De-centering the Symposium:
Characterizing Commensality in Late Classical Olynthos, Greece

by

Nadhira Y. Hill

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Art and Archaeology)
in The University of Michigan
2023

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Lisa C. Nevett, Chair
Professor Natalie D. Abell
Dr. Nikos Akamatis, Academy of Athens, Research Centre for Antiquity
Professor Bradley A. Ault, University at Buffalo, SUNY
Professor Sara Forsdyke

Nadhira Y. Hill

nyhill@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7366-0339

Dedication

For my grandmother, Roberta.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my appreciation for the support and guidance of my committee members. I am indebted to them for their advice throughout this work, for reading drafts, and for always offering detailed comments. Lisa Nevett and Natalie Abell have been and continue to be wonderful mentors and advocates. Their compassion, patience, and insightful suggestions have been invaluable at each stage of my research. Nikos Akamatis was a late-comer to this project but his consistent encouragement and expertise on Greek pottery, especially from the Classical and Hellenistic periods, is much appreciated. Bradley Ault has been a constant source of support throughout my time working on the Olynthos Project. I appreciated Sara Forsdyke's enthusiasm and encouragement, and her help in seeing the bigger picture and the relevance of my work to other scholarly questions.

I began this project believing that I would spend a lot of time abroad, but the COVID-19 pandemic had other plans. Nevertheless, I did visit a variety of locations both before and during the pandemic. At the Center for the Analysis of Archaeological Materials at the Penn Museum, as well as the Fitch Laboratory at the British School at Athens, I was lucky enough to receive training in geology/petrology and the petrographic analysis of archaeological ceramics from Marie-Claude Boileau, Evangelia Kyriatzi, and Ruth Siddall. They have all made me a better ceramicist and archaeologist by sharing their expertise. My ability to effectively study abroad on

my own was greatly improved by the support I received from Artemis Leontis and Despina Margomenou in learning Modern Greek.

The American School of Classical Studies at Athens has also been vital in helping me complete this project. Special thanks goes to Ioanna Damanaki, Dimitra Minaoglou, and Giorgos Mavrikis for helping me obtain permits and helping me get in touch with the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros to schedule my visits. My work as a volunteer at the Athenian Agora was formative in the development of my research interests, and I thank Elizabeth Fisher, my undergraduate advisor, for encouraging me to apply. I also thank John Camp for allowing me to participate and for supporting me both while I worked on the excavations and for many years after. Special thanks also must go to Sylvie Dumont and Aspa Efstathiou, whose generosity of time, energy, and expertise allowed my visits to study pottery from the Athenian Agora excavations to run smoothly.

With regards to my fieldwork in Greece beyond the Athenian Agora, special thanks goes to Bettina Tsigarida, Zosia Archibald, Bradley Ault, Lisa Nevett, David Stone, Stratos Nanoglou, Nikos Akamatis, and Anna Panti. Lisa has been a big supporter of my study and, along with co-directors Bettina and Zosia, gave me permission for it to be undertaken. Zosia was one of the first people with whom I shared my thoughts about the organization of dining space in our house at Olynthos. Bradley Ault, Nikos Akamatis, and Anna Panti have been instrumental in my development as a ceramicist in the field. They have helped me to identify and characterize pottery from a range of contexts and dates. David Stone has also been an encouraging presence throughout my time working at Olynthos. He has been supportive of my goals and has always been willing to help in any way he can. Special thank you must also go to Dimitra Aktseli for

granting me permission to study some of the material from Robinson's excavations at Olynthos, now housed in the Polygyros museum.

My peers and colleagues both in and beyond the Interdepartmental Program and the Department of Classical Studies deserve a special thank you. I appreciate the support, help, intellectual and non-intellectual discussions, and more of my cohort-mates Leah Bernardo-Ciddio, Machal Gradoz, and Tyler Johnson, as well as Laurel Fricker, Drew Cabaniss, Sheira Cohen, Caroline Nemechek, Joey Frankl, Shannon Ness, Caitlin Clerkin, Christina DiFabio, Robert Santucci, Brittany Hardy, Katie Mikos, Sarah Keith, Lauren Oberlin, Nicola Barham, Chris Ratté, Laura Motta, and Aileen Daas. Beyond Michigan, I must thank Molly Schaub, Elise Poppen, Irene Liesk, Maura Brennan, Brian Martens, Vivian Laughlin, Katharine Harrington, Chelsea Gardner, Kathleen Lynch, and Ann Steiner for also offering advice and supporting my work. Special thanks also must go to my undergraduate professors, Elizabeth Fisher, Greg Daugherty, Cathy Daugherty, John Camp, Dan McCaffrey, and Bartolo Natoli, without whom I would not be where I am today.

My final and most crucial thanks goes to my family. My mother, who was initially skeptical about whether going to grad school to study archaeology was a lucrative path, and my fiancé, Alex, have been important supporters of my academic journey. My biggest supporter, however, was always my grandmother, Roberta Hatcher. Although she is no longer with us, I know that she would be proud of all I have accomplished.

Table of Contents

Dedication ii

Acknowledgements iii

List of Tables ix

List of Figures xi

List of Appendices xiv

Abstract xv

Chapter One: Introduction 1

1.1 Anthropological approaches to consumption 6

1.2 Commensality in Archaic and Classical Greece 10

1.3 Towards a Broader View of Ancient Greek Drinking 20

1.4 Chapter Overview 23

Chapter Two: Approaches and Methodology 26

2.1 Theoretical Approaches 26

2.2 Methodology 45

Chapter Three: Problematizing the Symposium 53

3.1 Traditional approaches to the symposium 54

3.2 The Standard Image of the Symposium? 57

3.3 Discussion 93

Chapter Four: The Organization of Pottery Production at Olynthos 97

4.1 Approaches to the organization of craft production 98

4.2 Evidence for the organization of production 100

4.3 Data 107

4.4 Measurements 115

4.5 Decoration 127

4.6 Distinguishing imports and local products 138

4.7 Discussion 149

Chapter Five: Social Drinking in Context 154

5.1 Commensal politics at Olynthos 154

Chapter Six: Widening the Lens – Social Drinking Beyond the *Andron* 171

6.1 Where were people drinking? 172

6.2 How were they drinking? 184

6.3 Discussion 191

6.4 Towards a typology of social drinking in Late Classical Olynthos 196

Chapter Seven: Conclusions 201

7.1 Defining the symposium 202

7.2 Contextualizing the symposium 203

7.3 Theorizing social drinking 206

7.4 Future directions 206

Figures 209

Appendices 234

Bibliography 270

List of Tables

3.1. All 120 depictions of the symposium of mortals in my Beazley survey 72

4.1. Frequency table for heights of one-handlers from Athens 115

4.2. Frequency table for heights of one-handlers from Olynthos 116

4.3. Frequency table for rim diameters of one-handlers from Athens 116

4.4. Frequency table for rim diameters of one-handlers from Olynthos 117

4.5. Frequency table of rim diameters of skyphoi from Athens 118

4.6. Frequency table of rim diameters of skyphoi from Olynthos 118

4.7. Frequency distribution table of heights of bolsals found at Athens 120

4.8. Frequency distribution table of heights of bolsals found at Olynthos 120

4.9. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of bolsals found at Olynthos 121

4.10. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of bolsals found at Athens 121

4.11. Frequency distribution table of heights of kantharoi found at Athens 122

4.12. Frequency distribution table of heights of kantharoi found at Olynthos 123

4.13. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of kantharoi found at Athens 123

4.14. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of kantharoi found at Olynthos 124

4.15. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of kraters found at Athens 126

4.16. Frequency distribution table of diameters of kraters found at Olynthos 126

4.17. Vessels identified by David Robinson as slipped by dipping 129

4.18. Ribbed kantharoi and cup-kantharoi from Olynthos, with Athenian comparanda 131

4.19. Vessels identified as outliers in either height or rim diameter 138

4.20. Bolsals from Athens comparable in size to bolsal O25 from Olynthos 140

4.21. A selection of cup-kantharoi analyzed at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros, with Munsell readings 142

4.22. A selection of cup-kantharoi analyzed at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros, with Munsell readings and Robinson fabric descriptions 143

4.23. Selection of one-handlers analyzed at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros 145

4.24. Standardized one-handlers from Olynthos, with base diameters 146

4.25. Imported vessels found at Olynthos 151

6.1. Artifacts found in house A iv 5 by room 177

6.2. Artifacts found in house B vi 8 by room 180

6.3. Kraters found at Olynthos. Adapted from Cahill 2002, table 4, p. 183-185 184

6.4. Categories of social drinking identified at Olynthos 197

Appendix I. Published Olynthos Material 234

Appendix II. Published Athens Material 243

Appendix III. Unpublished Olynthos Material 265

List of Figures

1.1. View of west side of the Agora at start of excavations in Section A, June 9, 1931 209

1.2. Aerial view of the excavated area of Olynthos 210

2.1. Shape distribution at Olynthos by date (n=116) 210

2.2. Shape distribution at Athens by date (n=192) 211

3.1. Lebes depicting a symposium, attributed to the Nikias Painter 211

3.2. Interior of a red-figured kylix depicting a symposium 212

3.3. Plan of house 7 at Halieis 213

3.4. Plan of house B ix 6 214

3.5. Houses from near the Athenian Agora with *andron* indicated 214

3.6. Plan of the Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron 215

3.7. Plan of dining facilities at the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, Corinth 215

4.1. Histogram of height measurements for one-handlers found at Olynthos 216

4.2. Silver kylix, part of grave goods from a male burial in a cist-grave 216

4.3. Drinking cups depicted in Dionysiac scenes on Greek vases between 500 and 300 BCE 217

4.4. Black-gloss bolsal found at Ialysus 217

4.5. Attic red-figure skyphos, c. 460-450 BCE 218

4.6. Overall size distribution of one-handlers found at Athens 218

4.7. Overall size distribution of skyphoi found at Olynthos 219

4.8. BG skyphos (OP43) from house B ix 6 at Olynthos 219

4.9. Overall size distribution of bolsals found at Athens 220

4.10. Overall size distribution of bolsals found at Olynthos 220

4.11. Overall size distribution of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Athens 221

4.12. Overall size distribution of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Olynthos 221

4.13. Overall size distribution of kraters found at Athens 222

4.14. Overall size distribution of kraters found at Olynthos 222

4.15. Stamped decoration on a cup-kantharos found in house B ix 6 at Olynthos (OP04) 223

5.1. Reconstruction of a Greek *andron* from Priene 224

5.2. Reconstructed plan of the main court of the palace at Vergina 224

5.3. Plan and section of the house of Menander, Pompeii 225

5.4. Mosaic floor from the andron of House A vi 6 at Olynthos 226

5.5. Bellerophon mosaic from the andron of House A vi 3 226

5.6. Distribution map of one-handlers in the North Hill settlement of Olynthos 227

5.7. Distribution map of kantharoi in the North Hill settlement of Olynthos 227

5.8. Distribution of bolsals in the North Hill settlement of Olynthos 227

5.9. Distribution map of kraters in the North Hill settlement at Olynthos 227

5.10. Red-figured psykter attributed to Douris, ca. 490 BCE 228

5.11. One-handler found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 229

5.12. Kantharos found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 229

5.13. Cup-kantharos found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 230

5.14. Bolsal found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 230

5.15. Black-gloss bell-krater found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 231

5.16. Undecorated bell-krater found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 231

5.17. Interior of bolsal found during the excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos 232

5.18. Plan of house B ix 6 at Olynthos, with room h indicated 232

6.1. Distribution of krater fragments at the site of Olynthos 233

6.2. Distribution of kraters found in houses at Olynthos by room 233

List of Appendices

I. Published Olynthos Material 234

Abbreviations for Appendices II and III 242

II. Published Athens Material 243

III. Unpublished Olynthos Material 265

Abstract

This project, "De-Centering the Symposium: Characterizing Commensality in Late Classical Olynthos, Greece," aims to do two things. First, it seeks to determine to what extent the site of Olynthos in northern Greece participated in Athenian cultural practices, particularly surrounding social drinking. Although we know that Olynthos and Athens interacted during the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, this relationship has been understudied. Athenian evidence has been privileged in scholarship on drinking in the Greek world. Athenian sources have also contributed to the centering of the symposium, a formal, all-male drinking party in drinking scholarship; forms of drinking that are not considered to be sympotic have been largely ignored. Therefore, the second aim of this project is to develop a model for identifying and characterizing both formal and informal social drinking in Classical Greece. The purpose of this project is to expand our understanding of the social importance of drinking in the Greek world to include groups beyond the small elite group traditionally associated with sympotic drinking.

Accomplishing this goal requires a critical re-assessment of the textual, iconographic, and archaeological evidence for the symposium from Athens. The evidence available from Olynthos is more limited, so this project puts the material evidence from Athens and Olynthos into dialogue with one another. To evaluate the relationship between Athens and Olynthos, I examine the

production of pottery used for mixing and drinking wine at both sites. This involves close analysis of form (e.g., height and rim diameter) and surface decoration. My analysis of the production of these pottery shapes reveals similarities in the styles of the pottery from Athens and Olynthos, which suggests that the cities were a part of the same overarching community of practice (communities constituted by shared histories of learning). Analysis of the distribution of the same pottery shapes across the settlement at Olynthos, however, indicates that Athens and Olynthos participated in different communities of consumption. Although the two centers shared the knowledge of how to produce these shapes, they made different choices about what to use at local drinking events. There were clear differences in what kinds of drinking shapes each city preferred. For example, although stemmed cups are a characteristic feature of the Athenian symposium, they do not appear at Olynthos. Instead, the preferences shown for other, sturdier drinking shapes at Olynthos reflects trends seen at other sites in northern Greece.

These findings indicate that although Olynthos was influenced by Athens in many ways, locals still made idiosyncratic decisions about what, how, where, and with whom to drink. These decisions may have resulted from more sustained contact with neighboring cities such as Molyvoti, Torone, and even Pella, the capital of Macedon in the 4th century. Although there is evidence that some Olynthians participated in symposia, formal drinking parties were not the only drinking event available to them. The wide distribution of pottery traditionally associated with the symposium suggests that these shapes were used more widely, by a more diverse group and in a broader range of contexts, than traditionally assumed.

Chapter One

Introduction

This dissertation studies the social importance of both formal and informal drinking in the Greek world during the Classical period. More specifically, it asks whether it is possible to identify and characterize informal social drinking using only material culture (i.e., architectural remains and pottery). Scholarship on social drinking in the Greek world has traditionally focused on the symposium, which in its highly formal and ritualized form appears readily in the archaeological record. Other, less formal (and less visible) modes of social drinking are much harder to recognize, which has been an obvious roadblock in attempting to do a comprehensive study of social drinking in the Greek world, one which includes both formal and informal drinking practices. One of the most important findings in the present study is that not everyone participated in symposia; many different modes of social drinking co-existed on multiple scales during the Classical period. Formal and informal social drinking events occurred in the same community, the same housing block, and even the same household. It is even probable that both formal and informal drinking events happened in the same room within a house at different times of the day, month, or year. A new framework for identifying and discussing other, less formal modes of social drinking must be developed to approach a more emic view of social drinking in the Greek world.

Architecture and pottery related to the consumption and service of wine is found broadly across space and time. Houses with rooms that have been interpreted as *androne*s, for example, have been found in Athens, Halieis, Eretria, Olynthos, Delos, Pella, Vergina, and beyond even the Aegean. This project focuses on the urban center of Athens, located in the region of Attica in southeast Greece, and the city of Olynthos, located in the Chalkidiki peninsula of northern Greece, between 500 and 300 BCE. Despite numerous historical accounts of the political and economic relationship between Athens and Olynthos during this period, particularly because of events surrounding the Peloponnesian War, few scholars have considered this relationship from an archaeological perspective.

Athens, an important cultural, political, and economic center in Classical Greece, has been extensively excavated and studied. The ancient city was expansive, containing more than 10,000 houses (πλείους μυρίαι οἰκίαι) by the end of the Peloponnesian War, according to Xenophon.[1] Major archaeological investigations were undertaken on and around the Acropolis, the principal religious center of the city; in the Kerameikos, the major cemetery and industrial quarter, beginning in 1870;[2] and the Agora, the city's center of political and economic activity, beginning in 1931.[3] Of particular interest to the current project is the material uncovered in and

[1] Xen. *Mem*. 3.6.14.

[2] E.g., Knigge and Tancke 2005. For recent publications under the auspices of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens, see *Kerameikos. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen*.

[3] E.g., Shear 1932. For recent work at the Agora, see Camp and Martens 2020.

around the Athenian Agora, which remained central to studies not just of Athenian culture but of Greek culture more broadly.

The systematic excavations of the Athenian Agora began in 1931 under the supervision and direction of T. Leslie Shear (Fig. 1.1), after the Greek State entrusted the excavations to the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.[4] Since the 1950s, nearly 40 excavation volumes from the Athenian Agora and numerous articles, chapters, and monographs analyzing the material culture from excavations have been published. The volumes in the *Athenian Agora* series cover a wide range of material culture found during the excavations, including sculpture, coins, inscriptions, architecture, glass, and ceramics (lamps, pottery, and terracottas) from the Neolithic period through the Islamic period. The most recent additions have been volumes on the Early Iron Age cemeteries; amphora stamps from Thasos; and votive reliefs. In addition to the excavation volumes, many articles relating to material from the agora of Athens have been published in *Hesperia*, the journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. The excavations are still ongoing, so publications on excavated material from the Athenian Agora will continue to be published in the future.

