activity, not year-round domestic living. She also notes that the Tholos building may have consisted only of a stone foundation, upon which was pitched a tent during these seasonal occasional rites. Eliot 1962, pp. 39-41, suggests that the entire settlement was a sanctuary, dedicated to several gods and heroes worshipped by those of the Vari plain, below.

    Ainian 1987, p. 104, fig. 153, has identified a small building on the north spur of the hill as a possible shrine. It consists of three walls, and is open to the east. The excavation history of the building is difficult to interpret, but it seems to date from ca. 700. No ash or votive deposits are reported, and so the identification remains speculative.

797. Walter 1940, col. 178; Ainian 1994, p. 78, fig. 12, p. 80, pls. 3-4; 1995, pp. 147-148, fig. 8; 1997, pp. 116-119, 235-239. Ainian dates the earliest votive offerings to ca. 700. Lauter 1985b, p. 53, pl.14, dates the earliest to the late eighth century, the rest to the first half of the seventh century; cf. Seiler 1986, pp. 19-21, fig 11 a-h, for a similar date. Lauter and Seiler suggest some of the earliest figurines may be male. Ainian 1995, p. 146, n. 19, identifies all the figurines as most likely female.

798. Ainian 1995, p. 148; 1997, pp. 118-119.

799. Ainian 1995, pp. 146-147.

800. Walter 1940, col. 178; Ainian 1995, p. 148.

5. Pottery: The pottery is reportedly mostly miniature one handled-vases, kotylai, and amphorae, as well as lamps, and plates.[801]

3.2. Kiapha Thiti: Goddess?

The Site:

Kiapha Thiti is situated upon a series of three terraces located at the southern end of Mt. Hymettos, on a height overlooking the passes that connect the Vari plain with the plains of Lower and Upper Lamptrai. The site was established in the middle of the eighth century upon the remains of a fortified Mycenaean settlement, and remained active through the fifth century.[802] The site is accessible only from the west, which faces the Vari plain.[803]

Excavations in the upper terrace revealed a number of trenches with votives and pottery. Some of these trenches held mixed Geometric through Classical deposits, others exclusively seventh-century material. One trench showed evidence of at least five pyres, as well as terracotta votives and pottery from the seventh and sixth century. A possible altar has been identified near the pyres, though of unknown date. The middle terrace produced only scattered finds from the seventh and sixth century, mostly household wares. Deposits from the lower terrace produced the majority of terracotta votives and miniature pottery; according to the excavators, these votives were transferred from the upper terrace, perhaps in the Byzantine period during renewed building operations at the summit.[804] No post-Mycenaean architectural remains date earlier than the fifth century; perhaps the sanctuary was open-air before the Classical period.[805] At any rate, the large number of female figurines indicates that a female divinity may have been an object of worship.[806]

Votives – Middle Geometric through seventh-century:

---

801. Ainian 1995, p. 148. Cf. Lauter 1985b, pp. 50-52, fig. 7, who publishes surface finds dating late eighth- and seventh-century.

802. Christiansen 2000, pp. 74-76, 88-90.

803. Eliot 1962, pp. 54-55.

804. Christiansen 2000, pp. 74-76.

805. It is possible that later building on the upper terrace during the Byzantine period removed all trace of Geometric and Protoattic construction. For the location of the deposits, and the physical setting of the sanctuary in the eighth and seventh centuries, see Christiansen 2000, pp. 74-76, 88-90.

806. Christiansen 2000, pp. 90-95, believes that the sanctuary was for Artemis or the Nymphs.

1. Pottery: The earliest pottery dates from the Middle Geometric, with a dramatic increase in pottery and finds in the Protoattic period. Skyphoi other drinking vessels are the most represented shapes in both the Geometric and Protoattic periods. In the seventh century, Protocorinthian vessels become numerous, though still outnumbered by Attic wares; half are small, closed shapes for perfume or scented oil, such as aryballoi and alabastra. The other half are drinking vessels, mainly kotylai, both normal and miniature in size.[807]

Votives – Seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: All terracotta figurines were female figurines. A total of forty-eight were recovered, most pinched-faced with columnar bodies, a few are flat-bodied. All are dated to the first half of the seventh-century.[808]

2. Moldmade *Protomai*: Eight female Daedalic *protomai* were recovered, most of which are pierced with a hole for suspension. At least four are dated to the seventh-century.[809]

3. Terracotta Votive Shields: Two seventh-century shields were found among the deposits.[810]

3.3. Panagia Thiti: Goddess?

One kilometer east of Kiapha Thiti, as the crow flies, is Panagia Thiti, a low hill where a modern church for the Panagia now stands. A level area just south of the church is marked by four rupestral inscriptions that read ΗΟ for ΗΟΡΟΣ, and classical blocks in the area indicate that the area may have been a sacred temenos in this period.[811] Stempelidolen of perhaps the seventh century have also been reported from this area, provide

807. Christiansen 2000, pp. 22-44, 54-63, pl. 3-5, 7-8.

808. Küpper 1990, pp. 17-29, pls. 10-11. The only other terracotta figurine, Christiansen 2000, p. 71, no. GA 298, is what may be a part of a chair or throne leg. It is too fragmentary for a secure identification.

809. Christiansen 2000, pp. 67-68, nos. GA 284-287, pl. 9.

810. Christiansen 2000, p. 71, nos. GA 300-301, pl. 10.

811. Eliot 1962, pp. 56-58, fig. 5; Willemsen 1965, pp. 122-123, pl. 39.1.

evidence of sacred activity from at least this period. To date, however, the site has not been systematically excavated.[812]

3.4. Varkiza: Zeus?

A peak sanctuary has recently been located on Varkiza, overlooking the Vari plain to the north. Architecture from the site includes two terrace walls, an altar, and a collection of field stones that have been interpreted as some form of marker or *sema*. The earliest pottery dates from the ca. 700, and consists of four miniature cups, dated Subgeometric and Protoattic.[813]

4. Anavyssos Plain

4.1. Mt. Kastela: Nymphs?

The Site:

The Kastela-i-Spilia cave is on the low hill of Mt. Kastela, located near Kataphyki, southeast of Anavyssos. Over the entire eastern section of the cave was a disturbed deposit, with large quantitites of burnt earth and pottery, most of which dated to the first half of the fifth century, and included miniature cups, lekythoi, kylix and krater fragments, as well as terracotta figurines and plaques.[814] The material has not been fully published.

The cave has been identified as a sanctuary of the Nymphs, and may have become later associated with Pan after the Persian wars. Strabo, 9.1.21, notes a Paneion of Anaphlystos, the ancient deme in which this cave was located. Such an identification must remain tentative.[815]

---

812. An inscribed slab of slate, dated to the first half of the third century BC, records an obscene graffiti of four of five lines; EM 13201. The text, which is not fully preserved, describes a particular woman's desire or involvement in "holy couplings" (κελητισμοῖς ἱε[ροῖς]). This inscription has led some to believe that the sanctuary was for Dionysos or Aphrodite; see, e.g., Mitsos 1957, pp. 47-49, no. 9, fig. 2; Lang 1961, p. 62, pl. 34; Goette 1995. At present, the evidence is too slight to confirm either attribution.

813. Lauter and Lauter-Bufe 1986, pp. 297-298, nos. 1-4, fig. 8.1-4.

814. Wickens 1986, II pp. 15-20, no. 2; Lohmann 1993, pp. 68, 495, no. AN1, pl. 52.8, 122; Oikonomakou 1994; Blackman 2000, p. 15. Küpper 1990, pp. 18-19, dates the terracotta plaques to the late Archaic or possibly the Classical period.

815. Wickens 1986, II p. 18, for example, finds the Keratea cave on Mt. Pani a more likely candidate for the Paneion; for this cave, see 1986, II, no. 5, pp. 26-32.

Votives – Seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: Reported to date to the seventh century; it is also possible that other terracotta figurine-types date to this period.[816]

2. Moldmade *Protomai*: Eight female Daedalic *protomai* were recovered, most of which are pierced with a hole for suspension. At least four are dated to the seventh-century.

4.2. Mt. Profitis Elias: Zeus?

The Site:

Mt. Profitis Elias overlooks the agricultural plain south of Anavyssos. A survey of the peak produced Protocorinthian aryballoi, as well as cup shapes dating from the seventh and sixth century. No architecture, terracotta votives, or ash deposits were found.[817]

5. Charaka

5.1. Kassidis Peak: Zeus?

On this low peak, overlooking the Charaka plain in southern Attica, were found two vessels that date to the seventh century, a Phaleron cup and a miniature vessel. Two possibly parallel walls are undated.[818] There are no reports of burned layers.

6. Cape Sounion

6.1. Sounion: Athena

The Site:

Within the temenos of the later sanctuary of Athena at Sounion, a pit or bothros was discovered that was filled with a rich and varied deposit containing mostly seventh- to early fifth-century votive material. The pit was then sealed during renovations of the area in the Classical period.[819] Most of the votive material is whole, suggesting that the

---

816. Küpper 1990, pp. 18-19.

817. Langdon 1976, p. 104.

818. Lohmann 1993, pp. 388-389, no. CH 60, pls. 52.5, 123.3.

819. Stais 1917, pp. 178-181, 207-213; 1920, pp. 48-55. The pit is large, measuring over fifteen meters deep, and ca. 1.70 by 3.00 m. wide at the top, narrowing to 1.00 by 0.50 m. wide at the bottom. The original purpose of the pit is unknown.

objects were fairly carefully deposited within. Another fill just east of the later Temple of Athena revealed similar pottery and votives.[820]

An oval temenos wall, encompassing thirty to forty meters in area, overlaps the Classical sanctuary walls to the north. Walls from a multi-room structure were found in the southern part of the oval temenos. It is possible that the temenos wall marks the site of the Archaic sanctuary of Athena.[821]

Homer, *Od.* 3.278-285, sang of Cape Sounion, which he depicts as a stopping-off point for seafarers.[822] During just such a stop, Phrontis, the oarsman of Menelaos, died. Menelaos then delayed departure until after he could bury Phrontis at Sounion with due honors. Homer makes no mention of any sanctuaries or shrines at Sounion, and there are no indications that Phrontis' burial was intended as a site of hero worship. The tale, however, has encouraged scholars to interpret the votive deposits from the Athena sanctuary as indicative of the "hero cult" of Phrontis.[823] These "heroic" dedications include two iron swords, a terracotta votive plaque decorated with a ship and crew, as well as the votive shields, tripods, and horses. With notable exception of the swords, parallels for the remaining votives can be found at contemporary Attic sanctuaries, particularly those

---

820. The finds from the deposits found at both the Poseidon and Athena sanctuaries are being prepared for publication by Zetta Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis. At present, she believes that the deposits are so mixed at both sanctuaries that associations of any particular deposit with any particular deity is difficult, if not impossible; p.c., 18 April 2008. For the present, I am inclined to believe that the deposits found in the area of the Classical Athena sanctuary are from an earlier Athena sanctuary. While there are similarities between deposits from both sanctuaries, including weapons, terracotta female figurines are found only at the Athena sanctuary; in fact, terracotta figurines as a whole are missing from the Poseidon sanctuary. Full publication of the Sounion deposits in the coming years will no doubt make any distinctions between the two sanctuaries clearer.

821. Stais 1920, pp. 40-41.

822. ἀλλ' ὅτε Σούνιον ἱρὸν ἀφικόμεθ', ἄκρον Ἀθηνέων,/ ἔνθα κυβερνήτην Μενελάου Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων/ οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσιν ἐποιχόμενος κατέπεφνε,/ πηδάλιον μετὰ χερσὶ θεούσης νηὸς ἔχοντα,/ Φρόντιν Ὀνητορίδην, ὃς ἐκαίνυτο φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων/ νῆα κυβερνῆσαι, ὁπότε σπέρχοιεν ἄελλαι./ ὣς ὁ μὲν ἔνθα κατέσχετ', ἐπειγόμενός περ ὁδοῖο,/ ὄφρ' ἕταρον θάπτοι καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσειεν.

823. Picard 1940, associates the shrine of Phrontis with an enclosure built against the Classical temenos wall around the sanctuary of Poseidon, an unlikely identification. The enclosure is actually a defensive bastion; cf. Dinsmoor 1971, p. 17. Themelis 1970, p. 7, believes that the oval temenos north of the Classical Athena sanctuary was a sixth-century sanctuary for Phrontis. He does not provide evidence for either the date or identification. Abramson 1979, suggests that the small Classical temple built north of the Athena temple was dedicated to Phrontis.

of Demeter, Artemis, and Athena.[824] In addition, terracotta ship plaques and figurines have also been found in deposits from the Athenian Acropolis, indicating that such imagery was perhaps at home in Athena sanctuaries.[825] No secure evidence of any date, in fact, has ever been found to support a shrine to Phrontis at Sounion.[826]

Votives – Late eighth- or early seventh-century:

1. Weapons: Two iron swords were found at the very bottom of the bothros; they are often dated to the ninth century, though an eighth-century or early seventh-century date is more likely.[827]

2. Bronze: A number of bronze dedications were recovered, including miniature shields, miniature tripods, cups, horses, and standing female and male figurines. Other bronze objects include earrings, clothing pins, and other jewelry, including one gold and six silver rings. The dating of these objects has been a matter of controversy, with the earliest dates ranging from the middle of the eighth century to the beginning of the seventh.[828]

Votives – Seventh-century:[829]

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: The earliest terracottas from the deposit date to the beginning of the seventh century.[830]

---

824. See votive charts for comparison, pp. 296-305.

825. For ship plaques and terracottas from the Athenian Acropolis, see the catalogue entry for Athena Polias, pp. 215-221.

826. Antonaccio 1995, pp. 166-169.

827. Most have followed Stais 1917, pp. 207-208, in dating these swords to the second half of the ninth century. For a late eighth- or early seventh-century date, see Snodgrass 1964, 96, nos. 26 and 27.

828. Stais 1917, p. 208, fig. 17-18; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 32. Dinsmoor 1971, p. 4, who dates the two swords to the ninth century, considers the rest of the deposit to date from the early seventh through the early fifth centuries. Themelis 1970, p. 7, gives a similar date for the swords, and dates some of the offerings to the "8th-century but most 7th and 5th-century". Travlos 1988, p. 404, dates the founding of the Athena and Poseidon sanctuaries at Sounion to the seventh century. Goette 2000, p. 32, dates the earliest bronze objects to the second half of the eighth century.

829. The remains of at least five kouroi, similar to those found near the Poseidon sanctuary to the southwest, two of which are inscribed. They all date to ca. 600 (Richter 1960, pp. 30-45; Stewart 1990b, nos. 44-48), and so are not included in the seventh-century catalogue.

830. Stais 1917, p. 208, pl. 9; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 33.

2. Terracotta Horses: At present, only individual horses have been reported.[831]

3. Moldmade *Protomai*: These are female heads, wearing a polos; most are pierced with a hole for suspension.[832]

4. Terracotta Votive Plaques: Twenty-nine seventh-century painted plaques are reported. The most well-known is a nearly complete plaque with armed soldiers and a steersman aboard a ship. Only two other plaques have images that have survived, both with only one corner preserved. The first shows a checkerboard-pattern border, and the feet and dress of a woman facing right. The other shows the head of what is thought to be a sphinx. Suspension holes are preserved at the top corners of a number of plaques.[833]

5. Gems and Seals: Numerous round and oval seals, as well as numerous Egyptian scarabs, were recovered, most dating from the mid-seventh until the mid-sixth century. Similar seals were found at deposits from the nearby Poseidon sanctuary. Their style, material, and construction have more parallels with Aigina and the Cyclades than with other Attic sites.[834]

6. Pottery: The pottery from these deposits awaits publication, though the seventh-century pottery reportedly consists mostly of Corinthian vessels, such as aryballoi, oinochoai, and other mostly small plastic vases.[835]

6.2. Sounion: Poseidon

The Site:

The earliest votives found near the Classical sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion come from a pit at the promontory's southeastern corner, just outside the temenos of the Temple of Poseidon. The finds have never been fully published, but summary reports

---

831. For horses, and a small number of other terracotta animals, see Stais 1917, p. 208, 210, fig. 20; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 34, fig. 66.

832. Stais 1917, p. 208, pl. 9; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 35.

833. Ship plaque: Athens NM 3588; Stais 1917, p. 209, fig. 19, top left; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Sunium no. 1; Goette 2000, p. 33-34, pl. 34, fig. 65. The painting on the plaque is attributed to the Analatos Painter by Cook 1934, p. 173, pl. 40b. Female plaque: Stais 1917, p. 209, fig. 19, bottom left; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Sunium no. 2; Goette 2000, p. 33-34, pl. 34, fig. 64, on left. Sphinx plaque: Stais 1917, p. 209, fig. 19, bottom right; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Sunium no. 3; Goette 2000, p. 33-34, pl. 34, fig. 64, on right.

834. Stais 1917, pp. 211, fig. 21; Boardman 1963, pp. 123-127, fig. 12, pl. 15; Gorton 1996, p. 165; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 33. There is an unpublished collection of seals found at Brauron, which may have parallels with the Sounion examples.

835. Morris 1984, p. 99; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 36.

date the earliest finds to the beginning of the seventh century.[836] No architecture earlier than the fifth-century temple of Poseidon has been found.[837]

Votives – Seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Figurines: Though terracotta figurines are reported, the only published example is a foot, pierced at the top for suspension.[838]

2. Weapons: These are mostly bronze arrows; bronze axes or chisels are also reported.[839]

3. Other Metal: Bronze figures of a Near Eastern god, as well as an animal, and bronze rings were recovered.[840]

4. Gems and seals. Around fifty Egyptian scarabs and seals were recovered.[841] Among the motifs are a seated figure, a flying bird, a winged horse, a horseman next to a branch, a centaur with a stick and a bird, possible serpents and serpentine creatures, and a tripod. Some of the seals are similar to those found in Euboea, Delos and Perachora.[842]

---

836. Stais 1917, pp. 194-197. Almost no pottery is published. The earliest terracotta plaques seem to date to the sixth century. See also Stais 1920, pp. 10-28; Goette 2000, p. 20, pl. 10. Themelis 1970, pp. 7, 9, dates the earliest deposits to the second half of the seventh century; Dinsmoor 1971, p. 2, suggests they date to the beginning of the seventh. A second pit revealed revealed the remains of seventeen monumental marble Kouroi, similar to those found in the sanctuary of Athena. They all seem to date to ca. 600. See Stais 1917, pp. 189-194; Themelis 1970, p. 10; Dinsmoor 1971, p. 11; Goette 2000, pp. 19-20, pl. 8-9, figs. 11-14. For the date of the kouroi, see Richter 1960, pp. 30-45; Stewart 1990b, nos. 44-48.

837. Stais 1917, p. 189.

838. Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 9; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 18. Votive plaques were also recovered, but seem to date from the middle of the sixth period; see Stais 1917, p. 197, fig. 10.

839. Stais 1917, p. 194-195, fig. 7; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 15.

840. Stais 1917, p. 194-195, fig. 7; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 15. Hanfmann 1962, identifies the Near Eastern deity as either Reshef, Baal, or Hadad; he suggests Baal, the storm god, may be the most likely.

841. Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 8; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 17.

842. Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 8; Pendlebury 1930, pp. 82-84, nos. 176-225, pl. 4; Boardman 1963, pp. 123-127, fig. 12; Dinsmoor 1971, p. 4; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 17; Gorton 1996, p. 165.