By contrast, Olynthos has had a more modest series of excavation and survey campaigns in the last century. Nevertheless, Olynthos and its organization after 432 BCE is well-known from the excavations led by David M. Robinson between 1928 and 1938. Perhaps the best understood part of the site is the North Hill settlement, where the remains of over one hundred

[4] Mauzy 2006, 11.

domestic structures were discovered by Robinson and his team. These houses were laid out on an extensive orthogonal grid plan which can still be seen today (Fig. 1.2).

The North Hill settlement is traditionally believed to have been constructed shortly after the *anoikismos* of 432 BCE, when a large influx of people from coastal cities in the Chalkidiki sought refuge at Olynthos.[5] Nicholas Cahill, using evidence from coins found in the house deposits, has suggested that these houses were also built over a short period of time, which confirms the historical record, implying that the inhabitants of Olynthos were responding to a sudden growth in population. For all the attention that has been given to the late 5th century settlement on the North Hill, however, comparatively little is known about the organization of the earlier South Hill settlement, and even less is known about the extent of the *chora* or rural territory of Olynthos.

The results of Robinson's excavations were published first in preliminary reports and then more formally in fourteen excavation volumes on architecture (domestic and public), sculptures, coins, terracottas, vases, metals, and burials of Olynthos. Robinson's excavations at Olynthos inspired a wide range of publications and projects dealing with the material culture of the site. Most of the publications have dealt with the coins, inscriptions, and houses of the site, all of which have contributed to a better understanding of the social, economic, and political make-up of the Classical city. The coinage from Olynthos has primarily been utilized as

[5] Thuc. 1.58: "…And Perdiccas induced the Chalcidians to abandon and demolish their towns on the seaboard, and settling inland at Olynthus, to make that one city a strong place: meanwhile to those who followed his advice he gave a part of his territory in Mygdonia round Lake Bolbe as a place of abode while the war against the Athenians should last. They accordingly demolished their towns, removed inland, and prepared for war" (trans. Cahill 2002, 35).

evidence for a new Chalkidian state which formed sometime around the *anoikismos* of 432 BCE.[6] This evidence has most often been used alongside epigraphic evidence – primarily the Attic Tribute Lists.[7]

Inscriptions found in and around the site of Olynthos, particularly deeds of sale, have been used to many different ends in modern scholarship. In addition to the initial publications of these inscriptions in preliminary reports by Robinson,[8] Lisa Nevett has discussed various aspects of property deals gleaned from information from deeds of sale dating to the fourth century.[9] Finally, the houses excavated at Olynthos have also been the focus of several studies. Robinson himself noted the importance of his team's work in discovering the extent of the settlement at the site. He emphasized the significance of the many housing blocks which provided unprecedented evidence for domestic structures and activity for the Classical period. Since *The Hellenic House*,[10] numerous studies have been (and continue to be) carried out to further characterize the Olynthian house and its wider urban context.[11]

This was one of the major goals of the Olynthos Project, a recent excavation and survey at the site undertaken by the University of Michigan, the University of Liverpool, and the Greek

[6] West 1914; Zahrnt 1971; Gatzolis and Psoma 2016.

[7] Zahrnt 1971, 45-46; Cahill 2002, 35.

[8] Robinson 1928; Robinson 1931a; Robinson 1934; Robinson 1938b.

[9] Nevett 2000.

[10] Robinson and Graham 1938.

[11] Mylonas 1940; Graham 1953; Nevett 1999; Cahill 2000; Cahill 2002.

Ministry of Culture. The Olynthos Project, begun nearly 70 years after Robinson's work and completed in 2019, aimed to build upon Robinson's conclusions about the site and to employ a more complex, multi-scalar approach to a study of Olynthos to provide a more complete picture of it. The published reports from the Olynthos Project have contributed significantly to broader conversations about Greek houses and households in the Classical period. The current project, which analyzes a combination of legacy data and material from the recent excavations at Olynthos, will also contribute to these conversations.

The rest of this introductory chapter offers the reader a roadmap of sorts. An introduction to the study of consumption in anthropology and archaeology discusses previous scholarship and some of the main issues, challenges, and potential involved. The last section outlines the structure and the main arguments of the dissertation.

1.1 Anthropological approaches to consumption

Prior to the 1980s, discussions of consumption were largely undertaken by economists or through the lens of economy. This can be seen particularly in the work of Roland Barthes and Jean Baudrillard, who both saw a close connection between consumption and capitalist society.[12] Although Baudrillard acknowledges that consumption is a collective and social act, and especially implicated in facilitating social differentiation,[13] it was not until 1979, when *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption*, co-authored by an anthropologist

[12] Barthes 1990 [1967]; Baudrillard 2020 [1968]; Baudrillard 1998 [1970].

[13] Baudrillard 1998 [1970], 15.

and an economist, that any attempt was made to bridge the gap between the approaches to consumption of their respective fields. While in the introduction to the 1996 edition of the book Douglas and Isherwood acknowledge that, even 20 years on, the gap between anthropology and economics continued to persist, consumption was gaining more scholarly attention amongst anthropologists and sociologists by the mid-1990s.

Although not without its flaws - not least its limited, static view of consumption through a thoroughly modern lens – Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood's work provides an important contribution to the discipline. They provide a relatively straightforward definition of consumption that is socially embedded and constructed. Douglas and Isherwood enumerate four major characteristics of consumption: 1) it is governed by free choice; 2) it starts where market ends; 3) it is not dictated by or regulated within the law; and 4) it is "an active process in which all the social categories are being continually redefined".[14] This final characteristic is the most popular of the four in later anthropological and sociological approaches to consumption.

At around the same time that *The World of Goods* was published, another important contribution was made to the field of consumption studies by Pierre Bourdieu in his 1984 monograph *Distinction*. Significantly, the work of both Bourdieu and of Douglas and Isherwood centers around the cultural significance of consumption practices. Whereas Douglas and Isherwood argue that consumption is a means of saying something about one's identity, Bourdieu takes this a step further in asserting that consumption is a means of communicating social hierarchies. Bourdieu's approach remains embedded in the structuralist tradition,

[14] Douglas and Isherwood 1979, 45. Cf. Dietler 2007, 224; Wilkins and Nadeau 2015, 3.

particularly where he talks about "codes" that are only intelligible by members of certain groups. He states that "consumption is…a stage in a process of communication, that is, an act of deciphering, decoding, which presupposes practical or explicit mastery of a cipher or code".[15]

A question that is central to Bourdieu's work is: how do these "codes" come to be? His answer: *habitus*. The *habitus* is comprised of "durable but unconscious dispositions that people hold toward certain common perceptions and practices, which may generate patterned behavior".[16] The concept has been applied widely in ancient Mediterranean scholarship, particularly in discussions of ethnicity and materiality in the ancient world. These approaches are deeply intertwined, and both center on the role habitual choices play in the construction of identity. As Rafael Scopacasa illustrates, "people may signal their ethnicity through certain types of clothing and apparel, or by using specific types of pottery that are associated with distinctive eating and drinking habits".[17]

Bourdieu's work was only the beginning of in-depth theoretical approaches to the social importance of food. Shortly after *Distinction* was published, Farb and Armelagos produced an edited volume entitled *Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Eating*.[18] The aim of the volume was to examine the role of food in society since, they argued, eating was the primary way of initiating and maintaining human relationships. This sentiment has been echoed in other

[15] Bourdieu 1984, 2.

[16] Knapp 2014, 37; see also Bourdieu 1984, 78.

[17] Scopacasa 2017, 113; see also Woolf 1998, 5-16; Lomas 2014, 483.

[18] Farb and Armelagos 1980.

work on the social importance of food.[19] It is especially prevalent in discussions of food and ancient societies,[20] as Wilkins and Nadeau argued in the introduction to an edited volume on food in antiquity: "since food selection, cuisine, and eating behaviors are so closely linked with society, economy, and culture, food becomes a privileged object to allow access to ancient cultures and thoughts".[21]

Compared with food scholarship, the subject of drinking has received relatively less attention. Although the field of scientific inquiry about alcohol drinking has been growing since the mid-1940s, these early approaches focused primarily on "problem drinking," which involved "the excess and abuse of alcohol".[22] Mary Douglas' work was among the first approaches that attempted to introduce a less negative and moralistic discussion of drinking. Instead, Douglas viewed drinking as essential in the construction of society. De Garine and De Garine also recognized the importance of studies of drinking and produced an edited volume on the topic called *Drinking: Anthropological Approaches*.[23] Like Douglas, De Garine and De Garine believed that drink was an important marker of social identity. They go a step further, however, in promoting a pluri-disciplinary approach to drinking that "envisage[s] drinking from both the biological and the social science perspectives, and in the general framework of ingestion, liquid

[19] e.g., Detienne and Vernant 1989; Twiss 2007; Klein and Watson 2019.

[20] e.g., Slater 1991; Wilkins, Harvey, and Dobson 1995; Dalby 1996; Dalby 2000; O'Connor 2015.

[21] Wilkins and Nadeau 2015, 3.

[22] Douglas 1987, 3.

[23] De Garine and De Garine 2001.

intake and nutrition".[24] The latter perspective allows De Garine and De Garine to decenter alcoholic beverages in their discussion and include analyses of the socio-economic and cultural importance of other types of drinks.

The work of Michael Dietler has been most influential in the study of drinking in the ancient Mediterranean. In general, Dietler's work echoes that of previous studies of drinking which have acknowledged and investigated the social significance of the practice. However, he is one of the first scholars in this discipline to propose a model for characterizing drinking in its different social, political, and economic contexts. Dietler's work has focused primarily on the political role of commensality, an approach which had hitherto been largely overlooked in scholarship on food and drink. He argues that "feasts are inherently political and…constitute a fundamental instrument and theater for political relations".[25] This forms the basis of his model of "commensal politics," which draws from practice theory and the work of structuralist scholars like Bourdieu and Foucault. Dietler's work will be discussed in more detail below.

1.2 Commensality in Archaic and Classical Greece

Studies of commensality in Archaic and Classical Greece, which tend to center on discussions of the formal symposium, have been undertaken by scholars from a wide range of backgrounds, including philologists, historians, art historians, and archaeologists. Like the anthropological scholarship on drinking, which in its early years was preoccupied with the

[24] De Garine and De Garine 2001, 3.

[25] Dietler 2001, 66.

assumption that all drinking had negative consequences, early scholarship on the Greek symposium was similarly preoccupied with several assumptions about the practice.

1.2.1 Symposium Scholarship before the 1990s

Even before the first systematic definition of the symposium was proposed by Oswyn Murray in the early 1980s and expanded upon in the 1990s,[26] investigations of the Greek symposium were largely based on a set of assumptions about the institution. The most popular assumptions about the Greek symposium amongst scholars of this period were that symposia took place only in *androne*s, or formal dining rooms, and that they were attended only by elite men.

According to Karl Reber, the *andron* was an "indispensable element of the urban house of the Classical period".[27] This might, at first glance, seem like a reasonable statement, since *androne*s were identified in many of the houses excavated and published before the 1980s.[28] Classical *androne*s are invariably identified by their off-center doorways and the presence of a raised platform that lined the walls of the room and was elevated slightly above a central mosaic floor. Out of 488 Classical and Hellenistic mosaics found in identifiable buildings, almost 80% of pebble mosaics in houses were in the dining area, including 65% in the *andron* and 14% in

[26] Murray 2018 [1982]; Murray 2018 [1983]; Murray 1990.

[27] Reber 1998, 134.

[28] See, for example, Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994.

anterooms attached to *androne*s.[29] The mosaic floor of the *androne* likely had both practical and symbolic purposes. It was waterproof and easy to clean. Sometimes *androne*s were equipped with drains which served to catch any water used in cleaning or any liquid spilled during the drinking party.[30]

Most scholars identify *androne*s as square or rectangular in shape. In general, the rooms are described as having "standard sizes corresponding to multiples of a couch-length".[31] In her early work on determining the "optimal size for a dining room within which a truly sympotic atmosphere could arise",[32] Birgitta Bergquist identifies two standard sizes of dining rooms, one measuring *ca.* 4.50 meters to a side (for seven couches) and another measuring *ca.* 6.50 meters (for eleven couches). According to her analysis, the rooms for seven couches would have better facilitated the visual and auditory coherence of a truly sympotic atmosphere. Although Katherine Dunbabin suggests that the room for seven couches of standard dimensions was the most common, she acknowledges that rooms of the same shape holding other numbers of couches - including rooms for five, nine, eleven and, rarely, three couches - also existed in the Greek world.[33] Indeed, we know from the literary sources that there was such variety in room sizes in antiquity. Athenaeus tells us that three, four, seven, nine, and more couches were used.[34] Other

[29] Westgate 1997-98, 94-97. Cf. Franks 2014, 156: "While not every androne features mosaic decoration, it is the case that the pebble mosaics that survive in Classical domestic contexts are overwhelmingly associated with androne*s*."

[30] Robinson and Graham 1938, 176; Cahill 2002, 180.

[31] Westgate 2015, 71.

[32] Bergquist 1999, 39.

[33] Dunbabin 2001.

[34] Ath. II 29.

authors use terms for three, five, seven, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, and twenty couches.[35]

All these features – raised platform, mosaic floor, and off-center doorway – were identified in the *androne*s found in a Classical house on the north slope of the Areopagus,[36] and in several of the houses from the West Quarter in Eretria.[37] Occasionally, there may be other features present, such as an anteroom,[38] drain,[39] or ashlar masonry. In his investigation of Athenian houses, Rodney Young identified an *andron* based only on its size and position in the house. In addition to these features, Jones et al. argued that Room I of the Dema House in Attica might be the *andron* because of its off-center doorway. Although Room I did not have a decorated floor and anteroom, the excavators were not concerned, citing parallels at Olynthos and Eleusis.[40]

1.2.2 Developments in symposium scholarship

In addition to the assumption that all houses were equipped with *androne*s, other assumptions about the symposium continued to play a role in scholarship in the 1990s. The work

[35] McCartney 1934, 30-35. See also Dunbabin 2001, 88.

[36] Graham 1974, 47.

[37] Reber 1998.

[38] Anterooms are infrequently explicitly mentioned in definitions of the *andron*. See Robinson and Graham 1938; Nevett 1999, 66; Nevett 2010.

[39] Drains are also rarely mentioned in definitions of the *andron*. See Robinson and Graham 1938; Bergquist 1990; Nevett 1999. A drain was also identified in the *andron* of House II at Eretria (Reber 1998).

[40] Jones et al 1962, 109-110. Analogy with Olynthian houses is also used in Jones et al.'s 1973 investigation of the Vari House in Attica.

of François Lissarrague, primarily his monograph *Un Flot d'Images*, has been foundational to the study of the iconography of the Greek symposium. Lissarrague's work, like many other studies of the iconography of the Greek symposium,[41] proceeds from the assumption that the images of symposia on Athenian vases provide information about contemporary people, including their "fundamental social, religious, and philosophical ideas".[42] Kathryn Topper has challenged this view, arguing that certain images of symposia on Athenian vases depict not the lived experiences of elite men in Athens, but the 'primitive' symposia of their ancestors.[43] The most important difference between Topper's and Lissarrague's approaches is that Topper's interpretation of the images of symposia on Athenian vases does not rely as heavily on the ancient texts.

Like the early approaches to images of the symposium, some scholars also argued that material culture reflected the depictions of the symposium found in textual sources. The most prevalent approach involved identifying the *andronitis* and *gunaikonitis*, or men's and women's spaces of the house, respectively. Several scholars have problematized the use of textual sources to identify gendered spaces like the *andron* in the archaeological record. This scholarship generally occupies two extremes. On the one hand, Morgan has argued that an *andron*, as defined by our textual sources, cannot be identified in private houses. Rather than identifying architectural space, Morgan argues that "gender words like *gunaikonitis* and *andronitis* are meant to explain domestic behavior" and that these areas "could be moved or redefined

[41] E.g., Osborne 2018, 168-187.

[42] Lissarrague 1990, 7.

[43] Topper 2009; Topper 2012.

according to the changing needs of individual households".[44] On the other hand, Nevett's approach involves letting the architecture – in which she can identify the *andron* – speak for itself. She argues that certain features of the *andron*, especially its decoration, off-center doorway, and drain, point to the use of the room for entertaining visitors. Westgate has suggested that "the decoration of the whole house was designed with the intention of impressing the guests at the symposium".[45]

Owning an architecturally distinct, elaborately decorated formal dining room was no doubt a significant financial investment, one that was only available to a select few in Greek society. This aligns well with assumption that the 5th century symposium was a holdover from the Archaic period when it was practiced only by aristocrats. This idea prevailed prior to the 1990s and was reinforced by the work of Oswyn Murray in the 1980s. However, more recently, scholars have proposed a more widespread practice of the symposium. Of all the approaches to the formal drinking party, this topic has received the most sustained attention.

Using primarily textual evidence, A.M. Bowie (1997) argued that the symposium was not associated exclusively with any particular social class.[46] Kathleen Lynch has proposed a shift from 'sympotic drinking' to 'communal drinking' which "encompasses the formal symposium, but also recognizes less formal group drinking events".[47] Her approach seeks to explain why the

[44] Morgan 2011, 272; cf. Lynch 2007; Goldberg 1999.

[45] Westgate 1997-98, 100.

[46] Cf. Corner, who argues that "symposia could be more or less elaborate" (Corner 2015, 239).

[47] Lynch 2007, 247.

symposium as an institution got more popular, or 'democratized', in the late Archaic and early Classical periods. Similarly, Nathan Arrington has recently noted that "wine consumption itself was relatively ubiquitous…and it could occur at multiple social levels, from elite to nonelite".[48] These approaches to communal drinking are significant because they represent a step in the right direction. Although they all still focus on the symposium, they acknowledge the co-existence of other, less formal modes of drinking. However, their approaches are just that – acknowledgements. The other forms of drinking they allude to are not explored in depth. This is perhaps because the theoretical framework for characterizing and discussing the full range of communal drinking practices in the Greek world remains underdeveloped.

1.2.3 New approaches to the study of the symposium

Although anthropological scholarship on drinking and symposium scholarship began to develop at around the same time, there has been very little interaction between the disciplines. As mentioned above, Michael Dietler's framework of commensal politics has been discussed and applied the most widely.

His model is broken down into three modes: (1) empowering feasts; (2) patron-role feasts; and (3) diacritical feasts. The first two modes are similar because they are firmly rooted in the practice of reciprocity. The first of these characterizes "the most basic and fundamentally ubiquitous mode of commensal politics."[49] These feasts occur among nominal equals and,

[48] Arrington 2021, 190.

[49] Dietler 2001, 93.

because hosting requires a big investment of resources and labor, it is the provision of the feast itself that allows an individual, group, or entire community to build social capital. The second category legitimizes status differences and "asserts hierarchy through the controlled distribution of food and drink to subordinates who cannot reciprocate in kind."[50] The third mode disregards reciprocity and is founded on marked differences in taste and style along lines of status classes. These differences frequently are manifest in the adoption of foreign drink or drinking customs, which Dietler calls "symbolic diacritica".[51] Dietler's early work investigated how the integration of foreign drinking customs into local practices in Early Iron Age France affected "the implementation of both formal and informal power relations in a society".[52]

The framework of commensal politics has been widely adopted in anthropological, ethnographic, and archaeological studies of both the Old and New Worlds. Tamara L. Bray produced an edited volume in which contributors considered the commensal politics of early states and empires through close analysis of culinary equipment.[53] The concept has been used to theorize and understand feasting events in many regions around the globe, including not only Mesoamerica,[54] but also Asia and Africa.[55]

[50] Rabinowitz 2009, 159.

[51] Dietler 2001, 89.

[52] Dietler 1990, 372; cf. Dietler 1998.

[53] Bray 2003.

[54] e.g., Rosenswig 2007; Chicoine 2011; Lamoureux-St-Hilaire 2020, 243-273.

[55] Asia: e.g., Wright 2010. Africa: e.g., Fleisher 2010; Monroe and Janzen 2014.

In Europe, commensal politics has been applied primarily to discussions of feasting in prehistoric societies. Dietler's framework has been an important heuristic tool for discussing the social, economic, and especially political importance of commensality in the ancient world. This can be seen in its numerous applications in scholarship on the archaeology of the ancient Mediterranean. This scholarship can be divided into two major approaches. These can be roughly categorized as those dealing with material culture from the Bronze Age through Early Iron Age and the Archaic through Hellenistic periods.

The concept of commensal politics is often used in discussions of the role of feasting in the Bronze Age and Early Iron Age of Greece. In an edited volume on the Mycenaean feast, James C. Wright identified elite burials around Knossos which "strongly indicate the acceptance of Mycenaean customs" with Dietler's diacritical feast.[56] In the same volume, Elisabetta Borgna identified both empowering feasts and patron-role feasts in her analysis of the Mycenaean components of Cretan feasting in the Late Minoan period.[57]

Dietler's framework has also been used in discussions of the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods, most of which focus primarily on symposia, an event that centered more on drinking than food. Kathleen Lynch identifies the Classical symposium with Dietler's 'diacritical' feast since it involved "the use of differentiated cuisine and styles of consumption to distinguish status," a practice which could sometimes be emulated by individuals of lower

[56] Wright 2004, 28.

[57] Borgna 2004, 135.

status,[58] and the Hellenistic 'symposium-feast' with Dietler's 'empowering' feast. By contrast, in the same volume, Marek Węcowski argues that the egalitarian and intimate gatherings of the Classical period were transformed into 'patron-role feasting' after the mid-fourth century as "the most ambitious Greeks" became more influenced by the luxurious banquets of the Hellenistic kings.[59]

Although Dietler cautions that these modes of commensal politics are not evolutionary, as one form does not replace another over time,[60] what these approaches have in common is that, when discussing more than one category of feasting, those categories are presented in a way that reflects evolutionary thinking. For example, in a chapter on feasting in Early Iron Age Attica, Alexandra Alexandridou summarizes the development of feasting during the period as progressing from empowering feasts around 950 BCE, which were transformed into patron-role feasts by the mid-9th century, and then culminated in diacritical feasts, which continued after 850 BCE.[61] Few scholars have acknowledged the complexity of the relationship between the three modes of commensal politics. As mentioned above, Borgna identified both empowering and patron-role feasts in Late Minoan Phaistos. These types of feasts were able to coexist because they served different purposes, one "performed in order to encourage social bonding" while the other was "directly linked with economic goals" and functioned as a redistributive

[58] Lynch 2018, 236.

[59] Wecowksi 2018, 270.

[60] Dietler 2001, 93.

[61] Alexandridou 2018, 30.

device.[62] Similarly, Adam Rabinowitz suggested that Dietler's categories of feasts could coexist in the same community, arguing that "tension between the three modes of feasting [was] already visible in the Homeric poems."[63] While he points out both 'diacritical' and 'entrepreneurial' (empowering) features of the later symposium, there is little discussion of how these modes mapped onto other, non-sympotic contexts for drinking during the late Archaic period. Ultimately, by focusing on the commensal practices of the elite class, Rabinowitz contributes to the trend of eliding the practices of non-elites.

1.3 Towards a Broader View of Ancient Greek Drinking Practices

My project aims to identify and characterize a wide range of forms of social drinking, including both formal and informal drinking practices, in Greek households. Most scholarship on Greek drinking has focused on the symposium. As a result, forms of drinking that are not considered to be sympotic are largely overlooked.[64] Michael Dietler and others, however, have shown how socially important drinking can be. Building upon Dietler's work, I propose a new model for thinking about how social drinking in the Greek world, especially during the Classical period, worked. I do this to clarify the significance of drinking for a broader range of people, beyond the small group of elite men traditionally connected with sympotic drinking.

Developing this new model for thinking about drinking in Greek households requires two things. First, it requires an assessment of the history and current state of the field of household

[62] Borgna 2004, 135.

[63] Rabinowitz 2009, 159.

[64] With a few exceptions: Lynch 2007; Lynch 2011; Arrington 2021.

archaeology. Chapter 2 discusses major approaches to household archaeology in the Greek world, and especially highlights the relationship between household archaeology and pottery analysis. Considering these observations, the methodological approaches central to the dissertation are also outlined in Chapter 2.

Additionally, developing this new model requires a critical reassessment of the evidence that has been used to identify and characterize the symposium. Literary, iconographic, and archaeological evidence from Athens has long been central to discussions of the Greek symposium. This evidence has been used and interpreted in many ways and has resulted in just as many definitions of the institution. For example, as we have seen, there have been many approaches to identifying the *andron* in the archaeological record and differing opinions about whether it was necessary for a symposium to take place. The first sub-goal of my project is to develop a clear idea of the boundaries of what the symposium *is* to help me define what the symposium *is not*. To accomplish this goal, I re-analyze the literary, iconographic, and archaeological evidence from Athens for the symposium in Chapter 3.

Compared with architectural space, fewer studies of the symposium have discussed drinking equipment. Although many scholars take for granted that the *kylix,* or stemmed cup, and the *krater,* or mixing bowl, were the sympotic shapes *par excellence*, only Kathleen Lynch has clearly articulated what might have constituted a 'sympotic' assemblage, citing a wide range of pottery vessels used in the consumption and service of wine. My critical reassessment of the evidence traditionally used to identify and characterize sympotic drinking also involves asking: Were so-called 'sympotic' shapes, including the *krater*, *kylix*, and other drinking vessels, used

exclusively at symposia? And, more broadly, were they used in the same context (i.e., at the symposium) in every Greek city?

To answer these questions – the second sub-goal of my project – I look beyond Athens and focus on the material evidence from the site of Olynthos in northern Greece. Most studies of the Greek symposium consider either sympotic space or equipment, but rarely discuss the relationship between the two. In general, this may be because it is difficult to find examples where sympotic space and equipment are found together. For example, in Athens, so-called 'sympotic assemblages' tend to be found in wells and are rarely connected with clearly defined architecture, let alone formal dining rooms. Where sympotic space has been excavated, pottery is not often found in significant quantities.[65] Despite the unsystematic collection of pottery by Robinson and his team, which has resulted in household assemblages in a wide range of sizes, Olynthos provides a unique opportunity for investigating the relationship between domestic space and pottery used in the consumption and service of wine. Although most references to Olynthos in symposium scholarship highlight the *andrones* found at the site, to broaden our understanding of social drinking in the Greek world, my project considers not only the distribution of pottery traditionally associated with the symposium among houses with *andrones*, but also those without.

[65] Some scholars have noted that *andrones* were regularly cleared following a night of drinking (e.g., Westgate, 2000), which suggests that the equipment used during these events was stored elsewhere in the house when not in use.

1.4 Chapter Overview

In chapter two, 'Approaches and Methodology', I provide an overview of the theoretical and methodological approaches underpinning my dissertation project. The theoretical approaches are divided into two sections. First, I review the literature on household archaeology in the Greek world. Then I turn to the literature on ceramics analysis and review the approaches that have been employed in the study of archaeological ceramics. The final section of the chapter outlines the methodological approaches used in my dissertation project, including how my dataset was defined; what information was recorded; and how the data was analyzed.

In chapter three, 'Problematizing the Symposium', I determine how the symposium has been and should be defined using different kinds of evidence (literary, iconographic, and archaeological). The central questions asked and answered in this chapter are: How has the symposium been defined in the past? What evidence has been used to this end? How should the symposium be defined now? The final question is essential because, as several scholars have noted, no single definition of the symposium exists to date. However, to identify non-sympotic drinking, there must be a clear definition of the symposium.

In chapter four, 'The Organization of Pottery Production at Olynthos', I evaluate the relationship between Athens and Olynthos. For decades, Athens has remained central to studies of Greek social drinking and, more specifically, studies of the symposium. Although the site itself has not been studied at length, Olynthos also frequently features in symposium scholarship. This is because at least thirty *andrones*, or formal dining rooms, were identified in the houses at the site during the excavations led by David M. Robinson between 1928 and 1938. During the

more recent excavations of the Olynthos Project, part of the mosaic floor of the *andron* of house B ix 4 was uncovered.[66] Additionally, part of an *andron* was identified in a test trench (TT06) on the North Hill in 2014,[67] and one room (room h) in house B ix 6, which was more fully excavated, has been identified by the excavators as an *andron*. The nature of the relationship between Athens and Olynthos during the late 5th and early 4th centuries BCE is investigated through close analysis of a selection of drinking and mixing vessels from both sites. In chapter four, I ask: How was pottery production organized at Olynthos? To what extent did Olynthians consume Athenian pottery, and how did this influence drinking practices at Olynthos? Were Olynthian potters influenced by Athenian shapes and motifs?

Chapters five and six involve identifying and interpreting patterns of pottery distribution at multiple levels. In chapter five, 'Social Drinking in Context', I ask whether there exists a relationship between so-called 'sympotic' pottery and sympotic space (*androne*s). There is currently no consensus in existing symposium scholarship about whether 'sympotic' pottery must be found in connection with an architecturally distinct *andron*. In chapter six, 'Widening the Scope – Social Drinking Beyond the Andron', I ask how we can use pottery to characterize the drinking practices of households that did not have formal dining rooms. In this chapter, I also take the data collected and analyzed in chapters four, five, and six and propose a new model for thinking about social drinking in the Greek world. This model is based on Dietler's commensal politics. I ask: What does the archaeological data for drinking in Olynthos tell us about patterns of social drinking in the Greek world more broadly?

[66] Nevett et al. 2017, 27-28.

[67] Nevett et al. 2017, 18.

In chapter seven, ‘Towards a Typology of Social Drinking’, I summarize the major takeaways from the project and offer some conclusions based on my analysis of the literary, iconographic, and especially the archaeological evidence discussed in the previous chapters. I also propose some future directions for research, particularly in areas where the current project was constrained by time and space.

Chapter Two

Approaches and Methodology

This chapter provides an overview of the major theoretical and methodological approaches underpinning this dissertation. First, the literature on household archaeology from the late 1920s to the present day will be reviewed. Following this is a review of the literature on approaches to the study and analysis of archaeological ceramics. The themes arising from the literature on both ancient households and archaeological ceramics analysis will be discussed and the approaches that have been used by previous scholars will be evaluated in terms of their utility for the present study. Finally, I will describe the methodological approaches I used in selecting my dataset; creating my database; recording information about my data; and the analytical methods I used.

2.1 Theoretical approaches

2.1.1 Household archaeology

The field of household archaeology has come a long way since the houses of Olynthos were first discovered by the excavation team led by David M. Robinson in the late 1920s. While

it is true that few houses from the period before Alexander the Great had been uncovered in the Greek world by this time, this was not the first opportunity, in general, for the study of Greek houses. Already in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries entire residential blocks dating to the second and first centuries BCE had been excavated and investigated on Delos.[68] These investigations, like many of their contemporaries, primarily aimed to "establish a generalised picture of 'the Greek house'" through attempts to identify archaeological correlates for the descriptions of houses given in the ancient texts.[69]

Particularly influential has been the first century BCE description of Greek houses by the Roman architect Vitruvius, whose writings led to the development of an architectural typology of houses. In general, Classical and Hellenistic Greek houses were built around an open courtyard with a portico along at least one side. The typology inspired by Vitruvius allowed early scholars to group these houses into four main types. The first three are each closely associated with a major type-site; the fourth has been identified at two sites in northwestern Greece. The *prostas* house, which "consists of a narrow porch which projects in front of the main range of rooms,"[70] is most characteristic of the structures found at Priene.[71] At the site of Olynthos the *pastas* house, where the portico, longer than in the *prostas* house, is found within the house and must be passed through to access the houses' main living rooms, is more prevalent. A third house-type, the *peristyle* house, features a colonnaded porch around three or four sides of the courtyard, and is

[68] E.g., Paris 1884; Couve 1895; Jarde 1905; Jarde 1906; Chamonard 1906; Bizard 1907; Chamonard 1922; Chamonard 1924.

[69] Nevett 1999, 21.

[70] Nevett 1999, 22.

[71] Wiegand and Schraeder 1904; Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994, 323.

commonly found in the houses on Delos. The fourth house-type, the *Herdraumhaus*, or 'hearth-room' house, found at Ammotopos, differs from the other three types since it is not defined according to the design of the house's portico, but "is characterised instead by the presence of a large internal space… which often had a central hearth, and which constitutes the most prominent feature of the plan."[72]

This typology is nowhere more pronounced than in Wolfram Hoepfner and Ernst-Ludwig Schwandner's landmark study *Haus und Stadt im Klassischen Griechenland.*[73] While they certainly participated in, and ultimately canonized, this typology, Hoepfner and Schwandner's work differed significantly from earlier approaches in two important respects. Compared to their predecessors, Hoepfner and Schwandner's work took a more comparative approach. Rather than focusing on the houses from an individual site, they analyzed houses from more geographically and chronologically diverse sites. Such an approach was necessitated by the broader socio-political questions that the work aimed to answer. They were not content with simply slotting houses into a typology; Hoepfner and Schwandner believed that there were broader cultural reasons, such as the Greek concept of *isonomia* or equality under the law, for the similarities in architectural form. Hoepfner and Schwandner's work has had an enduring impact on the field of household archaeology.[74] In particular, it inspired scholars investigating Greek houses in the late 20th century to consider shifting the focus of their studies from the appearance of those houses to what the houses can tell us about the people who lived in them.

[72] Nevett 1999, 23; see also Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994, 146-154 and 323.

[73] Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994.

[74] E.g., Ault 2017, 40-50.

A major proponent of Hoepfner and Schwandner's approach to household archaeology was Michael Jameson. Prior to Jameson's work, few scholars of ancient households focused on identifying and characterizing gendered space. Most influential was the work of Susan Walker, who sought to identify aspects of domestic architecture that corresponded with literary models of gendered space and particularly women's seclusion in the Greek world.[75] Jameson's most significant contribution to the field was proposing that, contrary to Walker, questions centered around identifying male and female space in the Greek house were neither productive, as he demonstrated in the difficulties of identifying such spaces in the archaeological record, nor the most important questions to ask about social organization. Instead, Jameson's work focused more on other forms of social relationships within the Greek household which intersect with economy, religion, and status. Although more nuanced work has been done on gendered space in Greek houses since Walker's work, the shift towards other social questions was foundational to later scholarship which further investigated household economies[76] and rituals.[77]

Jameson's work has been foundational to the field of household archaeology in other ways. In closely following Hoepfner and Schwandner's approach to Greek houses, like his predecessors, Jameson, too, largely ignored and explained away the significance of variability in house form both within and between sites and regions. This is because the aim of his work was to identify a single underlying origin for "the Classical Greek house," which he identified at sites

[75] Walker 1983, 81-91.

[76] Cahill 2002; Cahill 2005; Tsakirgis 2005; Ault, 2005.

[77] Rose 1957; Jameson 1990, 192-4; Faraone 2008; Boedecker 2008; Sofroniew 2016. Morgan 2010.

across the Greek world.[78] The so-called 'Greek house' was one in which several small rooms were constructed around a central court, sometimes with a covered portico to the north of it. Of these rooms, few can be attributed functions; these include the decorated *andron*, the kitchen, the fireplace or flue, and the bathroom.[79] The logic behind the nearly universal construction of this house-type, according to Jameson, was simple: "the economic and social independence and privacy of the *oikos*," defined by the nuclear family.[80] This conclusion, however, is flawed in two main respects.