5. Pottery: As with the Athena sanctuary at Sounion, almost no pottery has been published, though small Corinthian aryballoi, oinochoai, and miniature shapes appear to be the most common context pottery.[843]

7. Mesogeion Plain

7.1. Pallini: Athena

The Site:

At modern Stavros Geraka, ancient Pallini, the site of a mid-fifth century temple of Athena Pallinis has been indentified, the superstructure of which was moved during the Roman period to the Athenian Agora.[844] Excavations within the foundations of the temple and in the immediate area show activity at the site from the Early Geometric period through the seventh century.[845] The material has not been fully published.

No architecture dating to the Geometric period or seventh century is reported, though there are reports of sacred springs, which perhaps were the focus of early ritual activity here.[846]

The sanctuary was already considered ancient by the fifth century, when it was tied to traditions involving the Herakleidai, and perhaps even Athena's building of the Acropolis.[847] The sanctuary was certainly active by the sixth century, for it was the site of the battle in which Peisistratos secured his rule over Athens.[848]

---

843. Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 9; Morris 1984, p. 99; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 18.

844. Korres 1992; Camp 2001, pp. 117-118, 189-191.

845. For reports on the excavations, see Filis 1994; 1997; Platonos-Giota 1999; Blackman 2000; Whitley 2003; Whitley 2006.

846. Filis 1994; 1997.

847. Eur. *Heracl.* 849, for the sanctuary during the time of the Herakleidai. Antig. Car. *Historiarum mirabilium collectio* 12 (= Jacoby *FGrH* 330), quotes a little known fifth or fourth century historian Amelesagoras the Athenian, who reports that Athena built the Acropolis from stone she carried from Πελλήνη, part of which was dropped to form Mt. Lykavittos. The Pellini of this tale be the area of the Athena Pallini sanctuary, which may indicate an early association of Athena with Pallini. The third century BC poet Kallimachos of Kyrene, however, writes in his epic *Hekale*, fr. 260, that the stone was brought from the Pellini in Achaia. Cromey 1991, p. 168, dismisses altogether the account of Amelesagoras, whom he deems "disreputable" and a "forger".

848. Hdt. 1.62.3; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.3.

Votives:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: Thousands of columnar πτηνόμορφοι, or "bird-faced" terracottas figurines are reported, many with arms out. Some wear a polos or other head gear. At least ten other female figurines are seated.

2. Terracotta Horse Groups: Horses are reported, but not horse-and-rider or chariot groups.

3. Other Terracotta Figurines: Other figurines include bulls, goats, snakes, and birds. Altogether, including horses, there are one hundred fifty terracotta animal figurines.

The terracottas of these three groups have been dated to the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries in preliminary reports. To judge from the few published images of the terracottas, however, there seems to be little reason to date them to earlier than the early seventh century, based on parallels from other deity sanctuaries in Attica.[849]

4. Moldmade *Protomai*: Four female Daedalic heads. In addition, another twenty one more naturally fashioned terracotta female heads in the round are reported.[850]

5. Metal Objects: Eighty small bronze objects, including pins and fibulae; two finger rings, one of pseudo-silver, with Egyptian characters on the bezel.[851]

6. Pottery: The pottery associated with these finds was found in mixed deposits dating from the Early Geometric to Hellenistic periods. The shapes consisted mainly of small and medium vessels associated primarily with drinking, such as kotyliskoi, skyphoi, kyathoi, phialai, and kantharoi.[852]

7.2. Brauron: Artemis

The Site:

The material remains from Brauron are largely unpublished at present. Based on summary accounts, it appears that the earliest votive material dates to the eighth century, increases dramatically in the seventh-century, and peaks at the end of the sixth cen-

---

849. For a 9th and 8th c. date for the terracottas, see Filis 1997, pp. 90-92, and pl. 41 for images; for an 8th and 7th c. date, see the earlier excavation report in Filis 1994. For an 8th c. date, see Whitley 2006.

850. Filis 1997; Whitley 2003.

851. Filis 1997; Whitley 2003.

852. Filis 1997.

tury and beginning of the fifth century.[853] Votive deposits are concentrated in the area of the sacred spring, under and near the later temple of Artemis, under and near the stoa, and in the "Cave of Iphigeneia".[854] Initial reports indicate that most of the deposits were mixed, with material ranging in date from the eighth to the fifth century all deposited together.[855]

Below the southern end of the east wing of the Classical stoa lies a partially excavated "older building." It appears to be constructed of poros blocks, oriented SW-NE, and

853. Original excavations reports can be found in Papadimitriou, *PAE* 1949, pp. 84, 90, pl. 14-18; 1950, pp. 175-177; 1955, pp. 118-119; 1956, pp. 75-76, pl. 19-21; 1957, pp. 42-45, pl 9-11. See Antoniou 1990, pp. 42-43, 46, 50-51, 53-56, for a full bibliography of initial publication reports on excavated areas that produced eighth- to seventh-century material, pp. 75-78 for a summary of the Geometric and Early Archaic pottery and votive material. Cf. the summaries found in Papadimitriou 1963; Kontis 1967; Themelis 1971; Hollinshead 1980, pp. 30-44; Wickens 1986, volume II, pp. 62-72; Eustratiou 1991b; Brulotte 1994, pp. 321-359; Themelis 2002, pp. 108-111.

854. Papadimitriou's *Ergon* 1961 30-34, figs. 26-37, suggests that most of the votive offerings recovered from the sacred spring were deposited there due to the Persian invasion of 480.

855. The site was occupied in the Mycenaean period, and subsequently abandoned during the Submycenaean and most of the Protogeometric period. The earliest post-Mycenaean pottery material is often simply dated "Geometric" in the preliminary reports. Themelis 1971, p. 10, believes that renewed activity began in the Protogeometric period, though he dates the earliest evidence for sanctuary activity to the eighth century; cf. Themelis 2002.

may have wheel ruts. It is possible that this structure is a seventh-century antecedent to the stoa, though a sixth century date is also possible.[856]

Votives – Eighth- and seventh-century:

1. Terracotta Female Figurines: The standing female figurines are both of the standing cylindrical and flat type; a number of female figurines are depicted sitting on a "throne". The earliest date from the late seventh century.[857]

2. Terracotta Horse Groups: These include horse and riders, individual horses, and teams of horses.[858]

3. Other Terracotta Figurines: A handful of individual animals also seem to date to the seventh century.[859]

---

856. Papadimitriou, *Ergon* 1961, 21; 1962, 28-29, 32; Hollinshead 1980, pp. 36-37; cf. *SEG* 53.103; 55.237. The earliest temple of Artemis foundations are dated by Papadimitriou to the late sixth century. He suggests that this temple was destroyed during the Persian invasions, and replaced by a second temple dating ca. 475-450 (*Ergon* 1959, 19; 1961, 33-34; 1962, 28). Themelis 1971, pp. 16-17, suggests that the present foundations represent only one temple, which he dates to the first half of the fifth century; he suggests an older archaic temple may have stood in the area where the modern church of St. George now stands. For the theory that a Geometric period wooden temple once stood at Brauron, cf. Papadimitriou, ΠΑΕ 1945/48, p. 86; 1955, p. 118; Travlos 1976, p. 205; Antoniou 1990, pp. 42-43, 46, 54, 56, 75-76; Eustratiou 1991b, p. 79. The altar has yet to be found. Papadimitriou 1963, p. 113, suggests that the altar may have been in the area the modern church of St. George. The altar, however, may have been located east of the temple, perhaps in the area of fill reported to contain ash and seventh- to fifth-century pottery and votive material (Papadimitriou *PAE* 1956 73, 75, p. 18; 1959, 20; *Ergon* 1959 20, fig. 11-12; cf. Hollinshead 1980, p. 37; Brulotte 1994). Goette 2005, has recently reexamined the cuttings in the bedrock in the terrace below the church of Ag. Giorgos, and believes that the terrace supported two buildings, an *Archaios Neos* and *Parthenon*.

857. Papadimitriou, *PAE* 1949, 90; 1959, 20; *Ergon* 1961, 30-32. The figurines are usually dated from the beginning of the sixth century, or from the seventh to sixth centuries. They are usually not described in detail. Kontis 1967, pp. 191-192, reports large numbers of terracotta figurines of the shape and type customary in other Greek sanctuaries, the earliest of which he dates to the end of the seventh or beginning of the sixth centuries. I was kindly permitted by Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon to view photos of all the terracotta votive figurines recovered from Brauron, in advance of her final publication of this material. She supports a late seventh-century date for the female figurines.

858. I was able to see twelve examples of what appear to be seventh-century horse group figurines in photos provided by Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon, April 30, 2008.

859. Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon, p.c. April 30, 2008.

2. *Protomai*: Three female *protomai* were recovered near the temple, all pierced at the top with suspension holes.[860]

3. Terracotta Votive Plaques?[861]

4. Metal: Bronze and gold jewelry, rings, mirrors were recovered in numbers. Dates for specific items are lacking in published reports; these items were found in deposits dating from the eighth to the fifth centuries.[862]

5. Seals and Gems: Found in deposits dating from the eighth to the fifth centuries, though many are reported to have parallels with seventh-century seals and gems found at Sounion.[863]

6. Pottery: Most of the pottery from the deposits dates to the fifth century, but Late Geometric and Protoattic periods appear well represented. Much of the pottery has been categorized as "à usage féminin," including pyxides, loutrophoroi, miniature lebetes gamikoi, and epinetra.[864] With the exception of fifth-century krateriskoi, vessel shapes are not discussed in detail by date.[865]

---

860. The excavator dates them to the mid-sixth century; see Papadimitriou, *PAE* 1949, 89, fig. 20. For a seventh-century date, see Brookes 1982, p. 72, no. 61, pl. 15, fig. 57. More are due to be published; p.c. Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon, April 30, 2008.

861. Earliest published examples are moldmade terracotta relief plaques of the sixth-century. They feature among their themes Artemis riding a bull (as Artemis Tauropolos?), Artemis on a throne, and Artemis holding a kitharos. See, Kontis 1967, pl. 102; Themelis 1971, pp. 76-79. All appear to have suspension holes at the top corners, and were painted. To date, no specifically seventh-century votive plaques have been reported or published.

862. Papadimitriou, *PAE* 1949, 79-80; *Ergon* 1961, 30-32.

863. Papadimitriou, *PAE* 1949, 79-80, fig. 8; *Ergon* 1961, 30-32, fig. 31-32. Boardman 1963, p. 123, 1968, p. 7.

864. Kahil 1963, p. 27. The loutrophoroi and lebetes gamikoi are often linked with marriage ceremonies.

865. Outside of Brauron and the nearby sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai Araphenides, fifth-century krateriskoi have been found at the sanctuary of Artemis Mounychia at Peiraieus, as well as on the Acropolis, in the Athenian Agora, and in fill associated with the temple of Artemis Aristoboule; cf. Kahil 1963; 1965; 1977; 1981; Threpsiades and Vanderpool 1964; Palaiokrassa 1991a, 1991b, who notes that the fabric of the krateriskoi found in Brauron is different from that at Mounychia, indicating localized production. In every case, the krateriskoi are associated with a sanctuary of Artemis. These vessels often depict young girls dancing or running, often near an altar and a tree. Many believe these images depict the ritual of the *arkteia*, though there is debate. See also Sourvinou-Inwood 1988b; Hamilton 1989; Gentili and Perusino 2002.

7.3. Loutsa: Artemis

The Site:

Ten kilometers north of Brauron, remains of the Classical temple of Artemis Tauropolos was discovered the ancient site of Halai Araphenides. Excavations two hundred meters directly south of the temple revealed a "small temple with a pronaos and adyton".[866] Much votive material, dating mostly from the first half of the seventh century, is reportedly associated with this smaller temple, including "idols and cosmetic items" which are "related to the those of the Brauron sanctuary".[867] We still await publication of the "small temple" and these seventh-century finds.

7.4. Prasiai: Apollo

At ancient Prasiai, modern Porto Raphti, Geometric and Archaic pottery was found just north of a Hellenistic apsidal building.[868] The pottery has not been published. Terracotta figurines are reported, though not published; their form and date is unknown.[869] There are no reports of eighth- or seventh-century architecture.

An inscription on a statue base, dated ca. 500, as well as a marble head of Apollo were recovered in the area, indicating that a sanctuary to Apollo was established in the area by at least this date.[870] This had led some to identify the site with the sanctuary of Delian Apollo at Prasiai mentioned by Pausanias, 1.31.2, though this must remain conjecture.[871]

---

866. Eustratiou 1991a, p. 73.

867. Eustratiou 1991a, p. 73, who reports on the same page that full publication of the finds "will prove the close relationship between the sanctuary of Loutsa and that of [Brauron]". Cf. Travlos 1976; Kahil 1977, who assert close ritual ties between the two sanctuaries.

868. Kakavoyanni, O. *ArchDelt* 39 (1984), Chron., 45; *ArchDelt* 40 (1984), Chron., 66, fig. 6; Kakavoyanni 1986; Travlos 1988, pp. 364-369; Ainian 1997, p. 317.

869. Ainian 1997, p. 317, reports "Geometric pottery and terracotta figurines" based on personal communication with Kakavoyanni in 1989.

870. Kakavoyanni, O. *ArchDelt* 40 (1984), Chron., 66, fig. 6; Kakavoyanni 1986.

871. Travlos 1988, pp. 364-369. According to Pausanias, the first-fruits of the Hyperboreans are handed over to the Arimaspi, Issedones, and then Scythians until they reach Sinope. At this point, Greeks take the offerings to Prasiai, and Athenians take the offerings from Prasiai to Delos. The first-fruits are all the while hidden in straw, unknown to the participants.

7.5. Mt. Pani, Peak: Zeus?

The Site:

The highest peak of Mt. Pani is located on the eastern edge of the mountain chain, and overlooks the southern Mesogeion, Lower Lamptrai and Anavyssos plains. Two sites, twenty meters apart, are located fifty meters north of the peak. At one of the sites are the remains of an elliptical building, around two and a half meters wide. Sherds collected during a survey of both areas date from the Geometric and Subgeometric periods, and include skyphoi, cups, and miniature kantharoi. Seventh-century finds include two inscribed sherds found near the possible building.[872] Burned animal bones are also reported. Though never excavated, the inscriptions and pottery styles resemble the finds from the Mt. Hymettos sanctuary, and may be the strongest candidate for another Zeus sanctuary in this period.[873]

7.6. Merenda Peak: Zeus?

This peak is located along the southern edge of the Mesogeion Plain. Sherds recovered during surveys are similar to those found on Mt. Hymettos and the Pani Peak, and include many cups and cooking wares. Burned animal bones were reported.[874]

7.7. Mt. Pani, Keratovouni Peak: Zeus?

The Keratovouni peak, located on the southeastern ridge of Mt. Pani, is the highest point in southern Attica, and overlooks southern Attica and the Anavyssos plain. Geometric and Subgeometric sherds from skyphoi and other cups have been found on the peak during surveys of the area. No architecture or ash debris was reported.[875]

---

872. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 22-24, 32, pl. IV d, e, VII b, c, d. Langdon 1976, pp. 102-103 reports that one of the inscriptions is an incomplete abecedarium, following up on the suggestion from Smith and Lowry. The inscription consists of only two letters, an alpha and what may be either a rho or a beta.

873. Smith and Lowry 1954, p. 32, report that the surface finds on the Pani peak were more extensive than any other peak site they surveyed in Attica.

874. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 27-29; Langdon 1976, p. 103.

875. Smith and Lowry 1954, p. 27; Langdon 1976, p. 103.

7.8. Charvati Peak: Zeus?

This peak is located along the southern Mesogeion, above the plain of Porto Raphti. Three sherds were recovered that were similar to those found on Mt. Hymettos and the Pani Peak. A rough oval of stones, ca. two meters apart, is also reported, though not dated.[876]

8. Mt. Penteli, Mavrovouni Peak: Zeus?

At the eastern end of Mt. Penteli, overlooking the narrowing coastal route that connects the Mesogeion and Marathon plains, lies peaks of Megalo Mavrovouni, where sherds possibly dating to the seventh century were recovered. A small area of burned earth was also noted.[877]

9. Marathon Plain

9.1. Marathon: Athena?

In the Homeric account of Athena's trip to Athens, *Od.* 7.80, she is said to have come first to Marathon.[878] This may suggest that there was a well-known sanctuary of Athena at Marathon perhaps by at least the seventh century, if not earlier.[879] No archaeological evidence for an Athena sanctuary has yet been found to substantiate this theory.

9.2. Agrieliki Height: Zeus?

Along the southwestern border of the Marathon Plain are two heights, Aphorismos and Agrieliki. Surveys of both peaks yielded no finds.[880] Along the east slope of the

---

876. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 29-30. Langdon 1976, p. 103, reports that he was able to find no antiquities when he visited the site.

877. Langdon 1976, p. 102. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 13-19, found Classical remains along the now closed-off main peak of Penteli, which they associated with a sanctuary to Athena mentioned in Pausanias, 1.32.2. They make no mention of earlier finds on the peak.

878. [Ἀθήνη] ἵκετο δ' ἐς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην.

879. Cf. Lorimer 1950, pp. 436-437, who suggests that there is no other reason for Athena to go to Marathon in the epic unless a sanctuary of Athena was well-known there.

880. Smith and Lowry 1954, pp. 34-37; Langdon 1976, p. 104.

Agrieliki peak, however, a large area of ash and burned bones was discovered, along with what may be the remains of an altar. Pottery seen during a survey of the site ranged from the Geometric period through the Roman period, and included a large number of miniature cup shapes.[881] Much of the normal-sized Geometric and Subgeometric pottery consisted of cup shapes similar to those found at the Mt. Hymettus sanctuary.[882]

10. Northern Attica

10.1. Mt. Parnes: Zeus?

On the Karabola peak of Mt. Parnes is a sanctuary unique in both its location and votive assemblage. Its elevation, nearly 1400 m. above sea level, is much higher than any other site in Attica; this fact, together with the sometimes extreme weather, makes the sanctuary also the most difficult to access in Attica.[883] Excavations near the mouth of a cave just a few meters below the summit revealed a thick layer of ash two meters deep, spread across a one hundred meter area. The ash deposit contained burned animal bones, and thousands of iron daggers, an assemblage with no Attic parallels. No terra-cotta votives are reported from the site.

The pottery reportedly ranges in date from the Protogeometric to Roman periods, with most of the pottery dating to the Geometric and especially the seventh century, the apparent acme of activity on the peak. Inscribed dedications on seventh-century pottery confirm that Zeus was worshipped at the site. The pottery and other finds from this sanctuary have not been fully published, however, making interpretation of this site and its place in Attica religious life difficult to assess.[884]

Pausanias, 1.32.2, informs us that in his day there were two Zeus altars on Mt. Parnes, one for Zeus Semaleos, and one that was an altar for both Zeus Ombrios and Zeus Apemios. It is possible that the ash deposit is connected with early sacrifices at one of these altars. While there are chronological similarities with the pottery recovered at

---

881. Soteriades 1935, pp. 154-155; Vanderpool 1966, p. 321, n. 8; Wickens 1986, II p. 220.

882. Langdon 1976, p. 105. According to Pierce-Blegen 1936, p. 265, the pottery was almost all "Geometric," and similar to those found at the Mt. Hymettos sanctuary.