First, the household's economy is defined in terms of household industry, rather than social differentiation through conspicuous consumption. Although several examples of elaborate architectural decoration were identified in fifth and fourth century Greek houses, including stuccoed murals, carved capitals, architraves and columns, these elements were dismissed as indicative of the status and wealth of the household. By contrast, in a monograph on the rise of noble houses in the Greek world, Elena Walter-Karydi argued that there was social differentiation in domestic space during this period, but it did not occur until the early fourth century BCE.[81] Both Jameson and Walter-Karydi, however, relied heavily on the evolutionary assumption that only a single house form dominated during their respective time periods: the simple courtyard house of the fifth century and the more elaborate peristyle house of the fourth

[78] Jameson 1990, 197.

[79] For the apparent ubiquity of *androne*s, see also Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994; cf. Goldberg 1999 and Cahill 2002, who show that *androne*s were not as common as Jameson or Hoepfner and Schwandner believed.

[80] Jameson 1990, 195.

[81] Walter-Karydi 1998, 11; prior to this time, according to Walter-Karydi, elites would display their status and wealth in more public venues, such as through liturgies and costly funeral monuments.

century.

The *andron*, which Jameson, likely following Hoepfner and Schwandner's models, argued could be found widely in both urban and rural houses,[82] has in more recent scholarship been identified as an important index of the status and wealth of a household because of its distinctive decorative and architectural features.[83] It also appears frequently in discussions of household privacy, as it was one of the only domestic spaces which seems to have been deliberately set up with an eye to entertaining guests. In general, social independence and privacy of the *oikos* was maintained through the highly interiorized nature of the house, with many of its rooms only being accessible through the central court. The spatial syntax of the Greek household aimed to control the interactions of guests within the household, particularly its female members.[84] In some respects this aim was manifested in the architectural choices made by the occupants of the house, such as the single, *prothyron*-style entrance, which provided a "sheltered entry foyer," and the off-center doorway and/or anteroom of the *andron* which allowed for privacy. In other ways, the boundaries between outsiders and the household, like the boundaries between men and women within the household, were more conceptual and behavioral than physical.

The social relationships between men and women in ancient Greece have been the subject of several studies, many of which were undoubtedly inspired by the work of Susan

[82] Jameson 1990, 100.

[83] E.g., Lynch 2007, 243-249; Nevett 1999.

[84] Antonaccio 2000, esp. 539-542; Nevett 1995, esp. 374-75.

Walker.[85] Rather than being discouraged by criticism of Walker's approach to investigating gendered space in Greek houses, later scholarship reconsidered questions relating the male and female spaces from several perspectives. The consensus, however, has been that apart from certain types of spaces such as kitchens, bathrooms, and decorated *androne*s, it is not possible to identify architecturally defined gendered space in the archaeological record. Moreover, the literary sources have proved to be more complex than Walker initially believed. Lisa Nevett and Carla Antonaccio have shown that the literary sources suggest more flexibility in the use of space.[86] Moreover, Nicholas Cahill asserts that "the ease with which Euphiletos claims to have reorganized his household space should warn us against looking for architecturally specific women's quarters."[87] Instead of examining the architecture, we should look to the assemblage of artifacts found in a given room to determine how – and by whom – that space was used.

Apart from the architecturally distinct *androne*, Jameson and others were unconvinced that the function of household space could be identified archaeologically. This was likely because he had not considered the utility of artifact assemblages, although he acknowledged that the "careful analysis of artifact distribution…can add nuance and complexity to the purely architectural evidence."[88] An important example of a balanced approach to architecture and artifacts in household archaeology can be found in the excavations of Olynthos in northern Greece.

[85] Walker 1983.

[86] Nevett 1995; Antonaccio, 2000.

[87] Cahill 2002, 152-153.

[88] Jameson 1990, 109.

When Robinson's excavations at Olynthos began in 1928, the initial aim of the project was to locate public buildings and temples at the site. Although a 'fountain house' and a 'stoa' (later re-designated an 'Assembly Hall') were identified on the North Hill, and a 'prytaneum' was identified on the South Hill, the aims of the project eventually turned towards an extensive investigation of the domestic architecture of the site. Notably, in 1928, several trenches opened on the North Hill brought to light numerous well-preserved houses, shops, and an open agora. Robinson recognized the significance of this discovery, identifying these houses with those that were destroyed by Philip II in 348 BCE and seeing that they would be an important contribution to the study of Greek houses in general, as up to that point no complete Greek houses were preserved from the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. As a result, the following three campaigns at Olynthos took a special, primary interest in excavating the housing blocks at the site. The results of these excavations were published in fourteen volumes, including studies on the ceramics, terracottas, coins, mosaics, and public architecture, in addition to two volumes on the houses found at the site.[89] Several decades following Robinson's excavations at Olynthos, the Greek Archaeological Service excavated a house on the North Hill in 1988.[90] Subsequently, the Service also undertook extensive cleaning and restoration of the site between 1989 and 1994.[91]

More recently, the Olynthos Project sought to: evaluate the density and extent of occupation of the city and its hinterland; contextualize the excavation of two houses, one on the

[89] Robinson 1946; Robinson and Graham 1938.

[90] Drougou and Vokotopoulou 1989.

[91] Athanasiou 1992.

North Hill and one on the South Hill; and characterize the Olynthian household over a variety of overlapping dimensions. While Robinson broadly outlines the measures taken to ensure that no important information from the excavations was lost - including "careful and detailed supervision of the various sections" and recording "the finds in such a way that any object could be put back in its original position"[92] - Nevett has suggested that Robinson's team was not uniform nor systematic in their methods of selection and discard. By contrast, the Olynthos Project aimed to collect and "record all artefacts - ceramic and otherwise, complete and fragmentary - and to document their positions in three dimensions." Moreover, the Project has employed several varied methodological approaches, including geophysical survey, excavation, field survey, intra-site survey, digital mapping, and the analysis of associated material and data, to develop a more holistic understanding of the site.

The early excavations at Olynthos were exceptional for their time. In general, early scholarship on Greek houses and households did not take artifacts into account because few excavations produced information at this level of detail. At Delos, where some of the earliest excavations of Greek houses took place, the main interests of the archaeologists lay in the architecture, rather than artifact assemblages. In Athens, the situation is more complicated. On the one hand, many fifth and fourth century houses were excavated there, but rarely with any artifacts recorded. On the other hand, many artifacts have been found, particularly during the excavations of the Athenian Agora, but few artifact assemblages have been associated with identifiable architectural contexts. Finally, at the other end of the spectrum are the houses which were excavated in Attica, whose artifact assemblages were extensively recorded in the final

[92] Robinson 1946, viii.

publications of the sites.[93]

Although artifacts were traditionally assumed to provide little valuable information beyond confirming the general layout of structures and the date of each phase of occupation, by the early 1990s, attitudes toward artifacts began to change. This can be seen in the excavation publications from Eretria on Euboea and Halieis in the Peloponnese. In 1993, Pierre Ducrey recognized the important role of finds (including statues, coins, and pottery) from the House of the Mosaics in answering questions about the ancient population and settlement of Eretria[94], a sentiment which was echoed in the later publication of the Classical and Hellenistic houses of Eretria's West Quarter by Karl Reber.[95] This role, however, was limited in several ways. Although the excavations of the houses of Eretria yielded significant amounts of pottery and small finds, only a fraction of these could be published in the excavation volumes due to financial constraints. More extensive volumes on the pottery found at Eretria dating to the Classical and Hellenistic periods would be published later.[96] The pottery that was catalogued in the volumes dedicated to the houses of the site was selected based on its perceived utility for dating the architecture and identifying the function of certain spaces.[97]

Compared with the two volumes dedicated to the houses of Eretria, which presented the

[93] See for example the reports on the Dema House (Jones et al. 1962); see also the report on the Vari House (Jones et al. 1973).

[94] Ducrey et al. 1993, 12.

[95] Reber 1998.

[96] See Gex 1993; Ackermann 2020.

[97] Ducrey et al. 1993, 97; Reber 1998, 173.

architecture and artifacts separately, the artifact assemblages from the houses at Halieis are more thoroughly integrated into the descriptions of the architecture in the official volumes from the excavations. The artifacts found in each house are quantified and their distribution throughout the architectural remains is discussed. In a few instances the function of a room has been identified on the basis of the architectural evidence and can be confirmed by the artifact assemblage associated with it[98]; however, in most cases the discussion of the artifacts is limited to general characterization, spatial patterning and, occasionally, a consideration of formation processes.[99] This approach served the aim of the publication well, which goes beyond merely identifying the function of spaces and considers the use of domestic space more holistically.[100]

Such approaches have recently centered around temporal and spatial flexibility in Greek houses. In a 2007 chapter, Lin Foxhall uses an artifact-focused approach to unpack the concept of the 'domestic assemblage' and the identification of fixed 'kitchens' in Greek households.[101] Ultimately she argues that these terms, especially the latter one, are inappropriate labels as the material culture suggests that our modern assumptions about family meals do not map onto ancient practices and behaviors.[102] Similarly, in the same volume Kathleen Lynch uses iconography, architecture, and material evidence to suggest that sympotic space was more flexible than traditionally believed. For Lynch, a decorated *andron* was not a requirement to host

[98] See for example the discussion of the kitchen in House 7 (p. 20) and in House E (p. 54-55).

[99] Cf. Ault and Nevett 1999.

[100] Ault 2005, 1.

[101] Foxhall 2007.

[102] Cf. Allison 1999.

a symposium; all one needed was wine, water, drinking cups, and company.[103] Finally, Lisa Nevett has convincingly argued that past studies of artifact distributions in Greek domestic contexts which have focused on the relationship between artifacts and architecture are flawed since they fail to recognize the complex nature of the relationship between artifact distributions and patterns of human activity. Instead, she has proposed that the 'taskscape' model should be applied to Greek domestic contexts in order to create a methodology sensitive to the potential temporal changes and rhythms of a Greek household.[104] More recently, Nevett has further investigated methods for identifying seasonal change in Greek houses at Olynthos.[105] She argues that neither architecture nor artifact assemblages are sufficient evidence for identifying seasonal activity at the site; instead, she advocates for the particular utility of soil sampling techniques including block sample, geochemical, and micro-debris analyses.

Even though artifact-focused approaches in household archaeology in the Greek world have become more popular in recent years, the subfield remains underdeveloped. This is likely because, although archaeologists recognize the importance of collecting and studying artifacts, publishing entire household assemblages, which can include a wide range of material, in addition to architectural features, can be expensive. Moreover, lengthy discussions of pottery assemblages might take up space that would (to some scholars) be better allocated to other narratives and interpretations. By contrast, ceramics continue to play a prominent role more generally in broader archaeological and anthropological scholarship. This is likely due to the various types of

[103] Lynch 2007, 244.

[104] Nevett 2015, 109-110.

[105] Nevett 2021, 381-92.

information that ceramics can provide about the ancient world.

2.1.2 Ceramics analysis

Scholars studying the Greek symposium, a form of private drinking, have largely adopted similar approaches to those popular in the field of household archaeology. However, one cannot rely on architectural evidence (e.g., an *andron*) alone for insight into ancient drinking practices. Artifacts – especially pottery, which often is discussed in symposium scholarship – must be considered as well. To identify patterns of social drinking, we must study dining pottery in not only its physical context, but also its broader contexts of production and use. In the present study, to determine what social drinking looked like in Olynthian households I ask what was in demand (i.e., specific pottery shapes, sizes, decorative motifs, etc.). I also consider how demand affected what was produced, how it was produced, and what was imported.

Traditional analyses of ceramics in both anthropology and archaeology have focused primarily on typology and chronology.[106] As Duistermaat outlines,[107] there have been many different approaches to the study of the organization of craft production since the 1970s. The scholarship described by Duistermaat have both their benefits and limitations for the study of archaeological pottery. These discussions focus on ceramic ecology, typological and characterization approaches,[108] and technology and human-thing relations. Typological

[106] E.g., Tiffany 1978; Whallon, Jr. 1972. For a more recent approach to ceramic typologies, see Hruby 2010.

[107] Duistermaat 2016.

[108] These studies, which notably include work by Costin (1991) and Pool (1992), closely resemble typological approaches.

approaches to the organization of craft production were especially popular between the 1970s and 1990 but have since been heavily critiqued and abandoned. One critique of these discussions has been their "obsession with 'specialization' as a cause or indicator of social complexity and political power."[109] Such a perspective is clearly rooted in nineteenth century cultural evolutionism.

Of particular interest to Duistermaat is scholarship that focuses primarily on relational approaches to the organization of craft production. Scholars who have adopted such relational approaches work within a variety of methodological and theoretical frameworks, such as the social construction of technology (SCOT); cultural technology and the *chaîne opératoire*; behavioral archaeology; holistic approaches; symmetric archaeology; and entanglement. Here, I focus on cultural technology and the *chaîne opératoire* because these approaches are frequently applied to ancient Mediterranean pottery and assemblages.

The *chaîne opératoire* has been variously defined over the years. Early definitions of the concept generally described the *chaîne opératoire* as a sequence of behaviors and processes characterized by "a genuine syntax that gives operational series both their rigidity and their flexibility."[110] Currently, the *chaîne opératoire* concept is used "either to describe a general technical activity...or to describe a portion of the technical activity that can then be divided into several *chaînes opératoires*."[111] In other words, the concept can be used to describe either the

[109] Duistermaat 2016, 117.

[110] Leroi-Gourhan 1964.

[111] Roux 2019, 1-2.

entire series of operations involved in transforming raw materials into finished products, or it can describe the processes of a single stage in that series. Here I describe the *chaîne opératoire* as a sequence of related technical processes carried out in the production of a craft. In this case, that craft is ceramics.

The application of the *chaîne opératoire* approach in studies of pottery production has led to increased focus on several topics relating to the production process. The social identity of potters, mobility and interaction of potters, and technological innovation are particularly popular in studies of the ancient Mediterranean. Regarding technological innovation and change, there has been much scholarship about the introduction and use of the potter's wheel on Crete,[112] the Cycladic islands,[113] and the Greek mainland during the Bronze Age.[114] A similar proportion of scholarship has discussed the mobility and interaction of potters in the Cyclades.[115] Several approaches have also dealt specifically with how interaction relates to social identity.[116]

Related to social identity is the concept of communities of practice. Communities of practice are characterized and constituted by shared histories of learning.[117] Scholarship on teaching, learning, and apprenticeship strategies borrows heavily from developmental

[112] e.g., Evely 1988; Knappett 1999; Jeffra 2013.

[113] e.g., Berg 2007; Gorogianni et al. 2016.

[114] e.g., Bouzakis et al. 2011; Choleva 2012.

[115] Abell 2014; Abell and Hilditch 2016.

[116] Davis and Gorogianni 2008; Stissi 2012; Williams 2016; Williams 2017.

[117] Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Wenger 1999.

psychology, which focuses on the developmental stages of learning,[118] and neurophysiological theories of learning, which "distinguish between kinds of learning and the different results of that learning in different parts of the brain."[119] This relationship is useful because it provides a framework for understanding a learner's trajectory in acquiring particular skills. Learning frameworks can be divided into four types characterized by differing levels of direct intervention by skilled individuals or craftspeople: self-teaching by trial and error; observation/imitation; verbal instruction/explanation; and hands-on demonstration.[120] The relationship between a skilled individual or 'instructor' and learner is most often observed through ethnographic research.[121] It is also possible, however, to investigate learning processes through archaeological inquiry, particularly by looking for material objects produced by learners.[122] This approach is especially useful in studies of craft production in the ancient Mediterranean.[123]

Despite the relatively widespread interest in how technical traditions were transmitted (i.e., communities of practice), questions concerning *why* those traditions differ between groups of producers have been more popular amongst prehistorians and especially archaeologists studying the Bronze Age Aegean. As we have already seen, there has been much scholarship

[118] e.g., Piaget 1972; cf. Vygotsky 1978; Rogoff 1984.

[119] Minar and. Crown 2001, 373.

[120] Schiffer and Skibo 1987, 597. While, as Schiffer and Skibo acknowledge, the emphasis in studies of ancient artisans has traditionally been on identifying the *chaîne opératoire*, or "inferring the specific sequence of activities employed…to produce a given form" (Schiffer and Skibo 1987, 595), the authors take a more fine-grained approach focused on the individual activities of artisans which cause variability. The individual activities employed in material procurement and manufacturing process are what they term "technical choices" (Schiffer and Skibo 1997, 29), which highlights the agency of the individual artisan.

[121] e.g., Roe 1995; Wallaert-Petre 2001; Bowser and Patton 2008; Wallaert 2013.

[122] e.g., Kamp 2001; Crown 2001; Crown 2007; Crown 2014.

[123] e.g., Hruby 2011; Hasaki 2013; Berg 2015; Knappett and van der Leeuw 2014; Gagne 2019; Abell 2020.

relating to the introduction and use of the potter's wheel during this period at sites across the Aegean. Some scholars have tried to address questions surrounding craft specialization,[124] which refers to both the production of a particular thing and the production of things beyond the level of subsistence.[125] Specialization is closely related to the organization of production, which can be identified based on four parameters proposed by Cathy L. Costin:[126] 1) context, or degree of elite sponsorship; 2) concentration, or spatial relationship of consumer to producer; 3) scale, or how many products are made; and 4) intensity, or investment of time and labor. It is therefore an important issue to address to better understand the social and economic context in which crafting happens. Among these parameters, however, context and intensity of production are particularly difficult to get at archaeologically and rely on our ability to locate workshops and facilities in the landscape.