883. Wickens 1986, II. 243-244. This peak is also the only place in Attica where fir trees grow.

884. Mastrokostas 1983, summarizes the finds, but provides no full publication of the pottery or other finds. Other summaries can be found in Hood 1959, p. 8; Daux 1960, p. 658; Vanderpool 1960, p. 269; Langdon 1976, pp. 100-101; Wickens 1986, I. 158-159, II. 243-245; Ainian 1997, p. 315.

the Zeus sanctuary on Mt. Hymettos, the the types of votive offerings at each sanctuary are on the whole dissimilar.[885]

Votives – Seventh-century:

1. Weapons and Metal: Fragments of five bronze knives, metal pins, and bronze shields, along with about three thousand iron daggers are reported, as well as fragments of at least one bronze cauldron. These objects have never been fully published or dated, though a number of them were likely dedicated during the seventh century.[886]

2. Pottery: Over two hundred Protocorinthian and Corinthian aryballoi from the seventh and sixth centuries are reported, which seems to have been the dominant vessel type. Some are inscribed with names and dedications, a few of which specifically name Zeus.[887]

10.2. Mt. Kithairon: Cave of Antiope?

Brief excavations within the Kissos Cave, on Mt. Kithairon, above Eleutherai, revealed pottery dating from the Geometric to the Classical period. The pottery, which has not been published, is reportedly mostly Protocorinthian and Corinthian, and includes "small vessels".[888] Terracottas are not reported.

Pausanias, 1.38.9, reports that a small cave near Eleutherai was where the Boiotian princess Antiope gave birth to her twin sons, Amphion and Zethos.[889] The Kissos Cave, therefore, has been tentatively identified as the Cave of Antiope.[890] Even if this identification is correct, we do not know whether the cave would have been so identified as early as the Geometric period, or whether more than one shrine was in the cave. Pausanias himself is silent on this issue.

---

885. Langdon 1976, pp. 13-15, no. 2, pl. 2, fig. 6, pp. 100-101. Zeus Apemios, the "Averter of Ills," is unattested outside of this site. For Zeus Semaleos, cf. the Zeus Semios inscription from Mt. Hymettos; Langdon 1976, pp. 7, 13-7, 15.

886. As of 14 March 2008, a small collection of Protocorinthian aryballoi, as well as fragments of a bronze cauldron, iron spearheads, swords, spits, sickles, and what appear to be axe heads are on display at the Peiraieus Museum.

887. Mastrokostas 1983, who provides no images or dates for the inscribed pots.

888. Stikas 1939, p. 52, 1940; Wickens 1986, pp. 274-275, no. 50.

889. Paus. 1.38.9: ἀπωτέρω δὲ ὀλίγον σπήλαιόν ἐστιν οὐ μέγα, καὶ παρ' αὐτὸ ὕδατος πηγὴ ψυχροῦ: λέγεται δὲ ἐς μὲν τὸ σπήλαιον ὡς Ἀντιόπη τεκοῦσα κατάθοιτο ἐς αὐτὸ τοὺς παῖδας, περὶ δὲ τῆς πηγῆς τὸν ποιμένα εὑρόντα τοὺς παῖδας ἐνταῦθα σφᾶς λοῦσαι πρῶτον ἀπολύσαντα τῶν σπαργάνων.

890. Stikas 1939, p. 52, 1940.

Appendix 2: "Hero" and "Ancestor" Shrines Reconsidered

1. Introduction

In 1933, excavations near the southwest corner of the Athenian Agora revealed a large Protoattic votive deposit set directly upon the ruins of an oval Geometric building. Both the deposit and the building were exceptional discoveries in their own right. The so-called Areopagus Oval Building is the earliest Geometric structure discovered in Athens; the Protoattic deposit is among the largest and best preserved seventh-century votive assemblages ever discovered in Attica. Dorothy Burr, who published the building and deposit in 1933, interpreted the oval structure as a domestic house; she believed that the votive deposit that covered the building was brought in from a nearby deity sanctuary as part of road fill to facilitate travel in this area of the Athenian Agora.[891]

This interpretation stood until 1968, when Homer Thompson reinterpreted the Areopagus Oval Building as an open-air temenos built to accommodate a shrine of the dead.[892] The primary evidence for this identification is the building's proximity to graves. The Areopagus Oval Building is located directly over a Early Geometric child burial; only a few steps away is a family plot of mostly Middle Geometric graves, including some of the wealthiest graves recovered to date in Athens. Thompson likewise interpreted the Protoattic Areopagus deposit as most suitable for a shrine of a dead. The evidence for this identification rests in large part on the similarities between the votives found in the Protoattic Areopagus deposit and that found in the Mycenaean tholos dromos at Menidhi, the "paradeigmatic example of hero cult at a Mycenaean tomb".[893] When viewed together, the Geometric oval structure and the later Protoattic deposit suggest a continuity of ancestor worship in this area.

Thompson's interpretation of the building and deposit has met with nearly unanimous approval. As a result, both the building and the deposit have entered academic literature as themselves paradigmatic examples of a "cult of the dead". As we shall see, a review of the archaeological evidence suggests that Burr's original interpretation is closer to the mark: Areopagus Oval Building was indeed a roofed structure, and the deposit does seem to have been brought in from a deity sanctuary as part of a road construction

---

891. Burr 1933, pp. 636-640. She believed that the deposit may have come from a nearby sanctuary of the Semnai.

892. Thompson 1968, p. 60; cf. Thompson 1978.

893. Antonaccio 1995, p. 102.

project. There is, in short, no secure evidence from either the building or the deposit to suggest worship of the dead.

The purpose of this study, however, goes beyond simply affirming some of Burr's original interpretations. A number of Attic shrines of the dead have been identified based on the same set of unfounded assumptions that were used to identify worship of the dead at the Areopagus Oval Building and the Protoattic deposit. These include the assumption that a structure located near graves must have been sacred, and that there is a typical votive package for ancestor or hero worship. Neither assumption is born out by a review of the archaeological record of Attica.

This conclusion has implications for the study of early Athenian religion in general. Current opinion tends to assume a spread of a number of ancestor or hero cults in Attica beginning in the Late Geometric period, a phenomenon sometimes ascribed to the spread of Homeric epic.[894] In recent decades, many have also claimed that the spread of hero or ancestor shrines is related to the "rise of the polis".[895] Neither Homer nor the emerging polis are responsible for nor attested by the spread of hero or ancestor shrines in Attica. The reason is simple: There is almost no evidence for Athenian or Attic cults of the dead dating to Geometric and seventh century.

2. Areopagus Oval Building

2.1. The Evidence

The Areopagus Oval Building is located near the southwest corner of the later Athenian Agora, in a roughly triangular area formed by the juncture of two roads along the north slope of the Areopagus. The intrusion of many pits, including Classical wells, Byzantine pithoi, and walls, Hellenistic to modern, hinders our complete understanding of the structure. Enough of the original walls, however, have survived to reconstruct the general plan of the building. The walls form an asymmetrical oval, encompassing an

---

894. Coldstream 1976, was the first to present a detailed account of the archaeological evidence for "hero cult" in Attica. He suggested that the rise of "hero cults" was due in large part to the spread of Homeric epic; cf. Coldstream 2003, pp. 346-348.

895. Such theories view "hero cults" as essentially land claims, either by peasants in the face of encroaching elite (Snodgrass 1980, pp. 38-40; 1982; 1988; 1987, pp. 60-62); by elite in the face of encroaching peasants (Whitley 1988, pp. 1-9); by the "state" in an attempt to mark the borders of its territory (Polignac 1984, pp. 127-151); or as expressions of the clash between the old world order of Iron Age elite and the ideology of *isonomia* of the rising polis (Morris 1988). For a summary of the evidence for Attic ancestor and hero worship, see Antonaccio 1995, pp. 102-126.

area roughly eleven meters long, five meters wide. Within the western apse, a floor surface of hard-packed earth and red sand was preserved. More of the earthen floor was discovered in the eastern section of the building, where it was covered by patches of white sand. Low platforms of cobbling stones were set directly upon the surface, embedded within sand fifteen centimeters deep. This feature was found mostly along the interior face of the long walls. A sterile, yellowish clay was found covering sections of the floor and the walls. A thin layer of burned material, measuring around one meter by sixty centimeters wide, was found upon the earthen floor near the center of the building, perhaps evidence for a hearth.[896] Two irregular, large stones and a granite quern were found on the floor just east of the hearth.

The sherds from within and under the building's floor are Geometric, but too few and too battered to offer a secure date for the construction of the building. As a result, dates ranging from the Early Geometric to the Late Geometric can be found in the literature today.[897] The earliest pottery from under or within the floor, however, dates to the Protogeometric.[898] Happily, the date of the abandonment of the building is more secure. The latest pottery found directly upon the floors can be dated to the third quarter of the eighth century, or Late Geometric period.[899]

A cist grave of a young boy was found cut into the bedrock under the floor of the building. He was buried with seven miniature vessels, including three oinochoai; a kylix; a handle in the shape of a foot; a handmade bowl, pierced at the top; two small seashells; and a small animal, likely a pig. The Geometric pottery from the grave is difficult to date, though seems comfortable in the Early Geometric, or early ninth-century.[900]

---

896. Burr 1933, p. 546, who notes that there is no structure around the ash feature, as would be expected for a hearth.

897. Brann 1962, p. 110, n. 3: "The date of [the oval structure's] erection is more difficult to fix, except that it is probably before 800 B.C.," i.e., Middle Geometric I or earlier. Cf. Burr 1933, pp. 554-555, nos. 8-20, fig. 12, p. 566, who argues for a second half of the ninth century for the building's erection; Thompson 1968, p. 60, who gives an eighth century date for the building; Coldstream 1968, pp. 11, 399; 2003, p. 30, who dates the child's grave to EG I, and the house to between EG and LG I. Morris 1987, p. 229, gives a Late Geometric date for the child's grave. Whitley 1994b, p. 225, gives a "possibly Late Geometric" date for the building, and an EG I date for the child's grave. For general discussion, see also Fagerström 1988b, p. 45; Ainian 1997, p. 87.

898. Burr 1933, p. 555, nos. 8-10, fig. 12.

899. Brann 1962, pp. 109-110.

900. Burr 1933, pp. 552-554, fig. 10-11. Cf. n. 897, p. 256.

Short fragments of other early walls just south of the Areopagus Oval Building indicate it was part of a larger architectural complex during its period of use.[901] A Late Geometric oinochoe, dated to the third quarter of the eighth century, was found set against the face of one of these walls, Wall A-A, indicating it was contemporary with the Areopagus Oval Building.[902] Furthermore, Wall A-A is built flush up against oval building's southern wall, but does not encroach upon it, suggesting that the walls were in use at the same time. Further west, just outside of the oval building's southern wall, a patch of hard-packed earthen floor was discovered, upon which lay two granite querns and Geometric sherds.[903] Not much more can be said of the scrappy architectural remains south of the Areopagus Oval Building, though it is clear that the building was only one of a number of contemporary Geometric structures in the area.

2.2. Previous Interpretations

In Burr's original publication of the Areopagus Oval Building, she argued that the architectural elements indicated a roofed house.[904] She interpreted the clay layer over sections of the walls and floor as collapsed mudbrick from the walls. The presence of a hearth and quern upon the floor seemed indications that the house was occupied and used for domestic purposes, an interpretation strengthened by the lack of votives or other evidence of ritual material contemporary with the building's period of use. These considerations led to the conclusion that the structure was a domestic house, not a sanctuary or shrine.[905]

For Homer Thompson, however, the architectural features of the Areopagus Oval Building were better interpreted as a sacred temenos for a shrine of the dead. His succinct argument is worth quoting in full.

"As a house...this structure would be unique and isolated within the region of the Agora now so extensively excavated. The architectural features: a thin, low stone socle for the bounding wall, a clay floor cobbled in part, and traces of burning on the floor, would be equally and perhaps more appropriate to a temenos open to the sky. An undisturbed child's grave of the early Geometric period was found beneath the clay floor of

---

901. Burr 1933, pp. 547-551, fig. 1-9.

902. Burr 1933, pp. 547-549, no. 37, fig. 1, 3-9, 18. For the date of the oinochoe, see Brann 1962, p. 109, no. 40.

903. Burr 1933, p. 549.

904. Burr 1933, pp. 636-637.

905. Schweitzer 1969, pp. 232-233, thinks the oval building was probably the house of a shepherd or peasant; cf. Fagerström 1988b, pp. 44-46.

the oval structure, and eight cremation burials of the same period came to light a few meters to the southeast. The oval building, whatever its nature, was short-lived. Above its ruins the excavator came on a mass of votive material of the 7th century B.C.: fine pottery, figurines of horses and chariots, rectangular pinakes and miniature shields of terracotta. All this material, which can be closely matched in the votive deposit found in the dromos of the Mycenaean tholos tomb at Menidi, is suitable to the cult of the dead. In view of the quantity and freshness of the deposit, it may be supposed to have originated in the immediate vicinity. The cumulative evidence suggests that the oval structure of the 8th century as well as the triangular enclosure of the 5th century are to be regarded as holy places that had their beginning in the cult of the dead."[906]

Note that Thompson's new theory about the form and function of the Areopagus Oval Building is not primarily driven by the surviving architectural elements. It is the location of the building, isolated and near and above Early and Middle Geometric burials, as well as his interpretation of the Protoattic votive deposit that really drive his new interpretation of the Areopagus Oval Building.[907] The assumptions inherent in his interpretation are that a structure located near graves is most likely sacred, and that there is a typical votive package for ancestor or hero worship. Since Homer Thompson published his suggestion, most have considered the matter settled: "the Geometric oval enclosure" is "now seen to be a temenos associated with one or more of the early graves in the area".[908]

2.3. Reexamination

2.3.1. Architecture

According to Burr, the layer of sterile, yellowish clay found covering sections of the floor and the walls was physical evidence of a now disintegrated sun-dried mudbrick superstructure.[909] The fact that the clay layer also extended over the top of the socle wall certainly would suggest this is the best interpretation. If the clay layer was indeed the

906. Thompson 1968, p. 60. Cf. 1978.

907. For the Early and Middle Geometric burials located in the immediate vicinity, many just meters to the east, see Smithson 1968, p. 78; 1974; Thompson 1968, p. 58, fig. 8; Coldstream 1995, pp. 393-394, 399; Whitley 1991, pp. 119-120, 129-134.

908. Lalonde 1968, p. 132. Cf. Wycherley 1970, p. 290; Abramson 1978, pp. 159-161; Whitley 1988, p. 176; 1994b, p. 225; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 122-125; Ainian 1997, pp. 86-87; Coldstream 2003, p. 30; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 21, 93, 275.

909. Burr 1933, p. 547.

result of the gradual disintegration of a mudbrick superstructure, we would anticipate a deeper layer of clay directly over the socle, with the clay gradually thinning out towards the interior of the building. Unfortunately, little is recorded in the notebooks or in photographs of this clay layer beyond the mere mention of its existence. An examination of the relationship between the walls of the Areopagus Oval Building and other architectural elements, however, shows that Burr's original interpretation must be correct: the structure was walled and roofed.

The stone cobbling set against the interior face of both the northern and southern walls is at roughly the same elevation throughout the building, varying between 65.43-65.50 meters above sea level. The top of the building's southern wall is at roughly the same elevation as the cobbling, as well. The top of the northern wall, however, is fifteen to twenty-five centimeters lower than the cobbling. It would be quite bizarre if the interior floor and cobbled platforms were higher than the bounding wall in the north, yet equal in the south. It is much more likely that the flooring and cobbled platforms in the south were set directly against the interior face of a mudbrick wall.

Other architectural considerations indicate that this mudbrick wall was more than an open-air temenos wall. Wall A-A rises at least twenty centimeters above the top of the Areopagus Oval Building's contemporary southern wall.[910] Water-deposited gravel found against the east face of Wall A-A suggests this area was outside. The west face of Wall A-A, on the other hand, was packed with fallen mudbrick and earth, along with Geometric, Protocorinthian, and Protoattic sherds.[911] Further west, along the outer face of the Areopagus Oval Building wall, a patch of hard-packed floor surface was revealed, upon which lay Geometric sherds and two granite querns.[912] It appears that both Wall A-A and the floor surface further west incorporated the southern wall of the oval building into their own building plans. If the Areopagus Oval Building were a low-walled temenos, we would also have to assume that the building(s) south of it either lacked a northern wall or were themselves open-air, an untenable position in light of the mass of fallen mudbrick found against the face of Wall A-A.

The width of the Areopagus Oval Building's wall socle, thirty-five to forty centimeters, may appear thin, but it is substantial enough to supporting a mudbrick superstructure and roof. Mudbrick walls in the Greek Iron Age were on average forty to fifty cen-

---

910. Burr 1933, p. 547, says that the "*bottom* [of Wall A-A is] at *ca.* 0.20 m. above the top of the wall" (my italics). Her cross-section on p. 545, fig. 4, appears to show that the *top* of Wall A-A is approximately twenty centimeters above the top of the Oval Building wall. Regardless, it is obvious from both the cross-section and the photos in figs. 1, 5, and especially 6, that Wall A-A is significantly higher than the Oval Building wall.

911. Burr 1933, p. 549.

912. Burr 1933, p. 544, 549, fig. 2, 8.

timeters thick, though walls were as thin as thirty centimeters.[913] The Late Protogeometric "Oval House" from Smyrna has three well preserved courses of mudbricks just thirty centimeters wide.[914] The "Oval House," however, is admittedly smaller, measuring five meters long and three meters wide, compared with the eleven by five meter Areopagus Oval Building. An oval building from Mytilene, built around 700, provides a closer parallel.[915] It measures roughly fourteen meters long, and five and a half meters wide, with a stone wall socle forty-three to forty-six centimeters wide, dimensions only slightly larger than the Areopagus Oval Building. The stone socle of the Mytilene oval building clearly supported mudbrick walls, as indicated by a deep layer of fallen mudbrick within the structure.[916]

There can be little question that the Areopagus Oval Building held a substantial mudbrick superstructure. A high wall, only one brick thick, would have required protection from the elements to have lasted any length of time, particularly during the rainy winter months. A thatch roof not only would have provided this protection, but also would have been light enough to be sustained by the walls.[917] If Archaic building models

---

913. For an analysis of wall thickness in the Greek Iron Age, see Fagerström 1988b, pp. 119-121. The minimum thickness for mudbrick walls appears to be thirty centimeters. In the Athenian Agora, the walls of the Late Geometric Building A, a rectangular four room structure, has walls forty centimeters thick; Thompson 1940, p. 5. For the date of Building A, see n. 1027, p. 283.

914. Three courses of the mudbrick wall of the "Oval House" are well preserved. The mudbricks measure, on average, 0.50 x 0.30 x 0.12 meters. See especially Akurgal 1983, pp. 17-18, fig. 8, pl. 4-5, for images, plans and reconstructions. Cf. Drerup 1969, pp. 44-46; Snodgrass 1971, pp. 369-370; Desborough 1972, pp. 182-183; Fagerström 1988b, pp. 91-92; Ainian 1997, p. 99. Mudbricks were also found within a wall of the tenth century phase of Unit IV-1. These bricks are between fifteen and nineteen centimeters wide; MacDonald et al. 1983, p. 24. Cf. Fagerström 1988a; 1988b, p. 35; Ainian 1997, p. 75.

915. *ArchDelt* 28 (1973) Chron. 515-517. Cf. Spencer 1995, pp. 296-299; Ainian 1997, pp. 89-90.

916. In Attica, itself, there is only one other oval building that was constructed by the end of the eighth century, at Tourkovounia. It measures 7.60 m. wide and 11.50 m. long. The width of the socle, ca. 1.50 m., is unusually thick for buildings of this size and date, and so is assumed to have accommodated both a mudbrick wall and an interior bench. The building is believed to have been roofed; see Lauter 1985a; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 191-195; Ainian 1997, pp. 87-89. Fagerström 1988b, p. 47, however, believes the Tourkovounia foundations are for an open-air structure.

917. No post-holes for roof supports are reported, though the middle of the building, where these posts would have been set, has been greatly disturbed by later pits. Cf. Fagerström 1988b, p. 45.

provide any parallel, the roof was probably half conical at both ends, where open smoke holes were also provided.[918] We cannot, at any rate, accept the view that the Areopagus Oval Building was a temenos, and therefore inherently sacred.

2.3.2. Chronology

The contemporary evidence most often marshaled in support of a sacred function for the building are the child's burial under the floor, and the nearby graves from the so-called Areopagus Geometric Lot, only steps away from the building. This lot held at least ten graves, most of which are dated to the Middle Geometric period.[919] Presumably the buried were all members of the same family.[920] If the Areopagus Oval Building was indeed a sacred building constructed to facilitate a shrine for these nearby dead, it presumably would have been built after the graves appear. It is therefore important to review the possible chronological relationship between the Areopagus Oval Building and the graves.

---

918. See, for example, the limestone of an oval building recovered in Samos, usually dated to the late seventh or early sixth century, though a Late Geometric date is not out of the question; Buschor 1930, pp. 16-17, pl. 4, fig. 6; Burr 1933, p. 547; Schattner 1990, pp. 78-80, no. 38; Ainian 1997, pp. 90, 113, fig. 508. Cf. the suggested restoration of the roof of the "Oval House" at Smyrna by Nicholls, Akurgal 1983, fig. 8.

919. The child's burial is generally dated to Early Geometric I; see n. 897, p. 256. Of the eight burials in the nearby Areopagus Geometric Lot that can be dated, only one may be contemporary with the child's grave (Grave AR II, dated by Smithson 1974, p. 341, to between the Protogeometric and Early Geometric II). The remaining graves all date to the Middle Geometric I period; see Smithson 1974; Whitley 1991, p. 203. Spectacular Early Geometric II graves are found nearby on the north slope of the Areopagus, including the "Areopagus Warrior Grave" (D 16:4, Blegen 1952), the "Boots Grave" (D 16:2, Young 1949), and the "Rich Athenian Lady" (H 16:6, Smithson 1968). Many more Geometric graves dotted the north slope of the Areopagus, now destroyed or emptied during later activity in the area. See, for example, Smithson 1974, pp. 349-350; 1968, p. 82; Young 1949, pp. 277-279.

920. Smithson 1974, pp. 327, 329-327, 334, suggests the Areopagus Geometric Lot is family grave plot representing two or three generations. Cf. Whitley 1991, pp. 133, 203. Smithson 1968, p. 83, suggests that the "Rich Athenian Lady," whose grave is among a cluster of seven Submycenaean to Middle Geometric graves fifty meters to the northeast, may be the wife of King Arriphonos. He would have reigned during the time of her in internment, according to the king list compiled by the Hellenistic historian Kastor of Rhodes (*Frag.Gr.Hist.* 250, F 4). Coldstream 1995, p. 393, pushes her identification further, suggesting that the Areopagus cemetery may have been the burial ground of the Medontidai *genos*.

The date of the Early Geometric child's grave, which is earlier than any of those in the Areopagus Geometric Lot, should provide a convenient *terminus post* or *ante quem* for the construction of the building. Unfortunately, the chronological relationship between the grave and building is far from clear.[921]

It is generally assumed that the child burial must predate the oval structure, based in part on the depth of the burial. The grave is sunk only twenty centimeters within the hard pan below the floor surface. Contemporary child graves from Eleusis are one meter deep.[922] It is a bit surprising, therefore, that a child's grave would have been sunk under the floor of the Areopagus Oval Building at so comparatively shallow a depth. A more likely explanation for the shallow depth, it is thought, is that the construction of the building disrupted the upper levels into which the grave was originally sunk.[923] Such a reconstruction would provide a *terminus post quem* date of the Early Geometric for the building. It also allows for an argument to be made that the building was constructed specifically to mark the child's grave.[924]

The construction of the building, however, cannot account for the shallowness of the grave. The ground plan of the building makes it clear that the building project did not entail the removal of eighty centimeters of fill or bedrock over the child burial, as would be necessary if the burial were originally one meter deep. The stone socle of the building, only ten to twenty centimeters high, was set directly upon a thin layer of soil above the bedrock. There was no attempt to level off the bedrock during construction, despite a rather dramatic sloping down of the bedrock under the northern half of the building. The result was a northern wall thirty centimeters lower in elevation than the

---

921. Brann 1962, p. 110, n. 3: "An Early Geometric child's grave was found under the floor level of the house (H 17:2). Unfortunately the pottery from within the floor of the house…is not distinguishable in date from that of the grave, and though it is likely that the grave was there before the house it is not certain that it was not sunk through the house floor, which was disturbed in this area."

922. Skias 1898, p. 96; Poulsen 1905, p. 21.

923. Burr 1933, pp. 554, 561, notes that there may have been two other burials under the house. The evidence for additional burials consists of burned fragments of pyxides bodies and lids found near some of the later intrusion pits within the building, which she presumes came from other graves within the walls. Subsequent excavations have shown that at least one, if not all all of the pyxides fragments originally came from the nearby pyre of the "Rich Athenian Lady," which were placed over the oval structure during fourth century cleaning operations. See Smithson 1968, pp. 78-79, n. 11.

924. E.g., Coldstream 2003, p. 30.

southern wall.[925] The interior of the building was made level by a deeper layer of fill. In other words, far from adapting the area to the building, the building was adapted to the area.

If we may discount the depth of the child's grave as a chronological indicator, there is some positive evidence to suggest that the grave was actually sunk into the floor of the building. The fill over the grave was "disturbed," and contained "a little burned matter to the east of the head just outside the grave."[926] The disturbance and burning are difficult to explain unless we assume that the child's burial was set within the floor of the building. If true, then the Early Geometric period would then become our *terminus ante quem* for the building; furthermore, the building would pre-date all graves in the area, and so not built for ancestor worship.

Indeed, a Late Protogeometric date is not out of the question. Less than ten meters to the northeast of the building lies a well containing mostly cups, along with a few oinochoai and amphorae, dating to the very end of the Late Protogeometric period or beginning of the Early Geometric period.[927] As we noted above, the earliest pottery from the building itself dates to the Protogeometric period.[928] It is possible, therefore, that the Areopagus Oval Building dates to the end of the Late Protogeometric or beginning of the

925. Burr 1933, p. 545.

926. Burr 1933, p. 552. Cf. p. 546: "The filling over [the child grave] was disturbed but its upper level must have been close to that of the floor."

927. Agora Well Deposit H 16-17:1; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 92-93. Smithson 1961, p. 166, and Desborough 1952, p. 83, date pottery from the well to the very end of the Late Protogeometric. There are a total of three Protogeometric wells along the north slope of the Areopagus, for which see Brann 1962, pl. 45; Papadopoulos 2003, figs. 1.2, 1.4.

928. Burr 1933, p. 555, nos. 8-10, fig. 12.

Early Geometric period.[929] The boy under the floor and the dead of the Areopagus Geometric Lot undoubtedly were members of the family who lived in this house.[930]

Due to the paucity of pottery and other finds from the building itself, however, a date contemporary with the nearby burials remains possible. Some have even suggested that the Areopagus Oval Building was constructed as late as the Late Geometric period.[931] If true, it may even be the case that the builders of the structure were unaware of or not concerned with the Early and Middle Geometric tombs in the area. The cumulative evidence, however, seems to suggest the Areopagus Oval Building stood before the first graves appeared in the area.

2.3.3. "Sacred House"?

Even if the Areopagus Oval Building was constructed after the area was beset with graves, what would indications of contemporary a grave shrine look like? There are possible indications of continued ritual activity at graves at the Kerameikos in the Early and Middle Geometric period, when some monumental kraters, serving as grave markers, are pierced at the bottom, allowing for libations to pass through to the grave.[932] These

---

929. Early and Middle Geometric wells have not been found on the north slope of the Areopagus, but some have been found just to the north and west. According to Smithson 1974, p. 330, "[a]lthough wells of the Early and Middle Geometric periods have not yet been found on the north slopes of the Areopagus, a continued mixed use is likely-small family burial lots here and there on the hillside, interspersed among houses and small industrial establishments."

930. If we accept this theory, we would be left to explain where the eighth-century inhabitants of the house chose to bury their dead. One hundred meters to the northwest, in the area of the later Tholos, is grave precinct with twenty burials, presumably of kin, dating from ca. 750-700. See Young 1939, pp. 6-138; Brann 1962, pp. 111-112; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 11, 15-11, 16; Morris 1987, pp. 126-127; Whitley 1991, p. 65. Adjacent to the cemetery, and sharing a common wall, is a four-room structure built during the Late Geometric period, Building A, within which was found a kiln. The cemetery, kiln and building were all abandoned in the second or third quarter of the seventh century. For the date of Building A, see n. 1027, p. 283. Late Geometric grave groups are found at even a shorter distance to the southwest of the Areopagus Oval Building; see Young 1951; Brann 1960; 1962, pl. 45; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 10-12.

931. Morris 1987, p. 229; Whitley 1994b, p. 225.

932. The earliest pierced krater is found over Grave 2 in the Kerameikos, dated Early Geometric II; this is also the earliest krater designed specifically as a grave marker, as indicated by its monumental size. See Kübler 1954, pp. 210-212, pl. 17. Cf. Krause 1975, p. 88; Morris 1987, p. 151; Whitley 1991, pp. 116-117; Coldstream 2003, pp. 32-33.

developments may indicate continued ritual or cultic activity at the site of individual graves after burial.[933] Evidence of such monumental grave markers, however, is lacking for the Areopagus Geometric Lot graves.[934]

In fact, there are no finds directly associated with the building's period of use that are necessarily indicative of ritual activity. The pottery associated with the building's period of use is mostly oinochoai and drinking shapes, which are common in both sacred and domestic settings.[935] The querns found inside and outside the building indicate grain was ground on this spot, while the hearth indicates cooking; whether these activities were conducted in a sacred or domestic context is unknown.

Does proximity to graves necessitate a sacred function for a building, be it roofed or open-air? To evaluate this theory, let us first look at other examples in Attica of buildings near graves, so-called "sacred houses".

2.3.3.1. Eleusis: "Sacred House"

The Site

Another site of ritual activity at Eleusis is the so-called "sacred house," which has often been associated with ancestor or hero worship.[936] The building measures 14.5 by 10 meters, and consists of four rooms, side-by-side, that communicate with a corridor. The walls were mudbrick upon a stone socle. The largest room, Room I, is about five meter square, and provided with a central post to support a roof, a small bench, and a stone enclosure. The next room, Room II, was provided with a pit or bothros, from which an underground covered drain leads through the corridor, ending at a paved court that

933. Cf, for example, Kübler 1954, pp. 19-36, who marks the Early Geometric period as the beginning of *Totenkult*.

934. In fact, the Areopagus Geometric Lot is among the more unusual in Athens. Five of the ten graves are are simple cremations, in which the remains of the deceased were swept directly into the burial trench. This was an extremely rare practice in the Geometric period. See Graves AR II, III/IV, V, I 18:2, I 18:3 in Smithson 1974, pp. 327, 329-327, 334. Cf. Coldstream 2003, p. 81.

935. Burr 1933, pp. 554-557.

936. Discussion and bibliography: Kourouniotes and Travlos 1937, pp. 42-50, 1938, p. 35; Kourouniotes 1940b, pp. 274-275; Mylonas 1961, pp. 59-60; Drerup 1969, p. 33; Coldstream 1976, p. 16, n. 76; Abramson 1978, pp. 189-191; Travlos 1983, pp. 333-336; 1988, p. 92; Lauter 1985a, pp. 163-169; Morris 1987, p. 68; Fagerström 1988b, pp. 43-44; Pesando 1989, p. 49; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 190-191; Ainian 1997, pp. 150-152; Binder 1998, p. 135.

fronted the building.[937] The next chamber was originally one room, separated into two, Rooms III and IV, by a crosswall during a later remodeling.[938] A small triangular room, Room V, is found at the western end of the building, that appears not to have communicated with either the corridor or the adjacent room.

Rooms II, III, and IV were filled with ashes, as well as a number of predominantly household vessels, such as chytrai, lekanes, bowls, jugs, amphorae, and pithoi. The larger vessels were filled with ashes.[939] The earliest pottery dates to the end of the Late Geometric period, ca. 700, and continues through the seventh century, at which time the building was destroyed.[940]

The presence of ashes in the rooms and larger vessels is thought to be indicative of sacrificial activity, and the bothros a place for pouring libations.[941] It is possible, however, that the ashes, bothros, and drain are more indicative of industrial practices.[942] The "sacred house" is not located near a cemetery or burial plot, but it has been associated with a Late Geometric male inhumation, just meters in front of the building.[943] The grave was covered by an earthen mound three meters in diameter, followed by a series of at least six sacrificial pyres, containing burned bones, shells, and broken pots, most dating

---

937. Lauter 1985a, pp. 163-169, has reinterpreted the "corridor" as a porch, probably roofed, and the "paved court" as a street. In the plan seen in Travlos 1983, p. 333, fig. 10, there appears to be a wall blocking part of the "street" at its northwest corner, which makes such an identification less secure. See Ainian 1997, p. 151.

938. Ainian 1997, p. 150.

939. Kourouniotes and Travlos 1937, pp. 42, 48; Travlos 1983, p. 334; Lauter 1985a, p. 167.

940. Travlos 1983, p. 333, dates the building's construction to the middle of the eighth century; he believes that it was originally a domestic house, and was later converted to a shrine building by 700. There is no evidence that the building is this early, however. See Ainian 1997, p. 151; Binder 1998, p. 135.

941. Ainian 1997, p. 151.

942. Lauter 1985a, pp. 166-167, believes that the bothros was perhaps used for tanning or dyeing operations. Fagerström 1988b, pp. 44, 160-44, 161, prefers to see the building as a "substantial Late Geometric farm building".

943. Kourouniotes 1940b, pp. 274-275; Morris 1987, p. 68. Travlos 1983, pp. 334-335, suggests the deceased was a member of the Eumolpidai, who he believes were the occupants and builders of the "sacred house". Lauter 1985a, p. 168, believes that the "sacred house" served a group associated with the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, perhaps the Kerykes.

to the seventh century.[944] Sometime in the early sixth century, a small, bi-partite naiskos was set directly over the burial and mound.[945] By the end of the sixth century, the naiskos was in ruins, and replaced by an altar.[946] At around the same time, a small temple was constructed over the ruins of the "sacred house," which together with the altar were surrounded by a peribolos wall.[947]

This sequence of events has led some to believe that the "sacred house" was associated with worship of the ancestor or hero buried in front of the building.[948] Certainly the peribolos wall leads us to suspect that by the sixth century, the "sacred house" and burial were thought to be intimately connected, as reflected by the peribolos wall. While this may also be true for the seventh century, it is also possible that the "sacred house" was in fact multi-functional, serving the industrial, living, and cultic needs of a family, a prominent member of which was buried just before their doors.[949]

2.3.3.2. Academy: "Sacred House"

The Site:

---

944. Ainian 1997, pp. 151-152.

945. Kourouniotes and Travlos 1937, p. 49; Travlos 1983, p. 335.

946. Dedications from around the altar included black figure pottery and moldmade female terracotta figurines. See Kourouniotes and Travlos 1937, pp. 49-51; Travlos 1983, pp. 333-336.

947. Ainian 1997, p. 153.

948. Ainian 1997, pp. 152-153, believes that the "sacred house" was built to accommodate the rites for the deceased ancestor, serving as a pious storehouse for the sacrificial remains.

949. Mylonas 1961, pp. 45-47, 60, claims there is another "sacred house" at Eleusis, near the Stoa of Philon. The pottery from the building dates to the Late Helladic period, but the foot of one Geometric krater was found on a wall, enough to convince him that the building was used as a "sacred house" through the Geometric period, due to its links with an undated well in the area he identifies as the Kallichoron in the Hymn to Demeter. Cf. Mylonas and Travlos 1952, pp. 56-57. A "heroön" for the Seven Against Thebes is also claimed at Eleusis; see Mylonas 1953, pp. 81-87, 1961, p. 62, who bases this assumption upon a Late Geometric wall surrounding, awkwardly for his thesis, eight and half of a ninth Middle Helladic burial. For a sound rebuttal of this "heroön," see Antonaccio 1995, pp. 112-117.

The so-called "sacred house" at the Academy is a building with seven rooms on either side of a corridor, measuring at its largest extent 15.30 by 14.60 meters long.[950] Each room, as well as the corridor between the rooms, held at least five layers of what appears to be sacrificial debris containing animal bones and smashed pottery. Though a catalogue of the pottery has not been published, reports indicate the pottery consisted mostly of skyphoi, lekanai, and oinochoai; pyxides and spindle-whorls are also attested.[951] No objects manufactured specifically for votive use, such as terracotta figurines, were found among the debris. Each sacrificial layer was covered by a thin, clean earthen layer, and then marked by rows of stones. A mudbrick hearth was located in one room, filled with four layers of nearly sterile ash. A rectangular *eschara* was found at the end of the corridor, near which was found a knife. Two clay-lined, parallel channels or drains were found in yet another room; their purpose is unknown, though they have often been interpreted as channels to receive ritual offerings or blood sacrifices.[952]

The "sacred house" seems to have been erected at the end of the Late Geometric period, and used throughout the seventh century.[953] The building was constructed in at least two phases, with sacrifices originally performed inside and outside the building in the first phase. Later, the area of open-air sacrifices were surrounded by additions to the building.[954] Curiously, most of the walls consist entirely of mudbrick, with no stone socle.[955] It is not clear, however, that any of the rooms were roofed. The largest sacrifices appear to have been conducted within the corridor of the building, near the *eschara*; the

---

950. For general discussion and bibliography of the Academy Sacred House, see especially Stavropoullos 1958, pp. 5-9; Drerup 1969, pp. 31-32; Snodgrass 1971, p. 398; Travlos 1971a, p. 42; Coldstream 1976, p. 16, 2003, p. 347; Abramson 1979, pp. 187-189; Lauter 1985a, pp. 159-162; Fagerström 1988b, pp. 46-47; Whitley 1994b, p. 221; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 186-189; Ainian 1997, pp. 140-143.

951. Ainian 1997, p. 141.

952. Offering trenches (*opferinnen*): Drerup 1969, p. 32. Channels for blood sacrifices: Stavropoullos 1958, p. 8. Lauter 1985a, p. 160, prefers to see an industrial use for the channels, such as drains for a wine press.

953. Stavropoullos 1958, pp. 6-7.

954. The lowest layer of sacrificial deposits extend under the walls of some of the rooms. Stavropoullos 1961b, p. 21, believes all sacrifices were originally performed open-air, the area later provided with walls. Ainian 1997, pp. 141-142, believes that Room α-α´ and β were erected when the site became sacred, the other rooms being gradually added over where open-air worship was previously practiced.

955. Ainian 1997, p. 141. Only two walls of Room β and the wall of Room δ´ have socle. Up to ten courses of mudbrick were preserved in places, rising to a height of 0.90 m.

fires from these sacrifices would seem to preclude a roof. Furthermore, by the end of the seventh century, sacrifices appear to have been conducted upon the walls, themselves.[956]

Only a few meters to the north of the "sacred house" was found an Early Helladic apsidal building. A pit cut through the building held a deposit of around forty intact Late Geometric vessels; directly over the building were found six Late Geometric cremation burials, all dating to the Late Geometric.[957] Around one hundred fifty meters to the southwest, a deposit trench was discovered containing around two hundred Late Protogeometric or Early Geometric vessels, mostly neatly stacked rows of kantharoi.[958] Northeast of the "sacred house" are graves dating from the Late Geometric to the Archaic periods.[959] Close by the burials is Building V, a rectangular, pi-shaped building dated to the Geometric period. No ash or votives are reported from this building, though it has been suggested that it was a shrine or naiskos.[960]

The picture we have of Late Geometric and seventh-century activity at the Academy is a complex one. There is no doubt that extensive sacrifices took place from the Late Geometric period until the end of the seventh century at the "sacred house".[961] We do not know, however, to whom or what they were sacrificing. A popular theory is that in the Late Geometric period, the nearby Early Helladic building was re-discovered, at which

956. Stavropoullos 1962, p. 7. Cf. Ainian 1997, pp. 141-142.

957. Stavropoullos 1956, pp. 49-52. Child cremations are also found at Anavyssos, but in general are very rare in Attica during the Iron Age. See Morris 1987, p. 20.