Considering these difficulties, scholars have considered standardization to better understand specialization.[127] Rather than focusing on physical production space, standardization involves close examination of craft products. In particular, standardization is assessed based on two major categories. First, what materials (i.e., clay and tempers) are used and how they are processed. Second, what forming methods are employed as well as how they are employed (e.g., how a handle is attached or how certain features are painted on a vessel). Some scholarship has

[124] e.g., Roux and Corbetta 1989; Day et al. 1997.

[125] For an overview, see Costin 1991.

[126] Costin 1991.

[127] e.g., Longacre 1999; Roux 2003.

focused on applying this approach to Bronze Age conical cups;[128] however, recently scholars have investigated the standardization of vessels from later periods. For example, in his investigation of a small group of Geometric pots from the Kynosarges burials in Athens, Ioannis Smyrnaios concluded that "no matter what external social parameters formed consumer demands, the production sequence was still subject to the potters' own needs for efficiency, quality, and personal expression".[129] Similarly, for material from the Classical period, Ann Steiner and Richard Bidgood investigated similarities in the size, shape, and capacity of black gloss pottery found in a deposit associated with the Tholos building in the Athenian Agora, which points to the institution's egalitarianism and democratic goals.[130] In their study, the authors employed an online capacity calculator developed by Engels, Bavay, and Tsingarida.[131] This tool was also used by Kathleen Lynch in collaboration with Bidgood in a study of sympotic vessels from well J 2:4, a deposit comprised mostly of vessels from the 480 BCE. Persian sack of Athens.[132] Like Steiner's work, it was concluded that there was a strong emphasis on equality and *isonomia* in this house's drinking assemblage, as evidenced by the equal amounts of diluted wine consumed by participants.

Compared with analyses of pottery production in the Bronze Age Aegean, scholarship on the *chaîne opératoire* of pottery produced in the Archaic and Classical periods is much harder to

[128] e.g., Berg 2004; Hilditch 2014; Knappett and Hilditch 2015.

[129] Smyrnaios 2017, 120.

[130] Steiner and Bidgood 2018; see also Steiner 2018, 223-227; Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 93; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 18; Lynch 2011, 327, Appendix 11.

[131] Engels et. al. 2009.

[132] Lynch and Bidgood 2020.

come by. Traditional approaches to Greek pottery from these periods have tended to focus on the decoration and iconography of the vessels.[133] As Smyrnaios has succinctly observed, they are "primarily studied as products of painters instead of potters".[134] It is clear, however, that more interest in the work and experiences of potters has been developing in recent years. The earliest work in this respect focused on the first stage of the *chaîne opératoire*: the acquisition of clay materials.[135] Recent approaches have ranged from broad approaches to workshop organization,[136] to more targeted studies of other segments of the *chaîne opératoire*. While many scholars have investigated the firing process of Greek vases,[137] experimental approaches have been especially popular.[138] Others have taken surface decoration as the focus of their discussions.[139] Smyrnaios' work, which focuses on "basic shaping techniques and records characteristic metrical features of vessels…along with their proportional relationships", is the only study of its kind to date for ancient Greek pottery after ca. 900 BCE.[140]

[133] McPhee 1981; Lissarrague 1990; McPhee and Kartsonaki 2010; Topper 2009; Topper 2012.

[134] Smyrnaios 2017, 104, n. 2.

[135] E.g., Farnsworth 1964; Jones 1984; Whitbread 2003.

[136] Stissi 2012; Sapirstein 2013; Williams 2013; Williams 2016; Williams 2017; Balachandran 2019.

[137] E.g., Cianchetta et al. 2015a; Cianchetta et al. 2015b.

[138] Wissinger and Kahn 2008; Walton et al. 2013; Luhl et al 2014; Hylek et al. 2016.

[139] Maniatis et al. 1993; Maish 2008; Walton et al. 2013b; Walton et al. 2015.

[140] Smyrnaios 2017, 108.

2.2 Methodology

My aim for this dissertation is to identify patterns of social drinking in Greek households, with a particular focus on determining what was in demand (e.g., specific pottery shapes, sizes, decorative motifs, etc.) in Late Classical Olynthos and how that demand affected what was used and produced locally and what was imported from Athens. The methodological approach employed in the current project considers both quantitative and qualitative data. This is to accomplish two major goals. The first goal involves identifying patterns in group drinking practices beyond the Greek symposium in the archaeological record. The dataset analyzed in service of this goal was comprised of both architectural and ceramic evidence in the form of drinking assemblages. My second goal aims to provide in-depth insight into what those drinking practices looked like and develop a framework for talking about them. This process involves close analysis of literary texts and iconography in addition to material evidence.

2.2.1 Patterns of group drinking

The foundation of the dissertation is a database of drinking and mixing vessels from Athens and Olynthos dated between 500 and 300 BCE. The database aims to be as comprehensive as possible, including a selection of vessels reported primarily in excavation publications and preliminary reports.[141] This was largely done to illuminate patterns in group drinking practices at Olynthos.

[141] Sparkes and Talcott 1970; Rotroff and Oakley 1992; Moore 1997; Robinson 1933. Robinson 1950. For preliminary results from the excavations of the Olynthos Project, see Nevett et al. 2017; Nevett et al. 2020; and Ault et al. 2019.

A total of 351 vessels were examined. 161 drinking and mixing vessels were analyzed from Olynthos, including vessels from both the Robinson excavations and the more recent investigations of the Olynthos Project (Fig. 2.1); 190 were analyzed from Athens (Fig. 2.2). The vessels included in the current project were selected based on four major criteria. First, they had to be shapes that were used in the consumption and service of wine. Because dining assemblages tend to be very large, including a wide range of vessels relating to the service and consumption of food and drink (mixing bowls, wine-service vessels, food-service vessels, drinking cups, and eating vessels), the focus of the current project was narrowed down to include only kraters, or mixing bowls, and a variety of drinking cups, including skyphoi, kantharoi, one-handlers, and bolsals.

Of these shapes, perhaps the most frequently discussed is the krater. This is fitting as it is broadly symbolic of the style of drinking that is usually associated with the Greeks. Indeed, the krater has come to serve as a metonym for the formal symposium, a nocturnal drinking party attended primarily by elite males.[142] In addition to the krater, the kylix, or stemmed cup, is also closely associated with the symposium. It is, however, notably absent from ceramic – and especially household – assemblages at Olynthos. This is a significant difference in the dining assemblages found in Athens and Olynthos which may be due in large part to chronological differences. For this reason, kylikes were excluded from this study since a comparison between Athenian and Olynthian vessels would not be possible. Instead, I focused on two drinking shapes frequently discussed in modern scholarship on ancient Greek drinking: the kantharos, a cup with a high, molded foot and high-swung handles that is often depicted with the god Dionysos in Attic

[142] One of the earliest associations between the krater and symposium can be found in Lissarrague 1990. See also Lynch 2011.

vase painting; and the skyphos, a deep, two-handled cup that commonly appears alongside the kylix in scenes of group drinking. I also included bolsals, a shallower two-handled cup with a flaring ring foot and stamped decoration, and one-handled cups. These final two shapes are not as frequently associated with symposia, nor do they appear in Attic vase painting. They do, however, present interesting trends in production and distribution at Olynthos.

The second criterion for selecting vessels for my study was that they had to be illustrated in their respective excavation publications, either by photograph or line drawing.[143] Illustrations were important for this study because they allowed for the confirmation of shape designations. Moreover, in some cases, they also allowed for close inspection of any surface decoration. Third, they had to have measurements (e.g., height and rim diameter) recorded. In general, all catalogue entries for the shapes where a height, preserved height (p.H.), restored height (R.H.), and/or rim diameter measurement was provided are included in the present study. Due to differences in the units of measurements used by the excavators at Olynthos and by those in Athens, all measurements used in this study have been converted to centimeters.

Finally, for the vessels from Olynthos, they had to be from a domestic context. This is because, as we have seen, it is only possible to examine patterns of use for artifacts if they are studied in context. Olynthos is a unique case study for this project because over one hundred houses were uncovered during the excavations led by David M. Robinson between 1928 and 1938. Compared with the numerous, if largely incomplete, household assemblages found at

[143] No images of previously excavated material from Athens or Olynthos are included in the present study due to copyright issues. Instead, where an image would have been included there is a reference to the original publication.

Olynthos, there are few equivalent assemblages which have been identified in Athens. This is because many of the houses that were excavated were not published with comprehensive catalogues of the artifacts found in them (see above). Since a direct comparison between Athenian and Olynthian household assemblages is therefore not possible, the Athenian evidence is not meant to reveal anything about group drinking in Athens. Instead, it is used primarily as a point of comparison in terms of production. Therefore, only those Athenian deposits which fall within the given time frame, including drinking and/or mixing vessels within the parameters of my sample, and provide metrical data (height and/or rim diameter) are included.

2.2.2 What group drinking looked like

Determining what group drinking looked like in Late Classical Olynthos requires an examination of consumer demand. There may have been demand for certain shapes, sizes, decorative motifs, and even imported goods more generally. In the present study, a central question is whether there was a specific demand for Athenian pottery. The answer to this question has implications for what group drinking looked like for the residents of Olynthos, as well as what kinds of dining pottery were produced and how it was produced.

The database for the current project was built in Microsoft Excel. As with the types of vessels to include in the study, decisions also needed to be made about what kinds of attributes to include, how, and why. The main types of information recorded for each vessel, apart from site, deposit, date, catalogue, inventory, figure, and plate numbers, describe each vessel's shape (vessel category and subcategory), size (height, aperture (rim diameter), base height, base diameter), decoration (painted, stamped, incised), and provenance (fabric description, Munsell

color, import/local production). Other information described features related to the production process (wall thickness, height of handle, length of handle). These features also included ones that were specific to red-figured vessels (height of decorative motifs, height of figures). Several of the features recorded in my database, including shape, size, and provenance, have specific implications for what group drinking looked like at Late Classical Olynthos, and particularly how consumer demand affected what was produced. These are outlined below.

Shape

As described above, the dining shapes included in my sample were selected primarily based on their relationship to wine-drinking. Several of the shapes, including kraters, kantharoi, and skyphoi, have traditionally been associated with formal drinking. This is because they appear frequently in scenes of symposia on Athenian vases. By contrast, although scenes of group drinking appear on red-figured vases found at Olynthos, it is not possible at this time to determine whether these were produced locally or imported. Therefore, we cannot know if these images represent some version of reality for Olynthian drinkers or present a generic, idealized scene. A close examination of the distribution of these shapes across the settlement of Olynthos is required to understand the contexts in which these shapes were used.

Size

The size of a vessel may indicate broader social values around drinking. Steiner, Bidgood, and Lynch have all highlighted the relationship between standardized measures and *ison* (equality) in their studies of the capacities of Athenian vessels from the Tholos building and

a sympotic assemblage from a private house.[144] No capacity calculations were undertaken for the present study. However, determining the degree of standardization for different vessel categories may lead to similar conclusions about standard measures of wine. If the proportions and/or sizes of Olynthian dining vessels are not like those found in Athens, it is likely that Olynthians had different ideas about behavior at drinking events, including how much one should drink. On the other hand, if the sizes are similar, then it is possible that Olynthians are emulating Athenian practices since *isonomia* is an Athenian concept. More broadly, it could be the case that all Greeks shared in this ideology, but descriptions of it only survive in Athenian texts.[145]

Provenance

It is also important to consider provenance, since greater or lesser demand for imported vessels affects what was produced locally and how it was produced. In general, consumer demand is shaped by the dining customs of the local community. Greater numbers of imported dining pottery would have had an impact on local dining practices, in which their participants viewed imports as an important if not necessary part of those practices, as well as on local potting traditions. The latter may be detected in close similarities in the *chaîne opératoire* of Olynthian and Athenian pottery workshops.

[144] Steiner and Bidgood 2018; Lynch and Bidgood 2020.

[145] E.g., Hdt. 3.80.6: πλῆθος δὲ ἄρχον πρῶτα μὲν οὔνομα πάντων κάλλιστον ἔχει, **ἰσονομίην** ("But the rule of the multitude has in the first place the loveliest name of all, equality…" trans. Godley 1920); and Thuc. 3.82.8: οἱ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι προστάντες μετὰ ὀνόματος ἑκάτεροι εὐπρεποῦς, πλήθους τε **ἰσονομίας** πολιτικῆς καὶ ἀριστοκρατίας σώφρονος προτιμήσει ("The leaders in the cities, each provided with the fairest professions, on the one side with the cry of political equality of the people, on the other of a moderate aristocracy…" trans. Jones and Powell 1942).

Fewer imports at Olynthos might indicate a greater reliance on local workshops, which would inevitably have provided all or most of the dining pottery in use at the site. If we only find certain examples of pottery traditionally associated with the Greek symposium, such as kraters but not stemmed cups, this raises the question of how formal drinking was defined at Olynthos. If the inhabitants of Olynthos participated in 'symposia', did they define it differently from how scholars have traditionally defined it using Athenian evidence?

2.2.3 Final considerations

Before analysis the gathered data was prepared. Due to time and financial constraints caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, personal autopsy of many of the vessels from Athens and Olynthos included in my sample did not take place until Spring 2022. During this time, the dataset was checked for inconsistencies with the excavation publications. Such inconsistencies were found primarily in the labelling of objects and the measurements (esp. height and aperture) reported by the excavators. Labelling inconsistencies are primarily found in the Olynthos publications; they are both internally inconsistent – a single vessel type may be labelled differently between pottery volumes, such as the bolsal, which appears as both "kylix" and "skyphos" – and inconsistent with later pottery volumes, such as those produced by excavators at the Athenian Agora. Both types of inconsistencies can reasonably be traced to the reports of various trench supervisors, whose data was not standardized before publication. For such labelling inconsistencies, I re-assigned shape names in the Olynthos pottery volumes based on the labels more commonly and consistently used in Athens. This allowed for my sample to be more standardized and more conducive to comparisons between sites and publications.

Inconsistencies in measurements can be found in both publications from Olynthos and those from the Athenian Agora. There were many instances in my analysis of pottery from both Athens and Olynthos where the measurements that I recorded were not the same as those reported in the excavation publications. Most often, the measurements in the publications would differ from my own by +/- 1.0 centimeter. Where I was able to take measurements myself, I have included those measurements in the current project. I was not, however, able to re-study all the vessels in my sample due to constraints on time and funding, as well as the inability of the museum staff to locate some of the requested material.[146] The data was then analyzed using coefficients of variation (CVs), the results of which are presented in Chapter 4.

[146] This was particularly common at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros. It was suggested by Dr. Dimitra Aktseli of the Greek Archaeological Service that in cases where they were not found in the museum, they may be in the collections at the University of Mississippi instead.

Chapter Three

Problematizing the Symposium

In 1990, Oswyn Murray built on his earlier work to provide one of the first systematic definitions of the Greek symposium:[147] an all-male activity which usually took place in the *andron*, or 'Men's Room' of the house, where guests would recline on couches, and which privileged the consumption of alcohol over food. Although he briefly mentions evidence from Greek painted pottery and archaeology, Murray's definition of the symposium, a Greek social institution which he argues has its origins in the Archaic period, is based largely on ancient texts.[148] Since then, the symposium has been extensively discussed by scholars from philological, historical, art historical, and archaeological backgrounds. The definition proposed by Murray has largely been adopted with little critique; however, in their continued attempts to refine this definition and determine what the most essential elements of the symposium were, later scholars have contributed to persistent inconsistencies in the way that the symposium is discussed and identified in our textual, iconographic, and archaeological sources.

[147] Murray 1990, 6-7. This built upon an earlier definition he provided in a 1983 article.

[148] The texts Murray cites include Cicero, *Verr.*, 2.1.26.66; Theopomp. FGH 115 F 204; and Ath. 4. See Murray 1990, 6-7.

This chapter will consider what our evidence - literary, archaeological, and iconographic - tells us about the nature of the symposium in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, highlighting the variations in the evidence which have made it difficult for modern scholars to consistently identify the institution, even though some have argued that a single standard image of the symposium existed during this period. I will argue that these difficulties likely result from the fact that many different modes of drinking are being represented, the nature of which cannot be fully or effectively understood by continuing to use the term "symposium" in discussions of group drinking in the Greek world. The term is too specific, privileging a single mode of drinking (formal, domestic) at the expense of other modes of drinking. This is particularly apparent in scholarship that has assumed exclusive relationships between certain spaces (*andrones*), vessel shapes (*kraters* and *kylikes*), and the symposium. It is also heavily dependent upon Athenian evidence, particularly Attic texts and vase painting, even when the term is used to describe group drinking practices both elsewhere on the Greek mainland and outside of Greece. Therefore, I will propose a new framework for understanding the range of group drinking practices that coexisted in the Classical period. It will be suggested that the archaeological evidence from individual sites should be privileged where locally produced texts and/or images are not available.

3.1 Traditional approaches to the symposium

Many scholars are concerned with who and what was involved in the symposium. It is generally accepted that, as Murray argued, the invited guests of a symposium would have been male citizens who shared wine and intellectual conversation at the house of a male citizen host. Although Murray makes no mention in his 1990 chapter about the social status of attendees of

the symposium, in an earlier article he asserts that "the phenomenon is aristocratic, extending itself into the hoplite class, but not part of the lifestyle of the lower classes."[149] This, in addition to his belief that the significance of the institution lessened in the Classical period, has been challenged by several scholars in recent years. Using evidence from the ancient texts, A.M. Bowie has argued that, in Aristophanes' works, "the symposium is not associated with any particular social class."[150] Kathleen Lynch lends further support to this view in her analysis of archaeological evidence. In particular, she suggests that increased purchase of kylikes in Athens reflects the "democratic-minded man's way of co-opting the trappings of the previously politically powerful - the aristocrats" beginning in the fifth century.[151] Moreover, Lynch argues for a shift away from talking only about symposia to discussing 'communal drinking' more broadly, which "encompasses the formal symposium, but also recognizes less formal group drinking events."[152] According to her, the latter would have been characterized by less formal equipment and less refined conversation and entertainment. Finally, Sean Corner agrees that "the evidence does not support the view that the symposium, in classical Athens at least...was exclusive to the elite."[153] Since, as Lynch also showed, symposia could be more or less elaborate, they were likely accessible even to Athenians of moderate means. Indeed, Corner also notes that plainer symposium pottery would have likely been used by Athenians of lower social classes, and that *andrones* have been found even in some of the more modest houses in Athens.[154]

[149] Murray 2018 [1982], 27.

[150] Bowie 1997, 3.

[151] Lynch 2007, 248. See also Dentzer 1982, 450.

[152] Lynch 2007, 247.

[153] Corner 2015, 239.

[154] Corner 2015, 239.

In addition to questions surrounding who and what was involved in the symposium, there has also been much discussion surrounding the space in which the event took place. Murray argued that the Classical symposium "normally took place in the *andron*;" he does not, however, offer a description of the space.[155] An overview of how other scholars have described and approached the *andron* can be found in Chapter 1.2.1.

We must finally consider the commonly held assumption that the krater, or mixing bowl, was integral to a successful symposium. Although Murray himself has little to say about the equipment used at the symposium, the idea that the krater was the quintessential feature of the symposium was suggested by François Lissarrague in 1987.[156] Lissarrague's approach was significant in that it foregrounded vase painting, while still engaging with the literary sources. Using this evidence, Lissarrague concluded that the krater stood at the center of the sympotic space and was used to mix wine and water at a proportion prescribed by the symposiarch, or leader of the symposium, on a particular evening. Echoing Lissarrague, Nicholas Cahill notes that "the most characteristic vessel in the symposium was the krater,"[157] a view which he also based primarily on iconographic evidence. Considering this assumption, Cahill's discussion of the distribution of sympotic pottery in relation to *andrones* at the site of Olynthos is focused on this shape. Similarly, Adam Rabinowitz used the krater as evidence in his study of the symposium in Archaic Sicily and South Italy because it "could serve as a visual metonym for the

[155] Murray 1990, 6.

[156] Lissarrague 1987.

[157] Cahill 2002, 181.

symposium itself".[158] By contrast, Kathryn Topper has recently challenged Lissarrague's approach, which proceeded from the assumption that the images on vases "were inspired by the lives of fifth- and sixth-century Athenians".[159] Topper argued that, despite the popularity of modern definitions of the symposium, which she summarized as "a communal after-dinner party at which men reclined on couches in an *andron*, drank mixed wine and were entertained, and eventually participated in a komos, no depiction consistent with this definition emerges from the images" that we find on vases.[160]

It is ultimately the goal of this project, and particularly this chapter, to set the term "symposium," which I define here in the traditional sense as an all-male drinking party, at which guests recline in the *andron* of the house and drink was privileged over food, within a broader context of group drinking, which is inclusive of all modes of drinking, whether formal or informal, private or public, secular or religious. The symposium was just one form of group drinking.

3.2 The Standard Image of the Symposium?

3.2.1 Literary sources

Most symposium scholarship uses the ancient texts as its primary evidence for the event. A common starting point has been Plato's *Symposium*, which is indeed an important source for

[158] Rabinowitz 2004, 255.

[159] Topper 2012, 2.

[160] Topper 2012, 3.

understanding many aspects of the drinking party. While there is much that we can learn about the symposium from Plato's dialogue, as with other depictions of the symposium in ancient texts, most of the information that we get concerns what happens at the drinking party, rather than the physical space or equipment that was associated with the event. This is commonly interpreted as an omission based on the assumption that the audiences of ancient literature would have known from personal experience the specifics of space and equipment when they read descriptions of the symposium.

One commonly discussed aspect of the symposium that may be revealed through an analysis of the texts is the tension between its primarily egalitarian nature and its competitive elements. Some argue that the symposium would have primarily been a space for egalitarianism and the forging of social bonds between male participants.[161] Michael Dietler, however, argues that feasts are "inherently political and that they constitute a fundamental instrument and theater of political relations".[162] While they could function at times as arenas for the creation and maintenance of social relations, competition is a prominent feature of each of Dietler's three categories of feasts: empowering feasts, patron-role feasts, and diacritical feasts.[163] The goals of group solidarity and acquisition of prestige are not mutually exclusive because "individuals can use feasts to compete against each other without questioning a shared vision of the social order that the feast reproduces and naturalizes."[164]

[161] Lynch 2007, 243-44. Dibble 2010, 122. Westgate 1997-98, 97.

[162] Dietler 2001, 66.

[163] See Chapter 1 for full summary of Dietler's model.

[164] Dietler 2001, 72.

Therefore, while it is likely that symposia in many ways promoted group solidarity, they were "simultaneously arenas for manipulation and the acquisition of prestige, social credit, and the various forms of influence...that symbolic capital entails."[165] The symposium, at least in Athens, was a venue for tension between the Athenian ideals of *ison*, or equality, and *agon*, competition. This was manifested in many ways. In her interpretation of the increase in architecturally distinct *androne*s in late Classical Athenian houses, Lynch concludes that this phenomenon was a result of wealthier Athenians reacting "to the increased practice of sympotic-style communal drinking by the new democratic populace by increasing the formality of their symposia and by introducing even more obvious markers of status" such as more elaborate dining spaces.[166] Highly decorated *androne*s, in addition to the provision of wine and light snacks, would have not only been a huge financial undertaking, but would have also combined to emphasize and enhance the status and wealth of the host of the symposium. While the presence of architecturally distinct *androne*s in the archaeological record points convincingly to the 'marked' form of group drinking that is the symposium, most of the ritual aspects of the institution are not easily identifiable archaeologically.[167] Therefore, it is important to look at the texts for a better understanding of the rituals of the symposium.

In this section, I will consider what the ancient texts tell us about the social environment of the symposium, including the order of eating and drinking; the donning of wreaths; the

[165] Dietler 2001, 77.

[166] Lynch 2007, 248.

[167] This is a primary concern of Brian Hayden in his own definition of the feast. See: Hayden 2001.

clearing of the tables; the libation to the *Agathos Daimon*; drinking games; hired female entertainment (girl-pipers and hetairai); equality between participants and shared contributions. These features of the symposium which are described in the literary sources are grouped into three categories: ritual, equality between participants, and entertainment.

3.2.1.1 Ritual elements

Ritual is traditionally defined in relation to religion. More specifically, it has been narrowly defined by being equated with "traditional, prescribed communication with the sacred."[168] This association between ritual and religion can be traced back to early theorists such as Friedrich Max Müller, Edward B. Tylor, and William Robertson Smith who were members of the myth and ritual schools and primarily interested in the origins of religion. Compared to contemporaries who took phenomenological and psychoanalytic approaches to this question, members of the myth and ritual schools "tended to see ritual as the source of religion and culture."[169] In particular, Robertson Smith considered ritual to be a primary component of religion, since "religion was made up of a series of acts and observances."[170]

There are several elements of the symposium which have religious connotations. This is unsurprising, as ritual was deeply integrated into everyday life in the Greek world. Among these are some of the aspects of the social environment mentioned above, namely the pouring of a

[168] Grimes 2000, 261.

[169] Bell 1997, 25.

[170] Bell 1997, 23.

libation, the praise of the wine, the singing of a chant to the *Agathos Daimon*, the washing of hands, and the donning of wreaths. In the ancient texts, however, a clear distinction between dinner (το δείπνον) and drinking (το συμπόσιον) is more common. This formal separation between eating and drinking is facilitated by certain ritual practices which have analogues in the sacred sphere, such as the pouring of a libation. This practice is apparent in a passage from Plato's *Symposium* (ca. 385–370 BCE), following Socrates' arrival at Agathon's dinner party:

> "After this, it seems, when Socrates had taken his place and had dined with the rest, **they made a libation** (σπονδάς τε σφᾶς ποιήσασθαι) and sang a chant to the god (ᾄσαντας τὸν θεὸν) and so forth, as custom bids (νομιζόμενα), till they betook them to drinking."[171]

That these actions were indeed customary to this sort of social event can be seen in descriptions of symposia found in other contemporary ancient texts. In an oft-cited fragment from Xenophanes, the author implores his readers that "men of good cheer should first of all praise the god with pious stories and pure words; they should pour libations and pray for power to do the right."[172] Similarly, in Aristophanes' *Wasps*, Bdelycleon summarizes the order of events leading up to the drinking portion of the evening: "Water is poured over our hands; the tables are spread; we sup and, after ablution, we now offer libations to the gods."[173] Finally, in a lengthier passage from Euripides' *Ion*, the order of events largely remains the same, the end of the feast and the beginning of drinking signified by offering a libation.[174]

---

[171] Pl., *Symp*., 176a, trans. H.N. Fowler 1925.

[172] Xen. *Hell.* 1.

[173] Ar. *Vesp*, 1215: ὕδωρ κατὰ χειρός: τὰς τραπέζας ἐσφέρειν: / δειπνοῦμεν: ἀπονενίμμεθ': ἤδη σπένδομεν.

[174] Eur. *Ion*, 1165ff., esp. 1187-1189: ἐν χεροῖν ἔχοντι δὲ / σπονδὰς μετ᾽ ἄλλων παιδὶ τῷ πεφηνότι / βλασφημίαν τις οἰκετῶν ἐφθέγξατο.

In all these examples there is the repeated use of the word ἡ σπονδή, which has been translated as "drinking-offering, of wine poured out to the gods before drinking."[175] The noun is related to the verb σπένδω, which refers to the action of making a drink-offering, although the LSJ definition gives no specifics about the type of drink offered. As Louise Bruit Zaidman and Pauline Schmitt Pantel have observed, "libations regularly accompanied the rituals that punctuated daily life."[176] Therefore, the verb is used to refer to drink-offerings made at table, hearth, or altar, all of which can exist in a variety of contexts (e.g., sacred, domestic, or civic).

Although the term is often used in discussions of religion,[177] such a narrow definition of ritual inevitably excludes non-religious ritualizing. While Emile Durkheim's work continued to center on religion, his argument that religion was a 'social fact' provided the foundation for later discussions of ritual as a social phenomenon.[178] Particularly influential in this vein is the work of Max Gluckman, who "shifted the definition of ritual away from the Durkheimian notion that rite was primarily concerned with religion or 'the sacred',"[179] and instead argued that ritual could refer to a wider range of formalized activities which included but was not limited to religious ones. Ritual can therefore be broadly defined as "a style of action, one that is formal, stylized, prescribed, symbolic, non-technological, repetitive, [and] traditional".[180] More simply, ritual is

[175] Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon

[176] Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel 1992, 40.

[177] See, for example, Jameson 2014.

[178] Bell 1997, 55.

[179] Bell 1997, 79.

[180] Grimes 2000, 261-62. See also: Burkert 1979, 36.

the performance of a sequence of activities involving gestures, words, actions, or objects, in a specific place and in a prescribed order.

Once the drinking portion of the evening has commenced, the ritual nature of the symposium, according to this broader definition, can be further seen in the way that shared contributions to the conversation, singing, and/or gameplay by participants proceeds from left to right. In Plato's *Symposium*, the importance of this procedure is made clear in the author's repetition of the phrase "ἐπὶ δεξιά" at several points throughout the text.[181] In two instances Plato's drinkers use the phrase to prescribe the order in which they will each in turn contribute to the ongoing discussion of love, while in a third it refers to the order of sharing of wine between guests. The way that symposium events proceeded in an ordered rotation whereby everyone gets a turn reflects and lends support to the interpretation by many scholars of the symposium as a venue for egalitarianism and democracy. Indeed, everyone is invited to contribute equally and participate in the events of the evening.

Ritual, then, is a particular way of organizing and defining social relationships. This significant role of ritual is reflected in Susan Pollock's work, where she has observed that, "the entire social act, from presentation of food or beverages to the seating and serving order, the utensils used, the setting, time of day, conversation, smells, sounds and tastes all contribute to the perpetuation of as well as changes in social constellations and political relations."[182] Ritual, thus, both affirms the social order and serves as a mechanism through which the stresses and tensions

[181] Pl. *Symp*. 177d; 214c; 223c.

[182] Pollock 2015, 10. See also: Twiss 2007, 3.

built into the social structure can be expressed and worked out. In the Greek world, and indeed at the symposium, this dual role of ritual is reflected in the tension between egalitarianism and competition.

3.2.1.2 Equality between participants

As has been mentioned, the symposium has been traditionally conceptualized as a communal drinking event at which all participants shared equally in drink, song, conversation, and other activities. That this was the case has already been shown in literary sources discussed in the previous section. In this section, I will elaborate more on the specific ways in which equality between drinkers was maintained, as well as the implications of the common literary trope of the rowdy symposium-goer.

The symposiarch was the leader of the drinking party, appointed by his fellow drinkers to "efficiently oversee an orderly symposion, including negotiating beforehand the rules of the night's drinking...and keeping the sympotic entertainments cultured".[183] In Plato's *Symposium*, the individual who takes on the role of the symposiarch for most of the dialogue is unclear; however, we know that Agathon is the host. It is possible that Agathon himself is the symposiarch since he is the host. However, Marek Węcowski has argued that the symposiarch was responsible for deciding on the ratio of wine to water and for suggesting themes of sympotic conversation in order to potentially limit "the natural influence of the host on the party held in

[183] Węcowski 2014, 37.

his house" and so was usually someone other than the host.[184] Indeed, when it comes to deciding how much wine they will consume that evening, the decision seems to be a collective one,[185] which reflects the egalitarian ideal of the symposium that is often emphasized in modern scholarship.

Despite the ambiguity concerning who the symposiarch is for the majority of the dialogue, at the end of Plato's *Symposium*, after he makes his late entrance to the drinking party, Alcibiades decides to appoint himself as the symposiarch (literally, the ἄρχων...τῆς πόσεως or leader of drinking) until they have had enough to drink, because "they are all too sober."[186] As is customary, Alcibiades dictates how much wine is to be served and to whom, as well as what they will talk about for the rest of the evening and in what order each guest will contribute to that conversation. Paradoxically, Alcibiades also disrupts the norms of the symposium by demanding excessive drinking.

In an article on the role of the symposium in Aristophanes, A.M. Bowie observes that in the plays, "it is as if the natural state of a peaceful and ordered world is an ordered symposium, and the status of characters is indicated through the morality enshrined in sympotic practice".[187] This idealized environment of the symposium is often undermined by the involvement of individuals who shirk the rules set forth in order to maintain conviviality and composure by the

[184] Węcowski 2014, 37.

[185] Pl. *Symp*. 176a-176e.

[186] Murray 2018 [2015], 137.

[187] Bowie 1997, 4.

symposiarch and which are seemingly ingrained in ancient Greek culture. That this is the case can be seen in the various descriptions of individuals who have stuffed themselves and drank to excess that appear not only in Aristophanes' plays but in other ancient texts, which inevitably leads to disruption at the symposium. Although these descriptions are clearly dramatizations, the numerous accounts of disturbances by drunken individuals in the ancient texts suggests that they likely point to real concerns in contemporary Athens. Indeed, one of the major plot lines in Aristophanes' *Wasps* is that Bdelycleon's son is trying to teach him how to behave properly at a symposium. Moreover, this behavior is also apparent in Alcibiades when he arrives at the end of Plato's *Symposium*.

> "A few moments after, they heard the voice of Alcibiades in the forecourt, **very drunken and bawling loud** (σφόδρα μεθύοντος καὶ μέγα βοῶντος), to know where Agathon was, and bidding them bring him to Agathon."[188]

This casts Alcibiades in a dual, if not contradictory, role at Agathon's symposium. On the one hand, we have seen that he has seized for himself the role of symposiarch after arriving late to the drinking party. In this role, as we have seen, he is responsible primarily for maintaining order and temperance. On the other hand, both his demeanor when he arrives (see above) and his insistence that his companions drink more because they are too sober might lend themselves to the creation of a more disorderly atmosphere.

[188] Pl. *Symp*. 212d; trans. H.N. Fowler 1925.

3.2.1.3 Entertainment

Not only did guests at the symposium share in wine, mixed with water according to the proportions dictated by the occasion's symposiarch, but they also were expected to participate equally in the other entertainments which punctuated the evening of drinking. These entertainments might include but are not limited to: singing and reciting poetry; engaging in intellectual conversations; interacting with hired female entertainers and sexual companions, such as flute-girls and *hetairai*; and playing games like *kottabos*.

In most ancient texts describing sympotic events, including Plato's description of the events of Agathon's symposium, there is a lot of emphasis on the importance of the symposium as a space for intellectual pursuits. Among these pursuits are the taking of turns in singing songs and reciting lines of poetry since, as Vanessa Cazzato and Enrico Emanuele Prodi have noted, "the symposion [was]...the privileged site for the competitive display of poetic and musical skill".[189] The close relationship between symposia and philosophical inquiry has also been acknowledged by other scholars and, indeed, intellectual conversations appear more frequently in the ancient texts than do songs or poetry recitation.[190] This frequent occurrence of intellectual conversation in texts featuring sympotic drinking may be due to the often philosophical genres in which these accounts appear.

[189] Cazzato et al. 2016, 1.

[190] Morgan 2011, 267. Lynch 2011, 77. Osborne 2018, 168-169. Węcowski 2018, 257-58.