958. Stavropoullos 1958, pp. 8-9, who dates the deposit to the Protogeometric period; cf. Snodgrass 1971, p. 398; Morris 1987, p. 222; Antonaccio 1995, p. 188. For an Early Geometric I date, see Coldstream 2003, p. 347; Ainian 1997, p. 142.

959. Stavropoullos 1956, pp. 47-54, 1958, p. 9, 1959, p. 9, 1961a, pp. 5-7. Cf. Lauter 1985a, pp. 161-162; Morris 1987, p. 222; Whitley 1994a, p. 69; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 188-189.

960. Stavropoullos 1959, p. 10, 1961a, p. 7; Ainian 1997, pp. 142-143.

961. Although doubt is expressed by Fagerström 1988b, pp. 46-47, who interprets the building as perhaps a farmstead; his interpretation makes no mention of the sacrificial deposits. For a similar view, see also Pesando 1989, p. 46.

time a hero shrine to Hekademos was initiated at the site of the "sacred house".[962] Such a reconstruction, while imaginative, lacks supporting evidence.[963] Others have linked the sacrifices within the "sacred house" with practices of ancestor worship for the nearby dead.[964] A third option would be that the house was the home of a family, which was given over to occasionally large sacrifices for the family's nearby ancestors.[965] Such an option is less likely if the rooms were not provided with a roof, as seems to be the case. At present, however, all interpretations the building remain speculative.

2.3.3.3. Anavyssos: "Chthonic Shrine"

The Site:

A "chthonic shrine" for the dead is claimed for a small building near a Late Geometric burial ground at the necropolis of Anavyssos.[966] The building consists of three sections; at the center is Room 2, measuring 3.0 meters long by 2.5 meters wide. The west-

---

962. Stavropoullos 1956, pp. 53-54, 1958, pp. 5-13, who saw the forty Late Geometric vessels and child burials within the Early Helladic house as marking the date of "rediscovery". Whether these Late Geometric activities were related to a "rediscovery" is unknown, however. He also viewed the deposit of two hundred Protogeometric or Early Geometric vessels as evidence of an earlier foundation for the shrine of Hekademos, though how he reconciles this with the Late Geometric "rediscovery" of Hekademos' "house" is not explained. Cf. Coldstream 1976, p. 16; 2003, p. 347, who accepts Stavropoullos' interpretation. At any rate, the Protogeometric/Early Geometric deposit, while striking, is not close to either "house".

963. Whitley 1994b, p. 221; Antonaccio 1995, p. 188. Secure evidence for pre-Classical worship of Hekademos is lacking. Travlos 1971b, p. 42, appeals to a sixth-century sherd from the Athenian Agora (!) as evidence for an Archaic hero shrine to Hekademos. On the sherd, P 10507, a male figure is labeled with the name ΗΕΚΑ[..., which Travlos reads as ΗΕΚΑ[ΔΗΜΟΣ, following Beazley 1956, p. 27, no. 36. See, however, Vanderpool 1946, pp. 133-134, no. 26, who believes the figure is Apollo, and the inscription one of his epithets, such as ΗΕΚΑ[ΤΟΣ, ΗΕΚΑ[ΕΡΓΟΣ, or ΗΕΚΑ[ΤΟΜΒΑΙΟΣ. Ancient tradition held that Hekademos was the first settler in the area, which would seem to support an early date for the worship of Hekademos; our source for this tradition, however, is rather late: the third century A.D. biographer Diogenes Laertius, 3.7.

964. Ainian 1997, p. 143.

965. Lauter 1985a, pp. 160-162, suggests that the building was a roofed house and "private," and so given over only periodically for ritual purposes, most likely the annual celebrations of a hero or ancestor by a burial organization.

966. Davaras and Verdeles 1966, p. 98; Themelis 1973, pp. 109-110. Cf. Morris 1987, pp. 82-84; Ainian 1997, p. 145; Langdon 1997, p. 115.

ern wall of the room is provided with a bench; a small square platform is located in the southeast corner of the room. Adjacent and to the south is Room 1, measuring 1.85 meters long, and 2.30 meters wide. Within this room was found a stone base. The northernmost Room 3 is of unclear plan. Its eastern wall stops just before a Late Geometric IIa grave; whether the room extended further north is unknown. It is also unclear whether any of the three rooms communicated with one another.[967]

The building is thought to have been built together with a peribolos wall that surrounds the northern section of the necropolis, where there is a concentration of Late Geometric graves. For the excavator, the course of the wall indicates that it was intended to surround the three earliest and wealthiest tombs of cemetery.[968] If true, the peribolos wall, and therefore the building, would date to the end of the Late Geometric period.[969] The presumed association of the peribolos wall and building with the Late Geometric graves has also led to the identification of the small building as a shrine for the dead.[970]

We have, however, no independent means to verify the date of the peribolos wall or the building. In the fourth century, a bee-keeper renovated the building, turning it into a farm house; in the process, all traces of earlier activity were removed.[971] In other words, no pottery or finds of any kind dating to the period of use of the building or the peribolos

---

967. Themelis 1973, p. 110, thinks that Room 3 was a porch and entryway for Room 2. Ainian 1997, p. 145, believes that the two rooms did not communicate. Both the plans, and the photos provided in Themelis 1973, pl. 87, appear to show that there are parallel walls between all three rooms, indicating all three were cut off from one another.

968. Tombs I-III/73, for which see Themelis 1973, pp. 108-109, who dates the graves to the second half of the eighth century. Morris 1987, pp. 83-84, fig. 26a-b, dates Tomb I to Late Geometric Ib, Tomb II to Late Geometric IIb, Tomb III to Late Geometric IIa. Whitley 1991, pp. 199-200, dates Tombs I and II to the early eighth century, Middle Geometric II to Late Geometric I; he appears to date Tomb III to Late Geometric II.

969. Morris 1987, p. 84, fig. 26b, dates the building to Late Geometric IIb. Ainian 1997, p. 145, simply prefers before 700.

970. Themelis 1973, p. 109, calls the building "τὸ χθόνιο ἱερό". The floor level of Room 1 was lower than the outside soil level, which, according to Ainian 1997, p. 145, "indicates a cult of chthonian character". In the Archaic period, some buildings were set atop Geometric and Archaic burial mounds in Anavyssos and nearby Palaia Phokaia, indicating that funerary rites to ancestors were common in the area. See Kakavoyanni 1984, pp. 43-45, 1987, pp. 96-97; cf. Ainian 1997, p. 145; Langdon 1997, p. 115, who suggest these later practices support the idea that the Late Geometric building represents a similar practice. The Archaic parallels are not exact, however. The Late Geometric structure, if indeed that is its date, is not placed over any burials.

971. Themelis 1973, p. 110.

wall were recovered during excavations. Furthermore, the relative chronology between the building and the Late Geometric graves is not clear. It is possible that the building was already abandoned at the time of the initial burials; two graves may have damaged parts of the building.[972] At this point, however, with no dates or any finds of any kind associated with the building, its interpretation as a shrine for the dead is not conclusive.

2.3.3.4. Thorikos: "Sacred Houses"

The Site:

Two structures have been found on Velatouri Hill in Thorikos, in an area called Necropolis West 4.[973] The first, Building X-XII/XXII, is rather poorly preserved due to later activity in the area. It appears to be one large room, X-XII, and a porch or courtyard, XXII. It measures nine meters wide, and a little over six meters long.[974] No evidence for a roof was reported. Within the main room were found two pits, twenty centimeters deep, each with traces of litharge, a by-product of silver extraction.[975] The earliest pottery associated with the building dates to the Protogeometric period; by the Early Geometric period, it appears that the building was destroyed by avalanches and fire.[976] This building has sometimes been interpreted as a structure dedicated to the

---

972. The eastern wall of Room 1 stops at the point that it meets a Late Geometric IIa grave, Grave XXII/73. It is unclear whether the wall stops here out of respect for the grave, or if the grave disturbed the wall at this point. The southeast corner of the central room, Room 2, appears to have been damaged by the installation of a Late Geometric IIb grave, Grave XVIII/65. See Ainian 1997, p. 145, n. 994; for the dates of the graves, see Morris 1987, p. 84, fig. 26a-b.

973. Bibliography and discussion of both buildings: Bingen et al. 1967a, pp. 25-34; 1967b, pp. 31-56; 1969, pp. 102-109; 1984, pp. 144-146; Mussche 1974, pp. 25-29; 1998, p. 29; Themelis 1976, pp. 53-54; Lauter 1985a, p. 163; Morris 1987, pp. 68-71; Fagerström 1988b, pp. 51-52; Van Gelder 1991, pp. 55-57; Ainian 1997, pp. 146-147, 254; Mersch 1997, pp. 54-57

974. Bingen et al. 1967a, p. 27. The height of the walls is preserved to one meter; there is no mention of mudbrick.

975. Bingen et al. 1967a, pp. 29-30, 32; 1967b, p. 34.

976. Bingen et al. 1967a, pp. 25, 30-31, 34; 1967b, p. 36. Coldstream 2003, p. 70, with little explanation, dates most of the pottery from Building X-XII/XXII to the mid-ninth century, Early Geometric II or early Middle Geometric I. Cf. Ainian 1997, p. 254, who dates the building from the early Early Geometric to Early Geometric II or early Middle Geometric I. Mussche 1974, p. 25, gives an Early Geometric date for the building, though later—1998, p. 29—notes Protogeometric material.

dead.[977] There are, however, no contemporary graves in the area, and no evidence of ritual practice has been identified from this building. It is more likely that the building functioned at least in part as a workshop, in view of the evidence of silver working.[978]

After the building fell into disrepair, a grave dated to the second half of the ninth century, or Middle Geometric I, was set within the porch or courtyard.[979] This grave is the sole evidence of activity in the area during the Middle Geometric period.

In the Late Geometric period, a part of Building X-XI/XII's still standing south wall was used as the northern wall of a second building, Building III/XXVI, which measures nearly nine meters long, and nearly six meters wide. The building consists of a large, rectangular room, Room III, and a "porch," Room XXVI. Within the porch, and just off-center, is a square, stone-lined pit filled with ash, which may be a hearth.[980] The structure may have been open-air.[981] Building III/XXVI appears to have stood for a short time, having been built and destroyed during the Late Geometric period.[982] The building

---

977. Lauter 1985a, p. 163.

978. In support of this interpretation, the excavators noted that the floors were made of clay and clean ash; see Bingen et al. 1967a, p. 30. Also reported from the floor is a grinding stone, though whether it was used for grain or minerals is not known. Ainian 1997, pp. 147, 254, notes a similar ground plan between this building and a contemporary metals workshop on Pithekoussai. Mersch 1997, p. 55, suggests the litharge is actually the remains of a lead clamp used to mend vessels.

979. Grave 58: Bingen et al. 1967b, pp. 38-42. Cf. Coldstream 2003, p. 70, who dates the grave to the last quarter of the ninth century.

980. Bingen et al. 1969, p. 104.

981. The excavators raise the possibility that Room III was a court, since no floor levels were found; see Bingen et al. 1967b, p. 31; cf. Fagerström 1988b, p. 52, who also believes the building was open-air. A floor level was found in Room XXVI, Bingen et al. 1969, p. 102, which together with the hearth may indicate it was roofed?

982. Bingen et al. 1969, p. 109, dates the pottery, and therefore the building, to the second half of the eighth century. Mussche 1974, p. 25, simply gives a Late Geometric date. In earlier reports, a Late Protogeometric to Early Geometric level in Room III, and four pits, similar to those found in Building X-XII/XXII, held Early Geometric material. Three of the pits also held ash, shell and bone, loom weights, and beads; see Bingen et al. 1967a, pp. 32-33. This would indicate that Room III was active in the same period as the earlier building, and perhaps engaged in the same industrial activity. Most of the material in this room is Late Geometric, however, indicating that even if it was in use earlier, it was abandoned in the Middle Geometric, and rebuilt in the Late Geometric, at which time Room XXVI was added to it. See Ainian 1997, pp. 146-147.

certainly seems abandoned by 700, at which point a child burial within a hydria is placed within the floor of Room XXVI.[983]

Building III/XXVI was not the only structure in use in the Late Geometric period. Excavations just to the south revealed the corner of a Middle Geometric II or Late Geometric I building, Building XXX.[984] The remains are too scrappy to say much more than this.

Beginning in the Late Geometric II period, the area just east of these buildings was used as a burial ground until well into the fourth century.[985] There is a general assumption that Building III/XXVI and the graves were contemporary, leading to a claim that the building may have served a shrine of the dead.[986] Building III/XXVI went out of use around the time of the earliest burials to the east, however; it is possible that the burial ground was founded after its collapse. As with the earlier building, there are no signs of ritual practice associated with Building III/XXVI.[987]

2.3.3.5. Sacred Houses: Interpretation

As we can see, the only characteristic these "sacred houses" share is their proximity to graves. Yet the spatial and chronological relationship between each of the suspected "sacred houses" and nearby graves also differs. The closest graves to the Academy house are children's burials; adult burials are further away. The Eleusis house was near only one burial. In the cases of both the buildings at Thorikos and Anavyssos, the burials may have come after the buildings were abandoned. In addition to these variations in the relationship between grave and building, these "sacred houses" share no architectural plan or deposit type.[988] The only buildings to exhibit demonstrable ritual activity are those at

---

983. Grave 87: Bingen et al. 1969, pp. 107-108.

984. Bingen et al. 1984, pp. 144-146.

985. For the Late Geometric graves, see Bingen et al. 1969, pp. 71-101; 1984, pp. 72-150; Whitley 1991, p. 200. Ainian 1997, p. 147, suggests that the area was a cemetery since the Middle Geometric I period, though we have only one grave dated to this period in the area.

986. Themelis 1976, pp. 53-54; Lauter 1985a, p. 163, with some reservations; Ainian 1997, p. 147, who cites the presence of a louterion, "a vase which often turns up in chthonic contexts," in support of the claim that worship of the dead may have practiced in the building.

987. Fagerström 1988b, p. 52, suggests that "mule skinners of ox drivers" slept in Room XXVI, and boarded their animals in Room III. Mussche 1974, p. 25, thinks that the buildings are domestic houses of those who worked and lived within the necropolis.

988. Langdon 1997, p. 115.

the Academy and possibly Eleusis, both of which are seventh-century, not Geometric structures. In short, there is no standard set of attributes shared by these so-called "sacred houses" that allow us to identify a building near graves as indeed an ancestral shrine. The fact that a structure is close to burials should not be considered sufficient evidence for such an identification. In fact, it is generally held that in the Geometric period, the Athenian Agora was settled with houses, the material remains of which have since been lost due to later activity in the area.[989] If true, all of the buildings of the Geometric Athenian Agora would have to be considered "sacred," due to their proximity to burials.

2.4. Interpretation

While the evidence for each of these "sacred houses," as well as the Areopagus Oval Building, is difficult to assess, arguments that insist a structure was either sacred or domestic torture the evidence further.[990] Though there are no sacrifices to ancestors or heroes in the lines of Homer, *basileis* regularly conduct sacrifices to the gods at their home.[991] Public feasts, as well, could be held at their home, which would involve libations and offerings of meat to the gods.[992] A home, in other words, would have been the

---

989. The evidence usually cited is the large number of wells in the area. See, for example, Desborough 1952, p. 1; 1972, pp. 261-265, 362; Snodgrass 1971, p. 363; 1980, pp. 29-34, 154-157; Camp 1986, pp. 24, 33; Morris 1987, p. 65; Whitley 1991, pp. 61-64; Coldstream 1995, p. 393; 2003, p. 315; Townsend 1995, pp. 11-12. Cf. Young 1949, p. 279, however, who finds it "hardly likely that burials were made along the streets in areas built up with houses." Cf. Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 21-22, 271-316, who believes the area was used primarily for burials and pottery workshops.

990. Fagerström 1988b, p. 160, bemoans the "notoriously 'philhieratic' attitude of many classical archaeologists, not least those working in Greece," particularly those archaeologists who insist on identifying "sacred houses" with no explicit evidence of cultic activity. Amusingly, Antonaccio 1995, p. 191, n. 191, responds: "If the early excavators in Attica wished to make every structure into a "Sacred House," Fagerström turns them all into 'substantial...farm buildings'".

991. Cf. *Il* 9.774, 24.306; *Od.* 22.334. Outside of the sacrifices conducted at the funeral of Patroklos, the only sacrifices to the dead in Homer are those that Odysseus conducts in the Underworld in order to speak with the dead, Teiresias in particular. Odysseus promises Teiresias and the other dead that additional sacrifices will be conducted at his home altar when he returns to Ithaka; *Od.* 10.521-529, 11.30-36. No separate shrine or sanctuary is promised the dead, nor are the home sacrifices of Odysseus to be conducted more than once.

992. Cf. *Il.* 9.175, 10. 578; *Od.* 3.339, 390, 7.179, 13.50, 18. 423, 20.271.

site of many sacred activities; in the case of *basileis* or other leaders of the community, these rituals may have involved much of the community. The Areopagus Oval Building is probably best be interpreted as the family home of those buried in the Areopagus cemetery, as well as the center of some ritual activity.[993] To judge from the graves of the Areopagus Geometric Lot, the family was among the wealthiest and innovative of Middle Geometric period. At a time when urn cremations were the normal burial practice, this family alone practiced primary cremation, in which the the remains are cremated *in situ*, and then placed directly within the trench.[994] This cemetery also holds what may be the first inhumation found since the Submycenaean period. Though only partially preserved, the deceased appears to have been a female around fourteen years old; this burial includes eighteen pots distributed on and around legs, a pierced stone plaque, and three pieces of iron, marking it one of the richest burials of the period.[995] In light of the burial evidence, it is likely that the family was among the leaders of the community; as such, their home would have been the center of some form of communal ritual activity.[996] At the very least, there seems little doubt that the family home would have played some role in hosting feasts and funerary games commensurate with the lavishness of these cremation burials. Their home was close enough to some of the cremation fires to feel their heat. The house, then, would have been both domestic, in the sense that people lived and perhaps worked there, and sacred, during *ad hoc* rituals and festivals the family may have hosted or performed, both for themselves and for the community.

3. Protoattic Votive Deposit

The Areopagus Oval Building, however it functioned and whenever it was built, was abandoned around 725, early in the Late Geometric period. The mudbrick walls collapsed, sealing much of its floors and walls with a layer of clay. For a generation or two

---

993. It is also possible that some industrial activity was conducted at the house, though what nature of this activity is not clear. In the nearby Well H 16-17:1, four test pieces and a few wasters from a potter's workshop are reported; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 92-97. There is no evidence from the building, itself, however, which indicates any industry outside of grinding grain for bread, which in any case may be a thoroughly domestic affair.

994. See, for example, graves I 18:2 and 18:3, Smithson 1974, pp. 332-333, 359-363. She dates both burials to Middle Geometric I. Cf. Coldstream 2003, p. 81. See also n. 919, p. 261, n. 920, p. 261.