In Plato's *Symposium*, as well as the *Protagoras*, which also features a brief description of a drinking party,[191] flute-girls are mentioned. However, in both texts flute-, dancing-, and harp-girls are dismissed as desirable forms of sympotic entertainment in favor of conversation amongst drinkers on intellectual topics.[192] In the *Symposium*, the topic of conversation is love; in the *Protagoras*, it is virtue. That Plato mentions female entertainers at all is significant and suggests that they were not uncommon at ancient Athenian drinking parties. Indeed, in the *Symposium*, the decision to focus on intellectual conversation may stem to some extent from the fact that the group collectively decided on less drinking because they were all hungover from the symposium the night before and were uninterested in going through a full symposium a second night in a row. Therefore, their symposium is notably abbreviated, with a primary focus on philosophical conversation. A flute-girl also appears in Aristophanes' *Wasps*.[193] As in the Plato dialogues, however, the focus of the passage remains on the correct manner of speaking in conversation with other guests and reclining.[194]

There are some references to other forms of entertainment that were undertaken at the symposium, such as the game called *kottabos* (ὁ κότταβος).[195] *Kottabos* was played where a

[191] This is probably not a symposium because they are seated, not reclining.

[192] τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο εἰσηγοῦμαι τὴν μὲν ἄρτι εἰσελθοῦσαν αὐλητρίδα χαίρειν ἐᾶν...ἡμᾶς δὲ διὰ λόγων ἀλλήλοις συνεῖναι τὸ τήμερον ("I next propose that the flute-girl who came in just now be dismissed: let her pipe to herself or, if she likes, to the women-folk within, but let us seek our entertainment today in conversation," Pl. *Symp*. 176e, trans. H.N. Fowler 1925); οὐκ ἂν ἴδοις οὔτ᾽ αὐλητρίδας οὔτε ὀρχηστρίδας οὔτε ψαλτρίας, ἀλλὰ αὐτοὺς αὑτοῖς ἱκανοὺς ὄντας συνεῖναι ("You will see neither flute-girls nor dancing-girls nor harp-girls, but only the company contenting themselves with their own conversation," Pl. *Prt*. 347d, trans. W.R.M. Lamb 1967).

[193] Ar. *Vesp.* 1219.

[194] Ar. *Vesp.* 1170ff.

[195] Sparkes 1960.

target would be set up and individual drinkers attempted to hit it with the dregs of wine (ἡ λάταξ) in their cups. Our primary source for *kottabos* is Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*, written in the late 2nd century C.E., wherein the author provides evidence of the Sicilian origin of the game from a quotation from the *Elegies* of Critias the son of Callaeschrus: κότταβος ἐκ Σικελῆς ἐστι χθονὸς ἐκπρεπὲς ἔργον, / ὃν σκοπὸν ἐς λατάγων τόξα καθιστάμεθα.[196] There is also a Classical period reference to the game in Xenophon's *Hellenica* where, when Theramenes is sentenced to death by hemlock, he throws out the last drops of the poison, in the manner of someone playing *kottabos* (τὸ λειπόμενον ἔφασαν ἀποκοτταβίσαντα).[197] Despite the context of this passage, comparison with contemporary images of drinkers engaged in *kottabos* strongly suggests that this activity was popular at fifth and fourth century Athenian drinking parties.[198]

3.2.1.4 Discussion

Considering these trends, several conclusions may be drawn about what the ancient texts can tell us about the social environment of the symposium. As mentioned above, the symposium was an arena where egalitarianism and competition coexisted. This is apparent from the various depictions of the symposium in the texts. Equality between participants was facilitated by the appointment of a symposiarch, who oversaw the strength and provisioning of the wine. The sharing of wine, in addition to shared contributions in games and conversation throughout the evening also served the purpose of promoting and maintaining group solidarity. Almost all the

[196] Ath. 15.665–668. "The kottabos is an excellent invention from the lands of Sicily / where we shoot at a target with drops / from our wine cup whenever we drink it" (translation my own).

[197] Xen. *Hell*. 2.3.56.

[198] E.g., BAPD 212175, New York (NY), Metropolitan Museum: 57.12.21. For other images of the kottabos, see Csapo and Miller 1991; Vickers 1974, 158.

activities of the symposium, however, were competitive in nature. The most obvious of these activities is the *kottabos*, where presumably there would be a winner who would receive individual recognition for their efforts, but even speech-making was competitive as each participant sought to deliver the best speech in the group.

The depictions of the symposium in the texts may also supply us with an understanding of the organization of an evening of drinking. Although episodes of sympotic drinking are relatively frequent occurrences in the ancient texts, depictions of drinkers playing *kottabos*, singing songs, interacting with hired female entertainers, or reciting poetry are rare. It is possible that where they do appear, such as in the case of the dismissal of the flute-girls in Plato's *Symposium* and *Protagoras*, different activities characterized different parts of the evening. In both works drinking does not feature very heavily. Therefore, it is possible that hired entertainers were more frequently appreciated once drinkers were more heavily intoxicated. In a passage from a lost comedy by Euboulos, Dionysus describes the appropriate progression of a night of drinking in terms of kraters of wine. In particular, he indicates that "the second [is] for love and pleasure,"[199] which would correspond well with the hired female entertainers. In addition to sexual pleasure, this may also refer to the pleasure derived from music and games like *kottabos*. Thus, if all symposia followed these guidelines, guests at the symposium would be intoxicated, but not too drunk, when they engaged in these activities.[200]

[199] Euboulos *ap.* Athenaeus 2.36b (= fr. 94 Kock).

[200] In the Euboulos passage, Dionysus claims that "the fourth krater is not mine any more" and the behaviors in the description that follows demonstrate the dangers of too much drinking - shouting, rude banter, fistfights, disorderly conduct, ill humor, and madness - all behaviors that are described in Ar. *Vesp.* 1300-1325 after Bdelycleon gets too drunk at the symposium.

An alternative explanation for the dismissal of the flute-girls in Plato's works is that this was a deliberate choice on the part of the author in serving the greater purpose of the genre of philosophical dialogue. It would have been anomalous to give more space to flute-girls and *kottabos* in these works than to intellectual conversation. Considering this, it is not possible to know for sure whether the symposium was primarily a space for such conversations or if this reflected Plato's own ideas about the institution. A similar problem can be seen in the opposite case, such as in more boisterous depictions of the symposium that can be found in contemporary comedy. While there are some constants in depictions of the symposium across genres, such as the inclusion of ritual elements, it is important to acknowledge that these depictions are not transparent windows into the cultural values, meanings, and realities of all Greeks, or even all Athenians. Instead, they are "overlaid with the writer's own fantasies and projections," and should thus be treated with caution when mobilizing them in discussions and definitions of the symposium.[201] Moreover, there was likely variation in practice across time and space. The same may be true of the iconographic evidence.

3.2.2 Iconography

My study of the iconography of the symposium is based on the close examination of a sample of 132 vessels dating between 500 and 300 BCE compiled from the Beazley Archive's online database of ancient pottery.[202] These vessels were selected primarily based on the subject matter of their decoration, which fell under the Beazley category of 'symposium'; their degree of

[201] Grimes 2000, 262.

[202] In the following discussion, all references to vessels from the Beazley Archive Pottery Database will be abbreviated BAPD.

preservation (whole enough to preserve a reasonably full image of the drinking party); and their Attic fabric. Despite these restrictions, the survey yielded a wide variety of shapes on which the symposium, according to the Beazley designation, was depicted, including mixing, serving, and drinking vessels of numerous types which would have all been appropriate for an evening of drinking, as well as a broad range of findspots across the Mediterranean.[203] There were also twelve depictions of divine symposia, which can be differentiated from the symposia of mortals by the named figures. Among these are Aphrodite, Dionysus, Herakles, and Hephaestus. The focus of this section, however, is on the 120 remaining depictions of the symposia of mortals (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. All 120 depictions of the symposium of mortals in my Beazley survey.

Beazley No.	**Shape**	**Scene Type**	**Date, Findspot**	**Attribution**
204083	Kantharos		500-450	BRYGOS P
203923	Kylix, cup b		500-450	
203844	Kylix	2	500-450, ITALY, ETRURIA, VULCI	TRIPTOLEMOS P
203843	Kylix		500-450	TRIPTOLEMOS P
203721	Kylix	2	500-450, ITALY, ETRURIA, CERVETERI	COLMAR P
203720	Kylix	2	500-450, ITALY, BELMONTE PICENO	COLMAR P
203718	Kylix	2	500-450	COLMAR P
203714	Kylix	2	500-450	COLMAR P
203651	Kylix		500-450	
203647	Kylix	2	500-450	
203574	Kylix	2	500-450	
203491	Kylix	2	500-450, ITALY, ETRURIA, VULCI	ANTIPHON P

[203] Many of the examples of scenes of the symposium in my BAPD survey do not have findspots, likely because they were acquired illegally through looting or purchase on the antiquities market (or both). Therefore, the list of findspots for such depictions incomplete.

202940	Stamnos	1	500-450	COPENHAGEN P
202939	Stamnos	1	500-450	COPENHAGEN P
202884	Column Krater		500-450	HARROW P
202883	Column Krater		500-450	HARROW P
202763	Kantharos		500-450	SYRISKOS P
202693	Column Krater		500-450	
202691	Column Krater	1	500-450	
202678	Olpe		500-450	HARROW P
202660	Column Krater		500-450	HARROW P
202643	Column Krater		500-450	TYSZKIEWICZ P
44070	Kylix		500-450	DOURIS
18469	Kylix		500-450	PENTHESILEA P
12294	Oinochoe		500-450	
9426	Hydria		500-450	NIKOXENOS P
7537	Kantharos	2	500-450	CHARINOS POTTER; TRIPTOLEMOS P
1552	Column Krater		500-450	
211442	Kylix	2	475-425	TARQUINIA P
211441	Kylix, cup b	2	475-425	TARQUINIA P
211440	Kylix	2	475-425	TARQUINIA P
211438	Kylix	2	475-425	TARQUINIA P
211384	Kylix	2	475-425	
209607	Oinochoe		475-425	GROUP OF PHILADELPHIA PH 2272
207259	Kylix		475-425, ITALY, CAPUA	VILLA GIULIA P
207096	Volute Krater		475-425	PAINTER OF BOLOGNA 279
14125	Bell Krater		475-425, SICILY, LEONTINOI	
11176	Column Krater		475-425	
6251	Mug		475-425	
1278	Hydria		475-425, ITALY, CAPUA	
214721	Column Krater		475-425, ITALY, CHIUSI	

214666	Column Krater	1	475-425, ITALY, FALERII	NAUSICAA P
214614	Column Krater	1	475-425	PAINTER OF THE LOUVRE CENTAUROMACHY
214426	Stamnos	1A	475-425	KENSINGTON CLASS
214407	Stamnos	1A	475-425, ITALY, ETRURIA, VULCI	
213698	Bell Krater	1	475-425	GROUP OF POLYGNOTOS
213506	Stamnos	1A?	475-425, ITALY, ETRURIA, VULCI	
213410	Bell Krater		475-425, ITALY, BOLOGNA	POLYGNOTOS
213396	Stamnos	1A	475-425, ITALY, FALERII	POLYGNOTOS
213178	Kylix	2	475-425	
213120	Skyphos		475-425	
213119	Skyphos		475-425	
213056	Kylix	2	475-425	PAINTER OF LONDON D 12
213056	Kylix		475-425	PAINTER OF LONDON D 12
213053	Kylix	2	475-425	PAINTER OF LONDON D 12
213041	Kylix	2	475-425	PAINTER OF LONDON D 12
212175	Kylix	2	475-425	PAINTER OF WURZBURG 487
211994	Kylix		475-425	VEII P
211920	Askos		475-425, ITALY, ETRURIA, VULCI	
211499	Kylix	2	475-425	
9036869	Kylix		475-425	
9012077	Kylix		475-425	
216005	Bell Krater	1	475-425	PAINTER OF THE LOUVRE CENTAUROMACHY
216004	Bell Krater	1A	475-425	PAINTER OF THE

				LOUVRE CENTAUROMACHY
216003	Bell Krater	1A	475-425	PAINTER OF THE LOUVRE CENTAUROMACHY
214816	Column Krater	1B	475-425	PAINTER OF LONDON E 488
214796	Column Krater	1B	475-425	DUOMO P
214792	Column Krater	1B	475-425	DUOMO P
216195	Bell Krater	1	450-400	MARLAY P
215763	Bell Krater	1	450-400	POTHOS P
215441	Column Krater	1	450-400	PAINTER OF MUNICH 2335
215440	Column Krater	1	450-400, ITALY, NOLA	PAINTER OF MUNICH 2335
215408	Bell Krater	1C	450-400, ITALY, SPINA	PAINTER OF MUNICH 2335
215067	Bell Krater		450-400, ITALY, SPINA	HASSELMANN P
31311	Column Krater		450-400, SPAIN, ULLASTRET	MARLAY P
12578	Column Krater	1	450-400, ITALY, APULIA	
10738	Mug		450-400, ATHENS	
218431	Kantharos		450-400	CLASS M; VATICAN CLASS
250147	Skyphos		450-400, ATHENS, AGORA	MILLIN P
217207	Kantharos	2	450-400, ITALY, ETRURIA, VULCI	PAINTER OF THE NAPLES HYDRISKAI
216296	Stemless Cup		450-400, ITALY, CHIUSI	LID P
216271	Stemless Cup	1D	450-400, ITALY, RUVO	LID P
216251	Stemless Cup	1E	450-400	MARLAY P
216250	Stemless Cup	1D	450-400	MARLAY P
216248	Stemless Cup	1E	450-400, ITALY, CHIUSI	MARLAY P
216237	Stemless Cup	1D	450-400	MARLAY P
216234	Stemless Cup	1E	450-400	MARLAY P

216232	Stemless Cup	1D	450-400	MARLAY P
216227	Stemless Cup	1E	450-400	MARLAY P
216227	Stemless Cup		450-400	MARLAY P
216225	Stemless Cup		450-400	MARLAY P
216225	Stemless Cup		450-400	MARLAY P
216224	Stemless Cup	2A	450-400	MARLAY P
216223	Stemless Cup	2A	450-400	MARLAY P
275564	Bell Krater		425-375, ITALY, GENOA	
217575	Column Krater	1	425-375	SUESSULA P
217558	Column Krater	1	425-375	PAINTER OF LOUVRE G 433
217487	Lebes	1	425-375, ATHENS, PIRAEUS	NIKIAS P
217468	Bell Krater	1	425-375	NIKIAS P
31986	Bell Krater	1	425-375	
375	Column Krater	1	425-375, ITALY, BENEVENTO, MONTESARCHIO	SUESSULA P
260191	Bell Krater	1	400-300, SPAIN, GRANADA, CERRO DEL REAL, GALERA, TUTUGI	BLACK THYRSUS P; KERCH P
260190	Bell Krater		400-300, SPAIN, AMPURIAS	BLACK THYRSUS P
260189	Bell Krater	1	400-300, ITALY, S. AGATA DE GOTI	BLACK THYRSUS P
260104	Bell Krater	1	400-300	
260090	Bell Krater	1	400-300	TELOS P
260043	Bell Krater	1	400-300	DUBLIN P
260039	Bell Krater	1	400-300	NOSTELL P
230364	Bell Krater	1	400-300, GREECE, MACEDONIA, CHALKIDIKE, OLYNTHOS	GROUP G
218108	Bell Krater		400-300	PAINTER OF LOUVRE G 521
218073	Calyx Krater	1	400-300	UPSALA P

217956	Column Krater		400-300	MELEAGER P
217955	Bell Krater		400-300	MELEAGER P
217953	Bell Krater		400-300	MELEAGER P
217952	Bell Krater		400-300	MELEAGER P
217950	Bell Krater	1	400-300, ITALY, SPINA	MELEAGER P
217949	Bell Krater	1A	400-300	MELEAGER P
22727	Bell Krater	1	400-300, BULGARIA, APOLLONIA PONTICA	
10869	Bell Krater	1	400-300, ITALY	
8020	Bell Krater		400-300	

Within the 120 depictions of the symposia of mortals, I identified two major scene types and several variations of each. 50% of the images of the symposium in my sample fall into the category of the "standard scene-type" (**Type 1**), which depicts two or more male drinkers reclining on couches accompanied by a single standing female flute-player. There are many variations on this "standard" scene type, primarily relating to who provides the entertainment. **Types 1A** (both a male lyre player and a female flautist), **1B** (a male lyre player instead of a female flautist), and **1C** (a female with castanets instead of a female flautist) all appear on large vessels. **Types 1D** (depicting two drinkers reclining on a couch) and **1E** (depicting a single drinker reclining on a couch and a female flautist) appear only on the tondos of cups.

By contrast, only 19.1% of images of the symposium from the BAPD are characterized as "symposia on the ground" (**Type 2**). This category only has two variations: **Type 2**, which depicts many male drinkers reclining on the ground, and **Type 2A**, an abbreviated version of **Type 2**. Finally, 30.8% of the depictions in my sample did not conform closely enough to either of the two major categories.

Several chronological and geographic patterns emerge when we look closely at these images of the symposium on Attic vases. The chronological patterns I observed likely reflect patterns of consumer demand. Based on the data, it seems that prior to 425 BCE, images of symposia were almost exclusively exported to Italy. Beginning in the last quarter of the 5th century, the destinations of Attic vases with symposia depicted on them become more diverse. While Italy remains the primary recipient of Attic vases even in the late 5th and early 4th centuries, images of the symposium are also found in regions of Greece, Spain, and Bulgaria.

By contrast, the geographic patterns observed in my Beazley database survey may reflect modern issues of provenance. As mentioned above, most of the depictions of symposia on Attic vases in the Beazley database lack findspots because many museums acquired Greek art illegally from looters through art dealers. Only 35 examples in my survey are given a provenance in the Beazley database, and of these most were found in Italy. This is unsurprising since Greek vases are commonly found in Etruscan tombs and many such tombs have been thoroughly excavated and documented. Nevertheless, some significant geographic patterns related to consumer demand for certain shapes and scenes of the symposium can be identified and are discussed below.