995. Grave I 18:1, also dated Middle Geometric I by Smithson 1974, pp. 331, 352-331, 359.

996. Ritual activity is a regular occurrence in the Homeric homes of leaders. See, for example, *Il.* 11.774; 16.231; 24.306; *Od.* 22.334.

the entire area seems to have been abandoned. Our first sign of renewed activity in the area is a striking one.

3.1. The Evidence

A deep deposit of small stones and gravel was set directly over the fallen mudbrick clay that covered the walls and floors of the Areopagus Oval Building. Once the packing was laid down, it was covered by a thin ash layer. The intent of the deep deposit was not to simply cover the abandoned building; rather, it appears to have been restricted to a three meter wide strip along Wall D-D, a Late Hellenistic retaining wall that cut through the deposit in the eastern part of the building. The same fill extended into the area directly south of the oval building, and west of Wall A-A.

Included within the stone and gravel packing were a large number of votives and pottery. The earliest pottery from the deposit dates to the Middle Geometric, the latest to the early sixth century. Pottery from both these periods were later intrusions into the fill, however. All the Geometric pottery, for example, appears to have come from a disturbed ninth-century pyre deposit fifteen meters to the northeast.[997] The vast majority of the pottery within the deposit is Protoattic, dating to the first half of the seventh-century; the latest wares date to the third quarter of the seventh century, providing the date of deposition.[998]

The Protoattic deposit included the following:

1. Terracotta Human Figurines: Four standing terracotta human figurines, one female and three male.[999]

---

997. At least twenty examples of joins can be made between the Geometric pottery and the nearby pyre of the "Rich Athenian Lady," fifteen meters to the northeast. In addition, a number of the Geometric pyxides, both open-work kalathoi, and probably all the incised handmade ware originally came from the same pyre. See Smithson 1968, pp. 78-79, 82, for a catalogue of the joined pieces. She suggests that the burial pyre was disturbed, along with other Early and Middle Geometric tombs in the area, now lost, during fourth-century area renovations.

998. Burr 1933, pp. 543, 549-550, 640, fig. 8-9, dates the bulk of the deposit to shortly before ca. 640, and its placement over the oval building complex she dates to ca. 630. Brann 1962, p. 128, dates the deposit to the first half of the seventh century.

999. Burr 1933, pp. 615, nos. 295-298, fig. 82, 85. Two of the male figures, nos. 296 and 298, probably come from horse and rider groups. The third male figure, no. 297, has a helmet, and possibly a shield, which has been restored in the image of the figurine in fig. 82. Could this figure have come from a chariot group?

2. Terracotta Horse Groups: At least eleven terracotta chariot group fragments, three horse-rider fragments, and twenty-one individual horses.[1000]

3. Other Terracotta Animal Figurines: Other than horses, the only other terracotta animals are a bird and possibly a snake.[1001]

4. Terracotta Votive Shields: Thirty-three terracotta shields. Some of the shields have their painted decoration preserved, most of which are Geometric designs; one is decorated with a horse and rider. Hand and arm straps are regularly provided on their interiors.[1002]

5. Terracotta Votive Plaques: Four terracotta plaques. Three of the plaques are too fragmentary to recover the original decorative scheme, though two appear to have snakes along the border.[1003] The fourth plaque is excellently preserved. It is whole, with slight surface damage to the bottom left. At the center of the plaque stands a female figure. Her head is moldmade, and attached to the plaque.[1004] Her hair is painted red, and her diadem is painted bluish-green. The rest of the figure is painted onto the flat surface. She is holding her hands up, her fingers spread out. Her long garment is bound at the middle, and colorfully rendered in patterns of red, yellow and bluish-green. She is bordered on either side by a snake. The left-hand snake is red with bluish-green dots, and appears to have horns. Lotus buds are used as filling ornament. The color pattern is reversed for the right-hand snake, which is extending its fangs. Dot-rosettes are used as filling ornaments. Suspension holes are at either top corner.

1000. Burr 1933, pp. 615, 621, nos. 299-324, 328, fig. 82-86.

1001. Burr 1933, p. 620, nos. 325-326, fig. 86.

1002. Burr 1933, pp. 609-614, nos. 281-294, fig. 75-81.

1003. "Goddess and snakes" plaque: Burr 1933, pp. 604-609, no. 277, fig. 72-73; Cook 1934, pp. 195, 217; Boardman 1954, p. 197, Agora no. 2; Brann 1962, pp. 22, 87, no. 493. For other plaques from the Areopagus Oval Building deposit, see Burr 1933, pp. 605-606, nos. 278-280, fig. 74; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Agora no. 3. One of the cut disks recovered from the deposit appears to come the lower portion of a terracotta plaque, dated ca. 625; see Burr 1933, p. 604, no. 268, fig. 71, and cf. n. 1005, p. 279. The painted decoration includes part of a horse and chariot. Another votive plaque, dated to the middle of the seventh century, was found a little distance away and thought to be a stray from this deposit, has a central suspension hole, and a single tripod for decoration, for which see n. 1026, p. 283.

1004. The moldmade head is similar to numerous Daedalic *protomai* found at other female deity sanctuaries in Attic during the seventh century. For examples from Eleusis, see Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 165-174, pl. 20.

6. Cut Disks: One hundred seventeen disks, most cut from Protoattic pottery; two disks cut from stone. The disks vary in size from roughly three to eight centimeters in diameter.[1005] The purpose of these disks, sacred or otherwise, is unclear.[1006]

7. Votive tripods: A miniature bronze tripod was found within a Protoattic kantharos. The leg of a miniature terracotta tripod was also recovered.[1007]

8. Pottery: Shapes include large vessels, such as amphorae and kraters, as well as bowls, oinochoai, and kantharoi. Courseware jugs and pitchers were also recovered. Contemporary Protocorinthian shapes, primarily aryballoi, oinochoai, and skyphoi, were found in lesser numbers.[1008]

9. Other: A total of eighteen spindle whorls or loom weights were also recovered from the deposit, all but three Protoattic.[1009] Whether these objects were manufactured as votives, or dedicated after domestic use, is impossible to tell.

1005. Burr 1933, pp. 603-604, nos. 257-274, fig. 71. Up to thirty-four of the disks may be cut from Geometric pots. All disks are worn. Two disks—nos. 260 and 275—appear to be marked, each with a simple incised line or two.

1006. Most believe these disks were either stoppers or game pieces; see Burr 1933, p. 630; Young 1939, p. 191; Davidson 1952, p. 217; Brann 1961b, p. 342; Lalonde 1968, p. 131; Bérard 1970, p. 33. Cf. Hedreen 1991, pp. 315-318, for a discussion of sixth-century disks from the area around Olbia in the Black Sea, many of which are inscribed as dedications to Achilles. Hadreen views the disks as votive gaming pieces for Achilles. These disks have been found in primarily domestic contexts, and some have single images—such as a snake, human figure, sword, dagger, and perhaps a boat—instead of an inscription, complicating our understanding of these disks.

1007. Burr 1933, pp. 201, 579, 621, nos. 155, 201, 328, fig. 52, 39-40, 74. A seventh-century griffin head from a large bowl, in imitation of a bronze cauldron, was found in a cistern close to the votive deposit, and may also belong to the deposit; see Burr 1933, p. 621, no. 330, fig. 88.

1008. For a catalogue of all pottery, see Burr 1933, pp. 551-602, figs. 11-69.

1009. Burr 1933, pp. 566, 602, nos. 96, 245-256, fig. 24, 82, 85. There are two loom weights and one incised, handmade spindle whorl that date to the Geometric period; they are most likely intrusions from the "Rich Athenian Lady" pyre deposit.

3.2. Previous Interpretations

In publishing the deposit for the first time, Burr noted many parallels with the votive deposit found within the dromos of a Late Helladic tholos tomb at Menidhi.[1010] The deposit has never been fully published. Excavation reports indicate the deposit included quantities of pottery and votive offerings, recovered in stratified layers dating from the Late Geometric period through the first half of the fifth century.[1011] Terracotta votives reported from the deposit include around fifty horse figurines, prominent among which were chariot groups;[1012] many votive shields, at least six nearly complete;[1013] and terracotta votive plaques, none with images reported.[1014]

Since its discovery, it has generally been assumed that the pottery and terracotta votives were dedications to the occupant of the Bronze Age tomb. As a result, the Menidhi deposit has become the deposit-type for a shrine of the dead.[1015] The parallels in votive types between the Menidhi deposit and the deposit over the Areopagus Oval Building – particularly the votive shields, horses, and plaques – encouraged Thompson to associate the latter Protoattic deposit with a shrine of the dead.[1016]

The Menidhi deposit has, in fact, played an outsized role in the study of Protoattic deposits in Athens and Attica. A number of deposits have been assumed to be dedications to an ancestor or hero based in part, or primarily on parallels with the Menidhi de-

---

1010. Menidhi tholos tomb: Lolling 1880; Pelon 1976, pp. 231-233, pl. 168. Menidhi votive deposit: Wolters 1898, 1899. Cf. Mylonas 1966, pp. 181-184; Abramson 1978, pp. 96-100; Hägg 1987; Travlos 1988, pp. 1-2; Morris 1988; Whitley 1994b; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 102-109. The deposit has never been fully published.

1011. Callipolitis-Feytmans 1965, pp. 43-65; Hägg 1987, p. 96; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 105-107.

1012. Wolters 1899, pp. 121-123, fig. 26.

1013. Wolters 1899, pp. 118-121, fig. 25.

1014. Lolling 1880, pp. 5-6; Wolters 1899, pp. 121, 127, report the recovery of white-ground plaques, apparently with the images worn away. Boardman 1954, p. 198, suggests these plaques date to the middle of the seventh century. No images of these plaques have have appeared in print.

1015. See, for example, Wolters 1899, pp. 118, 128; Nilsson 1950, p. 603; Mylonas 1966, p. 182; Coldstream 1976, p. 11; Abramson 1978, p. 96; Hägg 1987, p. 99; Travlos 1988, p. 1; Morris 1988; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 102-109. Cf. Broneer 1942, pp. 156-157, considers terracotta votive shields as indicative of hero cult.

posit and the Areopagus Protoattic deposit.[1017] A good example of such an interpretation is the Triangular Shrine, located at a crossroads only twenty meters to the northwest of the Areopagus Oval Building.[1018] In the Archaic period, the area received an altar; by the second half of the fifth century, the area was provided with a triangular abaton, the corners of which were marked by stelai.[1019] One of these stelai survives, inscribed simply ΤΟ ΗΙΕΡΟ, "of the sanctuary/shrine".[1020] The earliest votive material associated with this shrine, however, dates to the seventh century, and includes two terracotta horses and twelve cut disks, similar in date and style with the votives found in the deposit over the oval building.[1021] In addition, the Triangular Shrine was thought to mark an earlier grave,

---

1016. See, for example, Thompson 1968, p. 60; 1978; Ainian 1997, p. 87, n. 442. Cf. Hägg 1987. Whitley 1988, p. 176, n. 26; 1994b, p. 224, is cautious in assigning a "hero cult" character to the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit based on the parallels between the deposits, though he feels the oval building deposit is an ancestor shrine associated with the child's burial under the floor of the building.

1017. Thompson 1958, pp. 148-153, for example, argues that a votive pit found under the Panathenaic Way is still yet another example of a shrine to the dead, due mainly to the votive types and location near burials. Within a pit constructed of a re-used well head and poros blocks, and covered by a re-used Doric capital, an assemblage was placed and then covered over, apparently with no indications above ground to mark the site. Within were deposited votive materials dating from the seventh century to early fifth. The deposit had been disturbed by later robbers. Recovered around the pits were a number of votives dating to the seventh century, including a gold band with foil, a bronze *protome* of a bearded snake, an Egyptian faience hawk, three terracotta figurines of charioteers and horses, one terracotta shield, a fragment of an ivory fibula, and three fragments of terracotta plaques. Seventh-century pottery consisted of a few Protocorinthian sherds. Cf. Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 119-121, pl. 65 a, b. Abramson 1979, p. 11, argues for a seventh century hero shrine to Phrontis at Sounion, based in part on a deposit that included votives that "frequently found in hero shrines," such as "swords, plaques, shields, tripods, and horses". The Attic parallels he cites are the Menidhi deposit, the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit, and the Panathenaic deposit. While the pit construction is certainly unique, again we are left to wonder whether a shrine of the dead is the only explanation for this deposit.

1018. Lalonde 1968; Thompson 1968, pp. 58-60; Wycherley 1970, pp. 289-291; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 120-121; Abramson 1978, pp. 160-161, 166-168; Antonaccio, pp. 121-122.

1019. There appears to be evidence for wall, possibly a proto-Hieron, dating to the seventh century. See Lalonde 1968, p. 130.

1020. Lalonde 1968, pp. 126-128, pls. 35-36.

1021. Lalonde 1968, pp. 130-131, pls. 36e, 37b.

strengthening its interpretation as a shrine for the dead based on the votive deposit.[1022] The claims of a burial below the abaton are unfounded.[1023] In addition, the only terracotta votive that this deposit shares with both the Menidhi deposit and the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit are horses, of which there are only two for the Triangular Shrine. Yet the Triangular Shrine continues to be most often interpreted as yet another site for a shrine of the dead based on these parallels with these two other deposits, as well as its proximity to the Areopagus Oval Building and nearby burials. As of today, in fact, the Triangular Shrine is still considered by some to be the "best candidate for a hero shrine" in Athens.[1024]

3.3. Reexamination

In order to interpret the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit, we have two tasks before us. The first is to determine whether the deposit reveals anything about the Areopagus Oval Building, itself. The second is to assess the argument that the deposit, as a whole, is indicative of ancestor or hero cult.

3.3.1. Relationship with Areopagus Oval Building

The answer to the first question lies one hundred meters to the northwest. Excavations of a seventh-century road fill against the face of a retaining wall for a Late Geometric grave precinct revealed joins between pottery found in both in the road fill and the Areopagus Oval Building deposit, as well as seventh-century terracotta horses.[1025] More road fill just to the south, disturbed during a sixth-century reconstruction of the cemetery precinct wall, contained Protoattic pottery of a similar date, as well as a terracotta votive plaque fragment and terracotta horse, both contemporary with the Areopagus

---

1022. See Thompson 1968, pp. 58, 60: "a shallow round pit neatly cut in the rock *may* mark the place of an early burial in the form of a bronze lebes used as a receptacle for ashes" (original italics). Lalonde 1968, p. 126, is more cautious, noting the area around the shallow pit was disturbed in Roman and Byzantine times. A few years later, however, we hear that "two small circular pits cuts in the bedrock may well mark the place occupied by the ash urns of early graves...," Wycherley 1970, p. 290; cf. Thompson and Wycherley 1972, pp. 120-121. Burials below the triangular shrine would be paralleled at the West Gate at Eretria, for which see especially Bérard 1970; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 228-236.

1023. Bérard 1970, pp. 56-71, disputes the possibility of a burial within the temenos, rightly noting that the pit below the Athenian triangular shrine is too shallow to have held an urn.

1024. Antonaccio 1995, p. 121. See also Thompson and Wycherley 1972, p. 119, n. 13.

1025. Young 1939, pp. 10, 128-138, nos. B 64-84.

Oval Building deposit.[1026] The project extended well to the north, as well. In all, the road was raised 0.50- 0.70 meters, a significant operation.[1027]

Adjacent to and north of the cemetery is a four-room structure, Building A. The building was constructed in the Late Geometric period; with its abandonment in the second or third quarter of the seventh century, Building A and its kiln were covered with a gravelly fill containing pottery of the same style and date as that found both on its fronting road.[1028] At least one terracotta figurine was recovered from this fill.[1029]

It is clear that a single operation in the second or third quarter of the seventh century deposited the gravel and stone fill over two abandoned buildings in the southeast Athenian Agora, Building A and the Areopagus Oval Building. After the fill was deposited over Building A, the area remained an open area for close to one hundred years, effectively expanding the roadway in this area.[1030] Likewise, the area over the Areopagus Oval Building remained open and free building activity until the fifth century, when two wells were sunk into the deposit and building.[1031] Since the very same fill was used to level at least one road in the area, as well, the operation is best explained as an effort to fa-

---

1026. Young 1939, p. 118-123, nos. B 44-51, figs. 87, 122. The votive plaque has a central suspension hole, and decorated with the image of a tripod. Cf. Boardman 1954, p. 197, Agora no. 1. One sherd from this deposit, probably a tile fragment, is inscribed with the name ΜΕΛΑΝΘΙΣ, above which, in retrograde, is written ΝΕΟΚΕ. See Young 1939, p. 121-122, no. B 47, fig. 87, 144. The top line appears to be a failed attempt at writing ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕ.

1027. Thompson 1940, p. 106.

1028. Thompson 1940, pp. 3-8, and Brann 1962, p. 10, date the construction of Building A to the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century. Recently, Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 126-143, has established the date of the earliest use of the kiln to the Late Geometric period, which would seem to indicate a Late Geometric date for Building A's construction. Though this building is adjacent to a contemporary cemetery, the presence of a kiln in one of the rooms has deterred anyone from interpreting it as a "sacred house".

1029. Thompson 1940, p. 7; Brann 1962, pp. 110, 128, deposit H 12:17; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 130-132.

1030. Thompson 1940, p. 8. The area of Building A was left open until the erection of Building F in the middle of the sixth century.

1031. Burr 1933, p. 543. These wells indicate that neither the area of the building nor the buried building itself was considered sacred by the fifth century.

cilitate traffic in this area of the Agora. The fill over the Areopagus Oval Building most likely allowed easier travel up and down the slope of the Areopagus.[1032]

3.3.2. Location of Shrine

There is no doubt that the mass of votives and pottery within the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit came from a single shrine or sanctuary, presumably located near the Areopagus Oval Building. In addition to the Triangular Shrine, there appears to have been a number of small seventh-century shrines in the immediate area, to judge from well deposits. One such well is located along the eastern edge of Kolonos Agoraios, near the Late Geometric grave precinct and Building A.[1033] The pottery and votives found within the well date to the first half of the seventh century, contemporary with the Areopagus Oval Building and Building A deposits. Among the votive material within the well were terracotta votive horses, clay discs, a throne or chair, and over eighty miniature votive cups.[1034] Another contemporary well deposit, located only meters from the Areopagus Oval Building, held votive cups, a cut disk, three terracotta columnar figurines, one terracotta horse, and one horse and rider.[1035] In fact, cut disks and terracotta horse figurines are found in almost every Protoattic well in the Agora, including one well that also held a terracotta votive shield and votive plaque.[1036] If we assume that the votives within each well came from a nearby shrine, it would appear that local shrines were scattered throughout the area of the Athenian Agora. In the end, however, the exact site

---

1032. Burr 1933, p. 550: "The deliberate packing with gravel and stones and discarded pottery must have been intended to raise the level so that one could pass up over the ridge of rock to the upper slope of the Areiopagos. It seems, then, that we have here the course of a road." She offered this suggestion *before* excavations of the road in front of Building A revealed joins with the Protoattic deposit.

1033. Well deposit D 11:5; Young 1939, pp. 139-230; Brann 1962, p. 125.

1034. Four terracotta horse and one quadriga: Young 1939, p. 193-194, nos. C 181-184, fig. 143; twenty-seven clay disks and two stone, some pierced near center: p. 191, nos. C 166-173, fig. 142; terracotta chair leg from throne?: p. 194, nos. C 186, fig. 143; votive cups: pp. 161-162, C 69-76, fig. 111.

1035. Votive cups: Young 1938, pp. 419, 424, nos. D 10-11, figs. 2, 8; cut disk: p. 426, no. D 26, figs. 8; terracotta figurines: pp. 420-421, D 30-34, p. 427, fig. 10.

1036. Horses and cut disks: Wells G, F, D, and H—deposits J 18:8, O 12:1, R 8:2, and M 11:3, respectively. M 11:3 contains a votive shield and plaque. Two Protoattic wells do not have terracotta votives reported: Well E (J 15:1), which held very little material from the period, and Well P 7:2. For discussion and bibliography for each well, see the "Index of Deposits" in Brann 1961b, pp. 125-131.

from which the Areopagus Oval Building deposit is unknown.[1037] A clue to the shrine's location may be the mass gravel and stone included with the deposit, which may indicate that the material came from the bedrock-rich Areopagus or Kolonos Agoraios. None of the gravel or stone was photographed or saved, however, leaving out any possibility of confirming this suspicion.

3.3.3. Identity of Cult

The Areopagus Protoattic Deposit is clearly out of context, and cannot be related to any practices conducted within the Areopagus Oval Building. The very nature of the deposit, however, has been considered indicative of a hero or ancestor cult.[1038] Much of the reasoning behind this assertion stems from the presence of similar votive types at Menidhi. While the location of the Menidhi deposit tempts us to associate this deposit with a hero shrine dedicated to a Mycenaean ancestor, there are difficulties with this near universal assessment.

Far from being a type-site and -deposit for hero cult, what is often overlooked is how one-of-a-kind the Menidhi deposit is. No other votive deposit in Greece, let alone Attica, can match the Menidhi deposit in terms of duration of activity, deposit context and votive types.[1039] The context and particulars of this deposit, in other words, are unique. In addition, the case for advocating that the occupant of the tholos was the object of the dedications is not airtight. There is, at any rate, no indication that the occupant of the tomb was considered a "hero," either from epic or as one recently heroized. There is, for example, not one inscribed dedication that suggests the votives were dedicated to a hero. No dedication survives indicating that the votives were for a deity, either. But while seventh-century dedications to deities are found at sites in Attica, most notably at the Zeus sanctuary on Mt. Hymettos, there is not one dedication in Geometric

---

1037. Kantharoi, a prominent drinking shape within the Areopagus Oval Building deposit, are relatively rare in well deposits. This distinction is all the more striking when we consider the wide array of cup shapes represented within the wells. On this point, see Brann 1961b, p. 22, who concludes that the kantharos must have been primarily reserved for ceremonial use.

1038. Cf. Hägg 1987, p. 99, who argues that though none of the individual votive types found in either the Areopagus Oval Building deposit or Menidhi deposit— which he finds are parallel—are specifically "heroic," "[s]till I think we are intitled to speak of a 'heroic character' of a certain deposit, namely when it contains large proportions of these very types of offerings [i.e., miniature shields, votive plaques, and chariot figurines]".

1039. Antonaccio 1995, pp. 107-109, 246. Callipolitis-Feytmans 1965, p. 65, finds the deposit and its location unique in all Greece.

or Archaic Attica that is inscribed as a dedication to a hero or tomb occupant.[1040] Though nothing in the votive package necessitates identification with a hero or ancestor, the location of the deposit at the tomb is enough to suggest for most that at the very least we have a tomb cult, perhaps to an anonymous hero.[1041]

We should note, however, that there is no evidence of ritual activity, such as sacrificial ash or votive and pottery scatter, at the site of the tholos itself. The deposit may have belonged a nearby shrine or altar and carefully deposited within the trench. Almost all the finds are located twenty or more meters away from the entrance, set against the north wall of the dromos. The entrance never appears to have been breached or viewed during the hundreds of years votives were left in the same trench. How can we be sure the dedicants knew the dromos led to a tomb?[1042] Certainly abandoned wells and pits were found to be convenient places to deposit votives. Is it not also possible that the

---

1040. Whitley 1994b, p. 221. Shrines for named heroes or ancestors are in fact rare in Archaic Greece. The earliest inscribed dedications are in fact for a heroine, Helen, at the Menelaion in Therapne, near Sparta; the earliest inscribed dedications to Menelaos at this site are later, dating to the early fifth century. See Catling 1975, p. 14, 1976, p. 36, figs. 24-27; Catling and Cavanagh 1976, pp. 144-157; cf. Antonaccio 1995, pp. 245-253. At the Polis Cave on Ithaka, where there is much Geometric and seventh-century activity, the earliest inscribed dedication is not for Odysseus, but for Athena and Hera in the sixth century; dedications inscribed to Odysseus appear for the first time in the second or first century. See Benton 1934; Jeffery 1990, pp. 230-231, 234, no. 3; *IG* IX.i, 653; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 240-244. Cook 1953, pp. 33, 64-66, fig. 38, nos. J1- J3, dates the earliest inscribed dedications to Agamemnon at the Agamemnoneion at Mycenae to the fifth and fourth centuries. Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, p. 89, date the earliest inscriptions to the fourth century, which they believe to be the date of the founding of the shrine for Agamemnon at the site; before this, the sanctuary may well have been primarily for Hera. Cf. Antonaccio 1995, pp. 236-240.

1041. Whitley 1994b, pp. 222-226, notes parallels in pottery type between the Menidhi deposit and *Opferrinnen*, or offering trenches for contemporary funerary rites at the Kerameikos and elsewhere, and suggests that the use of Orientalizing Protoattic pottery is essentially restricted to rituals for the dead. He concludes that the Menidhi deposit was from a hero shrine that belonged to a family. For other discussions of the parallels between *Opferrinnen* and the Menidhi deposit, see Antonaccio 1995, p. 109; Houby-Nielson 1996, p. 53. What are not found among *Opferrinnen* deposits, however, are terracotta votives, which weakens the parallel considerably.

1042. Wolters 1899, fig. 24; cf. Antonaccio 1995, pp. 107-108. Wolters 1899, p. 409, thought that the dromos would have been recognized as an entryway to the underworld, and that the offerings were deliberately left at the entrance of the dromos in an attempt to remain a safe distance from the land of the dead.

dromos was considered a convenient location for the deposition of pottery and votives from a nearby deity sanctuary or shrine?[1043]

A similar deposit of pottery and votive terracottas was found within another Mycenaean tomb, Tomb I, a LH II elliptical tomb at Thorikos.[1044] The few vessels, mostly Protocorinthian aryballoi, and Protoattic drinking vessels, such as skyphoi and other cups, date from the middle of the seventh century; the bulk of the material dates from the second half of the sixth century.[1045] As with the Menidhi deposit, the latest pottery from the assemblage is fifth century. For the excavators, the deposit was evidence of a funerary or heroic cult. The seventh-century terracotta votives, however, are all standing female figurines or Daedalic female *protomai*.[1046] The *protomai* are pierced for suspension, most likely so they could be hung from a tree or elsewhere at a shrine. As with the Menidhi deposit, the deposit is most likely a votive dump from a nearby shrine; in the case of the Thorikos, the exclusively female terracottas suggest that the sanctuary was for a female divinity. Indeed, female *protomai*, which are found at over half of all goddess sanctuaries, appear in no other contexts.

The evidence, then, for sustained tomb or hero worship at either of these Mycenaean tombs is less secure than is often assumed; it is possible that each deposit may in fact come from a nearby deity sanctuary or shrine. More germane to our discussion of the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit, however, is the fact that neither the Menidhi or Thorikos deposit provides the closest parallel for the votive matrix found over Areopagus Oval Building. This deposit on the whole is better compared with deposits found at sanctuaries and shrines for goddesses in Attica, as is clear from the votive distribution charts on pp. 296-305. For example, cut disks have also been found in deposits from the area of the later City Eleusinian, raising the possibility that their use, if cultic, could be

---

1043. The nature and location of this shrine is unknown. The only other Geometric and seventh-century activity noted in the vicinity of the Menidhi deposit are graves; see Coldstream 1968, p. 402; Travlos 1988, pp. 1-2; Morris 1987, p. 225; Whitley 1991, p. 200. The evidence for the nearby graves is unfortunately both unclear and unpublished.

1044. Servais 1968, pp. 30-41, figs. 8-11; Antonaccio 1995, pp. 109-112.

1045. Devillers 1988.

1046. Servais 1968, p. 31, fig. 9. Ten female protomai are reported, the earliest of which range in date from the end of the seventh century to the middle of the fifth century. Three "archaic," handmade, standing female figures with arms out are reported, but not illustrated.

used for deity rituals, as well.[1047] Horses, horse and rider, and chariot figurines are common in Demeter, Artemis and Athena sanctuaries throughout Attica.[1048] Terracotta votive shields have been found at Demeter sanctuaries in Athens and Eleusis, as well as from the Acropolis and a sanctuary to an identified goddess at Kiapha Thiti.[1049] Terracotta votive plaques have been found at Demeter sanctuaries in Athens and Eleusis, as well as from the Acropolis and the Athena sanctuary at Sounion.[1050] Votive tripods, either in bronze, or painted on plaques, have been found at the same sanctuaries, with the exception of Demeter in Athens.[1051] The sheer array of votive types within the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit is best paralleled not with that of Menidhi, but rather with votive deposits from goddess sanctuaries, and in particular, those to Demeter and Athena.[1052]

1047. Miles 1998, pp. 17, 110. All the disks appear to have come from deposit T 19:3. No disks have been reported from other cultic sites in Attic, suggesting either that these humble objects have been underreported, or cut disks are an object restricted to the Athenian Agora and its immediate vicinity. Outside of Attica, cut disks have been reported at Eretria, in and around Olbia.

1048. Horses, riders, chariots: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, 17-23, 109-112, fig. 1, 4. Demeter at Eleusis: Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 151-159, pl. 18-19. Artemis at Brauron: p.c. Veronika Mitsopoulos-Leon, April 30, 2008, who is publishing the terracottas from the site. Athena on Acropolis: Touloupa 1972; Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255. Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 208, 210, fig. 20; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 34, fig. 66.

1049. Votive Shields: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, 17-23, 109-112, fig. 1, 4. Demeter at Eleusis: Skias 1898, col. 69; Wolters 1899, p. 120, n. 12-13. Athena on Acropolis: Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 100, nos. 2484-2492. Kiapha Thiti: Christiansen 2000, p. 71, pl. 10.

1050. Votive Plaques: Demeter at Athens: Miles 1998, pl. 24. Demeter at Eleusis: Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, A 39-69, pl. 9-11; cf. Noack 1927, pp. 12-13, fig. 4-5; Boardman 1954, p. 198, Eleusis nos. 1-5; Travlos 1983, p. 337, fig. 16. Athena on Acropolis: Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 286; Boardman 1954, pp. 195-196. Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 209, fig. 19; Boardman 1954, p. 198; Goette 2000, p. 33-34, pl. 34.

1051. Votive Tripods: Demeter at Eleusis: Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pls. 10-11, nos. A51-61. Athena on Acropolis: Touloupa 1972; Touloupa 1991, pp. 254-255. Athena at Sounion: Stais 1917, p. 208, fig. 18; Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 32.

1052. Terracotta votives are rare at male deity sites. Zeus at Tourkovounia: one male leg fragment, one male foot, two horse leg fragments, one fragment of an unidentifable limb, and a front leg fragment of a centaur; Lauter 1985a, pp. 116-117, nos. 451-456, pl. 13.2. Zeus on Hymettos: one terracotta horse; Langdon 1976, p. 70, no. 313, pl. 26. Poseidon at Sounion: terracotta votives are reported, but only one foot is published; Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 9; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 18. Apollo at Prasiai: terracotta votives are reported, but not published; Ainian 1997, p. 317.

Such an attribution also provides a better context for the presence of the "snake goddess" on the terracotta plaque recovered from the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit. For such a remarkable votive, it has played almost no role in most attempts to interpret the identity and location of the deposit's shrine of origin. It is difficult not to conclude that the woman on the plaque is a goddess, and so perhaps the goddess of the shrine from which the deposit came. The snakes found to either side of her as a decorative and symbolic element are also found along the sides of contemporary votive plaques at the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis.[1053] A possible, though much later parallel for the depiction of the goddess herself has been found on a Hellenistic terracotta female figurine from the nearby "Demeter Cistern," dated to the fourth century. On her head she is carrying a *kanoun*, upon which is represented a female figure in a bell skirt, standing on a base with upraised arms.[1054] Based upon the evidence as it stands today, the most likely candidate for the origin of votive deposit is the nearby sanctuary of Demeter at the Eleusinion, a four minute walk from the Areopagus Oval Building.[1055] Votive deposits from the Demeter sanctuary indicate that at least the upper terrace was a sanctuary by the middle of the seventh century.[1056] If the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit did come from this sanctuary, so too must have the stone and gravel fill, created perhaps as a result of a grading of the bedrock on the terrace.

4. Conclusions

1053. Kokkou-Vyridi 1999, pl. 10, nos. A51-52, A54. Snakes are an attribute of many heroes and deities, yet—perhaps by chance—they are particularly associated with Demeter in surviving seventh-century votive iconography.

1054. Thompson 1954, pp. 94-96, 105, no. 9, pl. 22, who connects both the figurine from the "Demeter Cistern" and the "snake goddess" plaque from the Areopagus Oval Deposit with the City Eleusinion.

1055. Just north of the Eleusinion was found a pit of debris from a potter's workshop, dated to the second half of the seventh century. Within the pit were found neatly stacked skyphoi, kotylai and other cup shapes, along with a variety of other shapes, such as aryballoi. Lamps, spindle whorls and loomweights were also recovered. Included among the deposit were close to three hundred terracotta figurines, including fifty six standing columnar figures, and five enthroned female figures. Dozens of horses and horse groups. Also found were five terracotta plaques, and four terracotta shields. The proximity of the potter's workshop to the City Eleusinion suggests that at least some of the votives were intended for deposition at this sanctuary to Demeter. See deposit S 17:2; Brann 1962, p. 131; Miles 1998, pp. 17-18; Papadopoulos 2003, pp. 143-186.

1056. For discussion of the earliest evidence of ritual activity at this sanctuary, see pp. 225-227.

To sum up, I offer the following reconstruction of the Areopagus building and the deposit. The Areopagus Oval Building was constructed sometime during the turn of the Late Protogeometric to Early Geometric period, ca. 900. Both the child's burial under the floor and those buried in the Areopagus Geometric Lot were members of the family who resided and worked within the house. The owners of the house would have been among the leading figures in Athens in the Geometric period, if we may judge by the relative wealth of those buried within the lot. This house would have been the site of much ritual activity, associated both with funerary rites, and perhaps wider communal rites conducted by leading members of the family. In the Late Geometric period, the house, along with the entire north slope of the Areopagus, was abandoned for reasons as yet unknown. Also abandoned in the same period were Building A and its adjacent Geometric cemetery, located at the base of Kolonos Agoraios a short distance northwest of the Areopagus Oval Building.

Both buildings lay in disrepair until the middle of the seventh century, when a road-building operation in the southwestern part of the Agora covered parts of both buildings. The street in front of the Geometric cemetery was refurbished, the area of Building A was reclaimed as a travel route, and a strip over the Areopagus Oval Building turned into a road. Included within the stone and gravel was the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit, which must have come from a nearby shrine. The shrine is unknown, but based on our best comparative evidence, the shrine was for a goddess, and most likely was the nearby sanctuary of Demeter.

These conclusions have wider implications for the study of Athenian religion in the eighth and seventh centuries. As we have seen, many of the same assumptions for identifying a shrine of the dead at the Areopagus Oval Building and the Areopagus Protoattic Deposit have also been applied to a number of sites in Athens and Attica. These assumptions, namely that building near graves must be "sacred houses" dedicated to worship of the dead, and that deposits with horses, shields and plaques are indicative of the same practice, must be reevaluated.

Of the five so-called "sacred houses" or shrines of the dead in Attica, only two, at Eleusis and the Academy, have any signs of ritual activity. The other three, found in Anavyssos and Thorikos, have no evidence of ritual activity at all. In addition, the five Attic "sacred houses" differ in architectural plan, deposit type, and the spatial and chronological relationship with nearby graves. Whether any of these buildings were exclusively sacred in function, or even dedicated to the worship of ancestors, cannot be confirmed. Furthermore, so-called hero votives are particularly prevalent in goddess sanctuaries; the idea that there is a votive deposit type that can be associated with "hero cults" must be abandoned. In the end, hard evidence for sustained ritual practice on behalf of a hero, tomb or ancestor worship is generally lacking in Geometric and seventh-century Athens and Attica, and appears not to have been a major component of religious practice.

Appendix 3: Sanctuaries and Agriculture

A review of the deities who received sanctuaries in the Late Geometric and seventh century reveals an interest primarily in the rustic gods of farm and family. The ten peak sanctuaries to Zeus on mountain tops sites throughout Attica have been interpreted as an indication of his agricultural importance as the god of rain and weather in this period.[1057] Zeus Meilichios is the only seventh-century Zeus shrine not located on a peak. He was widely worshipped in the ancient historical period, and was particularly popular with family groups and individuals. He seemed generally concerned with all aspects of human welfare, and his associations with agriculture are clear from fourth or third century votive reliefs from Attica, in which he is either holding or being presented with a cornucopia. In other votive reliefs, he is represented as a bearded snake, which seems to have represented protection of both households in general, and agricultural seeds in particular.[1058]

The importance of Demeter for agriculture is obvious. For our period, the *Hymn to Demeter*, usually dated ca. 700, provides an aitiological account of the origins of grain cultivation, and seems to provide an aitiological account of the Thesmophoria, perhaps the oldest and most widespread of Demeter's festivals.[1059]

It is probable that Athena Polias in Athens was worshipped in part as an agricultural deity in this period, as well. Legends credit her with the invention of the plow, rake, and yoke, tools that enabled farmers to tame the fields. In Athens, Athena's association with the olive tree is strongest among the Greeks, and appears to have originated there.

Myths associated with Athena Polias, in particular, exhibit close ties with agriculture. This can be seen in a number of figures associated with her. For example, the Homeric bards sang of her close ties with Erechtheus, who was the closest she would have to a child. He is described by the Homeric bards, *Il.* 3.548, as "born of the grain-bearing earth". The association between Erechtheus-Erechthonios, Athena and the earth are reinforced by their symbolic association with snakes. Herse and Aglauros, and Pandrosos, also intimately tied to the tale of Erechtheus, have similar agricultural aspects.

1057. This view is supported by Pausanias, 1.31.1-2, who records, for example, that Zeus Ombrios, or Showery Zeus, had a sanctuary on Mt. Hymettos. For Zeus and rain, see Cook 1914, pp. 284-881; Langdon 1976, pp. 80-95.

1058. Lalonde 2006, pp. 40-47. Burkert 1985, p. 201, prefers to see Zeus Meilichios as concerned primarily with the dead. Cf. Cook 1914, II.1091-1160.

1059. On the connections between the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and the Thesmophoria, see Clinton 1992, pp. 28-37, 96-99. Cf. Richardson 1974; Foley 1994; Suter 2002.

The sanctuary of Pandrosos, for example, was prominent on the Acropolis, and home to the sacred olive tree of Athena.[1060]

Similar associations between Athena Polias and agriculture can be seen in the legend of the Athenian hero Bouzyges, who is also credited with the invention of the plough. The *genos*, or clan, later named after him, the Bouzygai, were responsible for ploughing Athena's sacred field, located north of the Acropolis.[1061] These operations closely parallel Demeter's sanctuary at Eleusis, which also had a sacred field, the produce of which were dedicated to her, and a rival inventor of agricultural practice, Triptolemos. While it appears that Triptolemos' role as the first cultivator superseded that of Bouzyges in Athenian myth by the middle of the fifth century, to judge from vase painting, Bouzyges and Athena Polias' ties with agriculture never fully disappeared, as illustrated by a red figure krater from Vari.[1062] The image on the krater, dated to ca. 430, portrays Bouzyges showing his new invention to Athena, identified as Athena Polias by her spear, and the nearby olive tree. In her right hand she is holding what appears to be an ear of corn.[1063]

1060. In fact, a host of early cults on the Acropolis may have been primarily agricultural, or fertility in nature. Ge Karpophoros had an ancient shrine atop the Acropolis, as did Zeus Polieus, who is specifically tied to tilling of the fields, as is seen in the skinning of an ox, and placing its skin on straw. The connection between Athena Polias and agricultural figures is further strengthened by inscriptions stating that the Errephoroi served Athena, Pandrosus, Demeter and Kore, and Ge-Themis, all of whom deal with the earth and fecundity. See Hopper 1963, pp. 4-5

1061. Athena Polias' sacred field and sacred plowing: Plut. *Praec. coniug*. 42. Bouzyges as first cultivator: *Etym. Magn*. s.v. Βουζυγία; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 7.57, who reports that by some accounts Bouzyges introduced the use of the plough and oxen in agriculture, while others consider Triptolemos to be the inventor. According to the scholia ad Aesch. 2.78, Bouzyges' first plow was displayed on the Athenian Acropolis. Sacred field of Athena Polias: Plut. *Sulla* 13, where the grain around the Acropolis is described as παρθένιον. The chief priest of the Bouzygoi *genos* seems to have taken the name Bouzyges: see IG ii² 3177, 5055, 5075, where he is listed as the priest of Zeus Teleios or ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ. Polyaen. *Strat*. 1.5 records that Demophon handed the Palladium over to Bouzyges during the Trojan War.

1062. *ARV*² 115. On this image, see Robinson 1931; Bérard in *LIMC* III 154-155.

1063. Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 286; Boardman 1954, p. 196, Acropolis no. 4. Also suggestive is a seventh-century terracotta plaque found on the Athenian acropolis, upon which seems to be an image of a goddess, perhaps Athens, with a threshing fork. For this plaque, see Graef and Langlotz 1909, pl. 10, no. 286; Boardman 1954, p. 196, Acropolis no. 4; Hurwit 1999, p. 90, fig. 62b.

Athena Polias' association with agricultural fecundity is also seen in the Arrhephoria festival, which has many parallels with the Thesmophoria celebrated for Demeter. Each festival entailed agricultural and fertility rites, occurred in spring, and involved parthenoi carrying secret and sacred items into chasms, among other parallels. Each festival and their accompanying myths also revealed similar kourotrophic aspects for their respective goddess; each looked after a young child, Demophon for Demeter and Erechtheus for Athena. As noted above, like Demeter, Athena also has a sacred field, which held her sacred grain. It is likely, in other words, that in the Geometric and into the Archaic period, Athena Polias was one of Athens' preeminent agricultural deities. These aspects never went away, but rather faded to the background as she accumulated more attributes in the process of Athenian urbanization.[1064]

The cults of Artemis, Nymphe and the Nymphs may have had much in common in the seventh century. Both the Nymphs and Artemis were later associated with childbirth, and both may have played a larger role in rites of passage into adulthood for women. "Marriage" pottery has been reported from the Artemis sanctuary at Brauron; likewise, at the Shrine of Nymphe in Athens, seventh-century loutrophoroi were recovered in numbers, a pottery shape associated with weddings.[1065]

The majority of Attic sanctuaries and shrines for which we have evidence host deities who deal with farm and family, associations that make sense considering the agrarian lifestyle of Attica's inhabitants.[1066] Some sanctuaries located at the very borders of Attica are outside of "mainstream" Attic sanctuary life, and perhaps should not be considered wholly "Attic." As we noted, the sanctuaries at Cape Sounion, for example, would have been an important stop for Greek seafarers heading east and Eastern seafarers heading west.[1067] Unlike other Attic sanctuaries, most of the pottery reported from

---

1064. An "agricultural Athena" meets with strong resistance. See, for example, Parker 2005, p. 418, who notes, however, the dedication of a pregnant sheep to Athena Skiras in a fourth-century Salaminioi decree (*SEG* 21.527.93 = *IG* ii^2 1232; Rhodes and Osborne 2003, no. 37, Lambert 1997, 86-88, no. 1. Pregnant animals are almost exclusively dedicated to deities concerned with the fecundity of the earth or family; see, for example, Simms 1998, pp. 96-97.

1065. Brauron: Kahil 1963, p. 27. Nymphe: Travlos 1971b, fig. 467; Larson 2001, pp. 111-112.

1066. As with the Late Geometric II period, there is little evidence that Attica was involved in seafaring enterprises, indicating that the economic life of Attica depending primarily upon local subsistence agricultural practice. The only significant exports from Attica during the seventh century are SOS amphorae, which most likely were carried to foreign ports by Corinthian or Aiginetan traders that were active in this century; cf. Morris 1984, p. 104.

1067. The cape is mentioned in Homer, *Od.* 3.276-300, as a stopping place for the Greeks on the way back from Troy; in this story, we are told Menelaus' steersman, Phrontis, died and was buried here.

Sounion is Corinthian. The large number of Egyptian and Greek scarabs, seals and gemstones found at both sanctuary sites indicate more cultural affinities with the Cyclades than with mainland Attica.[1068]

Likewise, the peak sanctuary at Mt. Parnes in northern Attica may not have been fully "Attic." As with the sanctuaries at Sounion, the majority of seventh-century pottery reported is Corinthian. In addition, thousands of iron daggers, as well as other metal weapons and implements were recovered from ash deposits.[1069] Weapons are rare dedications at Attic sanctuaries, the exception being the Athena sanctuary at Sounion, where two swords were dedicated.[1070]

Excavations at another site in northern Attica, the so-called Cave of Antiope on Mt. Kithairon, above Eleutherai, revealed similar percentages of contemporary Corinthian pottery as Mt. Parnes.[1071] It is likely, in fact, that the region of Mt. Parnes, as well as Mt. Kithairon to the west, was considered a common grazing ground for Attic, Boiotian, and Corinthian communities. In the fifth century, the Boiotians believed that oaths had been exchanged with the Athenians in "ancient" times to insure that neither would control

---

1068. Boardman 1963, pp. 123-127. For a discussion of Near Eastern figures, gems, seals and Egyptian scarabs from the Poseidon sanctuary: Stais 1917, p. 194-197, fig. 7-8; Pendlebury 1930, pp. 82-84, nos. 176-225, pl. 4; Hanfmann 1962; Boardman 1963, pp. 123-127, fig. 12; Dinsmoor 1971, p. 4; Goette 2000, pp. 20-21, pl. 10, fig. 15, 17; Gorton 1996, p. 165. Gems, seals and Egyptian scarabs Athena sanctuary: Stais 1917, pp. 211, fig. 21; Boardman 1963, pp. 123-127, fig. 12, pl. 15; Gorton 1996, p. 165;Goette 2000, p. 33, pl. 33. While Poseidon's connections to the sea are obvious, Athena, as well, has some claim to it. All seventh-century terracotta votive plaques with ships were found at Athena sanctuaries; see Boardman 1954, pp. 195-196, 198, Acropolis nos. 1-2, Sunium no. 1. In the epics, she is often helps to guide heroes, she is credited with building the first ship, and Pausanias, 1.5.3, tells us that in Megara, there was a sanctuary for Athena Aithuia, or "Sea-bird". On Athena's connection with ships and navigation, see especially Fontenrose 1948; Luyster 1965; Detienne 1981; Wickersham 1986.

1069. Hood 1959, p. 8; Daux 1960, p. 658; Vanderpool 1960, p. 269; Langdon 1976, pp. 100-101; Mastrokostas 1983;Wickens 1986, I. 158-159, II. 243-245; Ainian 1997, p. 315.

1070. Most have followed Stais 1917, pp. 207-208, in dating these swords to the second half of the ninth century. For a late eighth- or early seventh-century date, see Snodgrass 1964, 96, nos. 26 and 27.

1071. Stikas 1939, p. 52, 1940; Wickens 1986, pp. 274-275, no. 50; Munn and Zimmerman Munn 1990.

the area of Panakton.[1072] A recent survey of the area of Panakton supports this account. After the Protogeometric period, the site of Panakton, and indeed the whole Skourta plain, appears to have been abandoned until the late sixth or early fifth century, at which time the area was a point of contention once more between neighboring communities.[1073]

The Corinthian material at both the Cave of Antiope on Mt. Kithairon, when viewed alongside the sanctuary of Zeus on Mt. Parnes, may indicate that Corinthian and Attic communities shared this border region, a notion supported by the tradition that Theban and Corinthian shepherds shared common pasturage on Mt. Kithairon in the time of Oedipus.[1074] Leaving these areas open for common use would have been mutually beneficial for all communities, for it would have facilitated ease of travel between Boiotia, Attica, and Megara.[1075]

1072. Thuc. 5.42.1: ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ᾧ οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ταῦτα ἔπρασσον, οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων Ἀνδρομένης καὶ Φαίδιμος καὶ Ἀντιμενίδας, οὓς ἔδει τὸ Πάνακτον καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς παρὰ Βοιωτῶν παραλαβόντας Ἀθηναίοις ἀποδοῦναι, τὸ μὲν Πάνακτον ὑπὸ τῶν Βοιωτῶν αὐτῶν καθῃρημένον ηὗρον, ἐπὶ προφάσει ὡς ἦσάν ποτε Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Βοιωτοῖς ἐκ διαφορᾶς περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅρκοι παλαιοὶ μηδετέρους οἰκεῖν τὸ χωρίον, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ νέμειν, τοὺς δ' ἄνδρας οὓς εἶχον αἰχμαλώτους Βοιωτοὶ Ἀθηναίων παραλαβόντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀνδρομένη ἐκόμισαν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ ἀπέδοσαν, τοῦ τε Πανάκτου τὴν καθαίρεσιν ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς, νομίζοντες καὶ τοῦτο ἀποδιδόναι: πολέμιον γὰρ οὐκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ Ἀθηναίοις οἰκήσειν οὐδένα.

1073. Munn and Zimmerman Munn 1990; French 1989, p. 36.

1074. See, e.g., Soph. *O.T.* 1123-1145.

1075. Two passes over Mt. Kithairon, for example, would have provided access between these regions. See Pritchett 1957, pp. 16-21; Edmonson 1964.

Appendix 4: Votive Charts

The following are charts of non-pottery votives deposited at sanctuaries and shrines that date to the Geometric and seventh century, as well in wells and pits from the Athenian Agora.

The charts are as follows:

Chart 1: Votive offerings, non-pottery: female deities
Chart 2: Votive offerings, non-pottery: male deities
Chart 3: Votive offerings, non-pottery: "hero" or "ancestor" shrines
Chart 4: Votive offerings, non-pottery: "sacred houses"
Chart 5: Votive Offerings from the Athenian Agora: Late Geometric Wells/Pits
Chart 6: Votive Offerings from the Athenian Agora: Protoattic Wells/Pits

1. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: Female Deities

1. Architecture; 2. TC female figures; 3. TC chariot groups and individual horses; 4. Other TC figures; 5. Daedalic female *protomai*; 6. TC votive shields; 7. TC votive plaques; 8. Cut disks (all Agora?); 9. Jewelry; 10. Bronze dedications; 11. Seals, gems, scarabs; 12. Snake votive; 13. Ship votive; 14. Tripod votive; 15. Ash/Pyres; 16. Inscriptions

The locations of the shrines are marked as follows: **(H)** = Hill or Mtn.; **(B)** = Base of hill or mountain **(C)** = Coast; **(P)** = Plain

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Demeter, Eleusis, from end of 8th-7th c. **(B)**	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√		√	√	
Demeter, Athens, from end of 8th-7th c. **(H)**		√	√	√		√	√	√				√		?		
Artemis, Mounychia, from from LPG (2.2 10th c.) **(H)**		√	√?		√											
Artemis (and Poseidon?), Eleusis, from mid to late 8th c. **(B)**															√?	
Artemis, Brauron, from late 8th c. **(B)**	√	√	√	√	√				√	√	√					
Artemis, Loutsa, from 1.2 7th c. (=Brauron) **(C)**																
Athena, Acropolis, from LG **(H)**	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√			√	√		√
Athena, Sounion, from late 8th/ early 7th c. **(H)**		√	√	√	√		√		√	√	√		√	√		

Athena, Pallini, from EG (2.2 9th c.) **(P)**		√	√	√	√				√	√						
Shrine of Nymphe, Athens, from mid-7th c. **(B)**		√			√		√?					√				
Hill of the Nymphs, Athens, from 7th c. **(H)**		√														
Goddess: Kiapha Thiti, MG- ca. 500 **(H)**		√			√	√									√	
Goddess: Panagia Thiti, 7th- 5th c. **(H)**		√														
Goddess: Lathouriza, 7th- 5th c. **(H)**		√			√				√							
Demeter?: Trachones, 7th- 4th c. **(H)**		√														
Nymphs?: Cave, Mt. Kastela, from LG? **(H)**		√		√?												
Antiope?: Cave, Mt. Kithairon, 8th- 5th c. **(H)**																

2. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: Male Deities

1. Architecture; 2. TC female figures; 3. TC male figurines; 4. TC chariot groups and individual horses; 5. Other TC figures; 6. TC Votive shields; 7. TC votive plaques; 8. Cut disks; 9. Jewelry; 10. Bronze or iron dedications; 11. Seals, gems, scarabs; 12. Snake votive; 13. Ship votive; 14. Tripod votive; 15. Ash/Pyres; 16. Inscriptions

The locations of the shrines are marked as follows: **(H)** = Hill or Mtn.; **(B)** = Base of hill or mountain **(C)** = Coast; **(P)** = Plain

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Zeus? Tourkovounia, Late 8th- ca. 600 (resumes ca. 5th c.) **(H)**	√		√	√	√											
Zeus, Hymettos, ca. LPG-A (950-500); Roman **(H)**	√			√						?					√	√
Zeus, Mt. Parnes, LPG-A (late 10th-500) **(H)**										√					√	√
Mt. Agriliki, Slope, Geometric-7th c.; Roman **(H)**															√	
Mt. Penteli, Mavrorouni Peak, 7th c. **(H)**															√?	
Mt. Pani, Peak, Geometric- 7th c. **(H)**	√														√?	√
Mt. Merenda, Peak, Geometric- 600 **(H)**															√?	
Charvati Peak, Geometric/7th c. **(H)**	√?															
Mt. Pani, Keratovouni, Geometric/7th c. **(H)**																

Mt. Profitis Elias, 7th-4th c. **(H)**																
Kassidis Peak, 7th c. **(H)**																
Varkiza Peak, ca. 700-4th c.; Roman **(H)**	√														?	
Apollo, Prasiai, Geometric-Archaic **(C)**			?	?	?											
Apollo, Athens, Mid 8th c.-7th c. **(P)**	√															
Poseidon, Sounion, from ca. 700 **(H)**					√				√	√	√					

Sum total of terracotta votives at male deity sanctuaries:

Zeus, Tourkovounia: Two horse limbs?; two male limbs?; one centaur fragment?

Zeus, Hymettos: One horse

Poseidon, Sounion: One votive foot

Not found: Votive shields, votive plaques, *protomai*.

3. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: “Hero” or “Ancestor” Shrines

1. Architecture; 2. TC female figures; 3. TC chariot groups and individual horses; 4. Other TC figures; 5. Daedalic female *protomai*; 6. TC votive shields; 7. TC votive plaques; 8. Cut disks; 9. Jewelry; 10. Bronze dedications; 11. Seals, gems, scarabs; 12. Snake votive; 13. Ship votive; 14. Tripod votive; 15. Ash/Pyres; 16. Inscriptions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
(Agora Grave XI Pyre, ca. 700)		√														
(Agora Grave XII Pyre, ca. 700)		√	√	√												
Areopagus Protoattic Deposit, 7th c.		√	√	√		√	√	√		√		√		√		
Menidhi, LG II-mid 5th c.			√			√	√									
Thorikos, Tomb I, ca. 650- 350 (peak: 550-425)		√			√											
Triangular Hieron, Athens, 7th c.- ca. 400 BC			√					√								
Votive Pit, Panathenaic Way, 7th c.- ca. 480 BC.			√			√	√			√	√	√				

4. Votive Offerings, Non-Pottery: "Sacred Houses"

1. Architecture; 2. TC female figures; 3. TC chariot groups and individual horses; 4. Other TC figures; 5. Daedalic female *protomai*; 6. TC votive shields; 7. TC votive plaques; 8. Cut disks; 9. Jewelry; 10. Bronze dedications; 11. Seals, gems, scarabs; 12. Snake votive; 13. Ship votive; 14. Tripod votive; 15. Ash/Pyres; 16. Inscriptions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Areopagus Oval Building; PG/EG-LG																
Academy, LG-7th c.															√	
Eleusis, LG-7th c.															√	
Anavyssos, LG?																
Thorikos I, PG-EG																
Thorikos II, LG																

5. Votive Offerings from the Athenian Agora: Late Geometric Wells/Pits

1. Architecture; 2. TC female figures; 3. TC chariot groups and individual horses; 4. Other TC figures; 5. Daedalic female *protomai*; 6. TC votive shields; 7. TC votive plaques; 8. Cut disks; 9. Jewelry; 10. Bronze dedications; 11. Seals, gems, scarabs; 12. Snake votive; 13. Ship votive; 14. Tripod votive; 15. Inscriptions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Well Deposit B 18:6, 3.4 8th															
Well Deposit J 14:5, some 3.4, mostly 4.4 8th															
Well Deposit L 18:2, 2.2 8th, with some down to Roman															
Well Deposit R 10:5, LG (unp.)															
Well Deposit R 12:2, LG (unp.)															
Well I (D 12:3) some PG-MG, mostly LG															
Well J (N 11:3) late 8th															
Well K (P 7:3) late 8th (disk with hole and human torso)								√							
Well L (S 18:1) late 8th (1, hole, 1 whole)								√							
Well M (N 11:5) late 8th															
Well N (Q 8:9) late 8th															
Well/Pit O (M 11:1) late 8th/early 7th			√ LG												

Well P (R 9:2) 2.2 8th-early 7th			√ LG					√							
Well Q (N 11:4) late 8th/early 7th															
Well R (N 11:6) late 8th/early 7th															
Deposit G 15:5, PG-LG, though some into 6th c.								√							

6. Votive Offerings from the Athenian Agora: Protoattic Wells/Pits

1. Architecture; 2. TC female figures; 3. TC chariot groups and individual horses; 4. Other TC figures; 5. Daedalic female *protomai*; 6. TC votive shields; 7. TC votive plaques; 8. Cut disks; 9. Jewelry; 10. Bronze dedications; 11. Seals, gems, scarabs; 12. Snake votive; 13. Ship votive; 14. Tripod votive; 15. Inscriptions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Well C (D 11:5) 1.2 7th		?	√					√							
Well Deposit I 14:1, mostly 4.4 7th															
Well Deposit S 19:7, late 8th to 2.4 7th c.															
Potters' Debris, S 17:2 2.2 7th		√	√	√		√	√								
Well/Pit S (R 17:5) 2.4 7th		√													
Well E (J 15:1) ca. 700 (very little pottery)															
Well D (J 18:8) 3.4 7th		√	√					√							
Well F (O 12:1) 3.4 7th			√					√							
Well G (R 8:2) 3.4 7th			√					√							
Well H (M 11:3) 2.2 7th			√			√	√	√							
Well Deposit P 7:2, 3.4 7th															