Although the number of vases which remained in Athens or were found in other parts of Greece is rather low (n=4), half of these belong to **Type 1**, while the other half belongs to the non-conforming category of depictions of the symposium. The latter observation is significant because only two of the examples found in Greece are found on vessels traditionally associated with sympotic activity: a skyphos and a bell-krater. The remaining two examples are found on vessels that rarely bear images of symposia: a mug and a lebes (Fig. 3.1). Generally, then,

traditionally sympotic vessels (kraters and kylikes) adorned with sympotic imagery are more often used abroad than at home.

A similar pattern of distribution can be observed in the image types themselves. Images of the symposium that are characterized as **Type 2** are found exclusively in Italy. Examples of this type from the Beazley database were produced primarily in the period between 500 and 425, so this is unsurprising. By contrast, images that fall within **Type 1** are found in a much broader range of areas across the Mediterranean. Again, most examples (n=13) were found in Italy; however, because the "standard" symposium scene sticks around through the end of the 5th and well into the 4th century, its distribution corresponds with the trends mentioned above. Finally, those images that do not conform closely to either **Type 1** or **Type 2** are also found in a wide range of areas across the Mediterranean, including Italy, Spain, and Greece. However, in the next sections I will be focusing primarily on the patterns that can be observed in images that fall within **Types 1 and 2**.

3.3.1 Scene Type 1

On one side of a red-figured bell-krater attributed to the Painter of the Louvre Centauromachy dating to ca. 475-425 BCE is a depiction of a "standard" symposium (**Type 1**).[204] Within the first scene-type I identified in my sample, the "standard scene" makes up 68% of the category. According to Robin Osborne, in scenes of the symposium "the norm is to show three or more figures reclining along with one figure standing, frequently a young woman

[204] BAPD 216005, Vatican City, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Vaticano.

playing the double pipes, but sometimes a youth bringing wine".[205] On our bell-krater there are two youthful male drinkers reclining on couches, which is one less than the norm prescribed by Osborne for this period of Athenian vase painting. However, the drinkers are separated in the middle of the scene by a single female entertainer who faces to the right and plays the double flute. Each drinker has his own table, under which the painter has added his shoes. The drinkers are bare-chested, draped only from the waist down. The drinker on the left turns to look at his companion over his shoulder, while holding in his right hand a vessel resembling a *skyphos*, or deep cup. The drinker on the right faces forward, holding a *kylix*, aloft in his right hand, echoing the position of the first drinker.

That there is nothing here that is not standard can be seen by comparing this scene with other similar scenes by different painters in Athens during the fifth century BCE. For example, in a sympotic scene painted by the Marlay Painter ca. 450-400 BCE,[206] the composition of the scene is the same: two drinkers reclining on couches with tables in front; the drinkers on the left turning back to look at his companion; both men in the same poses as in the first scene and separated by a single female flute-player in the center.

This scene-type reflects several aspects of the traditional conception of the symposium. First, as numerous scholars have argued, the attendees of the events that are depicted are largely male, and they reclined on couches while drinking. The fact that this is a drinking party is confirmed not by the inclusion of mixing vessels (such as a krater) in these scenes - only two

[205] Osborne 2018, 181.

[206] BAPD 216195, Frankfurt, Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte: B147.

examples of these appear in my sample - but by the presence of cups.[207] Note, however, that the same cups are not always depicted. While there is clearly a preference for depicting symposiasts using *kylikes*, many scenes depict the *kylix* alongside *skyphoi* and *kantharoi*, or omit the *kylix* altogether in favor of one of the other shapes. A commonly substituted shape is the phiale, or shallow bowl.

Compared with the other vessels depicted in vase painting and mentioned in scenes of group drinking in the ancient texts, the phiale has more overt religious connotations. The phiale was a ceremonial shape used for the pouring of a wine offering to the gods during religious or ritual proceedings. The libation involved two stages: the pouring of the wine offering on an altar or on the ground, and the drinking of what remained in the phiale after the offering was made.[208] Euripides' *Ion* provides a good illustration of how the phiale is both a ritual and sympotic vessel,[209] since it blurs the line between ceremonial object and generic drinking vessel by paralleling the phiale with other types of cups.[210] As has already been discussed,[211] the pouring of a libation was an important feature of the symposium because, as the literary sources tell us, it marked the transition from eating to drinking. It is not possible to know to what extent this practice was taken up in other forms of group drinking. We may find a useful parallel with the modern Christian practice of saying grace before a meal: one might not do it before every meal

[207] 71.6% of the 120 examples of 'symposia of mortals' in my survey depict at least one cup.

[208] Zaideman and Schmitt Pantel 1992, 40.

[209] Eur. *Ion*, 1165ff.

[210] The word ἡ φιάλη also appears in Ar. *Vesp*. and is translated alternately as "drinking cup" (675ff.) and "sacred vase" (1445ff.).

[211] See above, section 4.2.1.1

but reserve the practice for special occasions (like Easter) or in special venues (like at a grandparent's house or in church). The inclusion of the phiale in group drinking scenes on Athenian vases, therefore, does not allow us to differentiate between formal symposia and other forms of group drinking with any certainty. This is because we know that the pouring of libations was used in a variety of contexts in the Greek world, not just at home and in the sanctuary, but also in civic contexts. We cannot disaggregate religious and non-religious practices because the two were deeply interwoven in the Greek world.

This scene-type (**Type 1**) also tells us that it is possible that these drinking events were equipped with tables, since they are depicted in more than half (59%) of the examples in my survey. It is not clear from these scenes for what purpose the tables were used. Occasionally the tables are depicted with food on them, which might suggest that light snacks would have been served while drinking.[212] Alternatively, the tables might have been used for drinkers to set down their cups.

These images of the symposium also reveal something about the kinds of entertainment that might have taken place in an evening, including musical performances, as well as some form of conversation among guests, although we cannot know what that conversation entailed from an image alone. The standard scene (**Type 1**) depicts a single female flautist at the center of the scene, facing right. One variation in the details of this standard scene, which depicts a female flautist and a male lyre-player in the same scene (**Type 1A**), makes up 11.6% of the first scene-

[212] Lynch 2018, 240-41.

type category, making it the second most popular scene. An example of this variation is a scene on a stamnos attributed to a painter of the Kensington Class.[213]

While most of the elements of the scene remain the same as the standard scene by the Painter of the Louvre Centauromachy, neither of the drinkers holds a cup and the one on the left seems to have traded his cup for a lyre. The lyre also appears in yet another variation on the standard scene, where the central female flautist is replaced by a male lyre-player in two images by the Duomo Painter dating to 475-425 BCE (**Type 1B**).[214] This variation makes up only 5% of the total standard depictions of the symposium. A final variation (**Type 1C**) which sheds light on the range of entertainment at the symposium is represented by a single depiction of a woman playing castanets on a bell krater by the Painter of Munich 2335,[215] instead of the usual female flautist at the center of the scene.

In another category of sympotic scene-types related to the standard scene (**Type 1**), painters adapt the standard scene, which primarily appears on larger vessels like the krater, to the more restricted space of the interior of Attic cups (**Types 1D and 1E**). Scene-type **1D** is characterized by two drinkers reclining on a single couch, while scene-type **1E** features a single drinker reclining on a couch and accompanied by a female flautist. These variations make up 6.6% each within the first scene category. One example can be found in the tondo of a red-figure kylix dating to ca. 450-400 BCE (Fig. 3.2). In this scene, it is abundantly clear that it depicts a

[213] BAPD 214426, St. Louis (MO), University, Washington Museum: 3282.

[214] BAPD 214792, Bari, Museo Archeologico Provinciale: 6252.

[215] BAPD 215408, Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina: T897BVP.

symposium, because it shares several characteristics with the scene-types that we have just discussed. We see two drinkers, a couch, and a table. Moreover, the drinkers echo the poses that became popular during this period, with the two figures facing each other in a lively conversation, the one difference being that the right arm of the figure on the left is reaching towards the figure on the right, rather than in front of him. Both figures are also bare-chested and draped from the waist down. It is unclear if the two figures are reclining on the same couch, or if the limited space of the tondo of the cup forced the painter to think creatively about how to squeeze the standard scene into a smaller space.

A similar issue may have informed the decision to include a female flautist in these scenes.[216] 37.5% of the total examples represented by scene-types **1D** and **1E** depict a female flute-player and reflect a condensed version of the standard scene (**Type 1**). This means, however, that more than half (62.5%) of the examples omit the flute-player and instead choose to focus on the drinkers.[217] Another difference between these scene-types and **Type 1** is the vessel that the painter chose to depict in this scene: a plate, rather than a cup. In particular, the plate appears in 75% of the examples of scene-type **1D** and just one example of scene-type **1E**.[218] As in the case of the scenes without flute-players, this amounts to more than half (62.5%) of the total examples represented by these two scene-types. Of these depictions of plates in sympotic scenes, almost all of them include depictions of food, usually in the form of a small fruit held in

[216] E.g., BAPD 216251, Florence, Museo Archeologico Etrusco: 3938.

[217] All the examples (5) of scene-type 1D omit the flute-player, while all the examples (3) of scene-type 1E include her.

[218] BAPD 216227, Mainz, Johannes Gutenberg Universität: 110.

the hand of one drinker. Moreover, depictions of food - ranging from small fruits to entire tables filled with snacks - became more popular in scenes of the symposium after around 450 BCE.

3.3.2 Scene Type 2

Another popular scene-type (making up 19.1% of the scenes of the symposium in my survey) in fifth century Athenian vase painting is one that is restricted to cups and that is characterized by several male figures drinking while reclining on what appears to be a couch with legs omitted. This, at least, is the interpretation that has been proposed by Kathleen Lynch in a 2007 article on the space of the symposium.[219] An alternative view is that the drinkers may be reclining on mattresses on the ground, which may at times be indicated by vines hanging overhead to indicate outdoor space, or by objects or standing figures next to the reclining ones. Since the context of the images in the present study remains ambiguous, they will be referred to as scenes of drinkers reclining on the ground going forward.

Like the previous group, this group can also be divided into 'standard' scenes of drinkers reclining on the ground (**Type 2**) and more abbreviated ones (**Type 2A**). As with the first scene-type category, **Type 2** is far more popular than its variation, comprising 91.3% of the category. One example can be seen on the exterior of a red-figure kylix attributed to the Tarquinia Painter dating to ca. 475-450 BCE.[220] In this scene, three youthful male symposiasts recline, their left elbows resting on striped cushions, and each person holding at least one drinking vessel. The

[219] Lynch 2007.

[220] BAPD 211440, Ferrara, Museo Nazionale di Spina: 784.

figure in the middle holds two phialai, one of which is held in his outstretched right hand. The other two drinkers each hold a skyphos in their left hand.

The only variation of scene-type **2** in my survey is scene-type **2A**, which consists of two images of group drinking on stemless cups produced by the Marlay Painter in 450-400 BCE.[221] Each example depicts four male drinkers reclining on cushions and thin mattresses on the ground on the exterior of the cup. The drinkers are separated into pairs by the handles of the cup. They also echo the poses that were featured in the standard symposium scene-type (**Type 1**) discussed above. Here, the drinkers face each other, both right arms outstretched and both left arms bent at the elbow and resting on a striped cushion. The main difference between the two examples is that in one the figure on the left holds a phiale in his outstretched hand,[222] while in the other scene the figure on the left does not hold anything in his right hand. Finally, like scene-type variations **1D** and **1E**, both examples of scene-type **2A** feature plates instead of cups, which appear in the standard scene of this category (**Type 2**).

Although the basic formula for depicting symposia - men, wine, conversation, reclining on couches - may have largely been followed, the producers of these depictions may have been influenced by what they knew, which may or may not have aligned with the reality of the symposium, what they preferred, and limitations of the genre, which resulted in the variable depictions that have survived. They may also have been influenced by the demands of their consumers and the export market more broadly.

[221] BAPD 216224, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum: 131

[222] BAPD 216223, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum: 93.

3.2.3 Archaeological evidence

The final type of evidence that has been used to support the traditional definition of the symposium is archaeological. There are two main types of archaeological evidence that have been discussed in symposium scholarship: architectural and ceramic evidence. Although the space of the symposium has generally been closely associated with the highly decorated *andron* of the house, definitions of 'sympotic' assemblages have been more flexible. This is due to both a lack of consensus about what the key ceramic components of the formal symposium were and the multiplicity of use-contexts for several shapes, including the krater (discussed below).

3.2.3.1 Architectural evidence

While Hoepfner and Schwandner's identification of an *andron* in every house they studied may have been wishful thinking,[223] *androne*s have been securely identified at many sites on the Greek mainland. In addition to the typical features of *androne*s described in Chapter 1,[224] at some sites, the use of ashlar masonry in the construction of the space has also been considered an important characteristic of the *andron*.[225] In particular, this construction technique has been identified in House 7 at Halieis (Fig. 3.3) and in House B ix 6 at Olynthos (Fig. 3.4).[226]

[223] Hoepfner and Schwandner 1986. See chapter 2 for more in-depth discussion of their approach.

[224] See section 1.2.1 for a detailed description.

[225] Nevett 2009.

[226] For Halieis, see Ault 2005. For House B ix 6 at Olynthos, see Nevett et al. 2020, 358.

A particularly illustrative example of a typical Athenian *andron* can be found in a house from near the Athenian Agora (Fig. 3.5),[227] in which an *andron* was identified based on its now largely destroyed pebble mosaic floor depicting dolphins and other marine life, its raised border, and its off-center doorway. The raised platform and off-center doorway are traditionally believed to be directly connected to the use of couches in these spaces.[228] On the one hand, the raised platform was included to make cleaning up after a symposium easier, and to keep the mosaic floor from getting damaged by the couches. On the other hand, the doorway was placed off-center both to accommodate the couches that lined the walls and, when the *andron* was combined with an anteroom with a centered doorway, to prevent onlookers from having a direct view into the space when a symposium was taking place.

Note, however, that the features - apart from the more elaborate use of ashlar masonry - should all be present when determining whether a space should be identified as an *andron*. For example, directly across the courtyard from the house previously mentioned is another space in which a mosaic floor was found. However, there is no raised platform, and the door is relatively centered in the eastern wall of the room. The excavators of this space identified it not as an *andron*, but more generally as "one of the principal living rooms of the house".[229] Similarly, in an adjacent house, located to the west of the central one, one of the rooms on the eastern side of the house has been identified as an *andron* primarily based on the off-center placement of the

[227] Shear 1973, 152.

[228] Lynch (2007, 244) has noted that "if you are not using klinai, then you do not need these architectural details." Cf. Goldberg 1999, 152-3.

[229] Shear 1973, 153.

doorway.[230] While the presence of a mud-brick hearth in the center of this space may point to the use of this space for consumption practices, especially when considered in relation to commensal spaces in ritual and public contexts, the evidence of the architectural features of this space do not point to its use for formal symposia.

Moreover, it is possible for off-center doorways to appear in spaces that do not necessarily have anything to do with the symposium. For example, rooms with off-center doorways have been found at several sanctuary sites, including the Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron (Fig. 3.6) and the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth (Fig. 3.7). These rooms have been identified with commensal practices,[231] and resemble domestic *andrones* in that they may have been equipped with benches that lined the walls and therefore contributed to the off-center position of the doorway. Due to the non-domestic contexts, the lack of mosaic floors or wall plaster, and the nature of the rituals that took place in these spaces, however - most importantly, that women and young girls were involved - it is not appropriate to associate these rooms with formal symposia.

3.2.3.2 Ceramic evidence

Despite the large body of scholarship which has been dedicated to various iconographic, historical, and philological approaches to the symposium, few studies have considered the archaeological context at length, and even fewer have considered the pottery from those

[230] Shear 1973, 147.

[231] For Brauron, see Kilker 2008. For Corinth, see Bookidis et al. 1999.

contexts. This may be because it is often difficult to attribute function, especially those as narrowly defined as 'sympotic' vessels versus more general drinking, to ancient pottery forms.[232] Most often, the presumed functions of ancient shapes are based on primarily iconographic evidence, and this is often the case where pottery associated with drinking is concerned. Lisa Nevett and Kathleen Lynch have notably taken this approach,[233] relying upon patterns found in vase painting as indications of pottery function and contexts of use. Lynch, in addition to utilizing iconographic depictions, relies heavily on morphological characteristics such as handles, wall-thickness, and presence or absence of covers to identify the functions of more ambiguous shapes.[234] These approaches are central to studies that have associated certain shapes, like the *kylix* and the *krater*, with the Greek symposium.

In her 2011 monograph, Lynch used material from other contexts - including civic, tavern, and religious - to define a 'sympotic' assemblage associated with her domestic deposit. In a discussion of a well deposit identified by Lucy Talcott as belonging to a tavern,[235] Lynch explains that "the extraordinary number of amphoras...and a large quantity of pouring and drinking shapes indicate that these deposits are not domestic in origin".[236] By comparison, as reflected in the two chapters dedicated to categorizing and describing the sympotic pottery from

[232] Laura Banducci (2013; 2021) has emphasized that a one-to-one relationship between form and function can be problematic. Instead, she points out that ceramic vessels may have multiple functions, citing Beth Preston's (2000) 'proper' and 'system' function dichotomy. Banducci further recommends the use of additional analyses – including use-wear and residue analyses – to determine the possible secondary functions of ceramic vessels. However, distinguishing between primary and secondary function is not the focus of my current project.

[233] Nevett 1999. Lynch 2011.

[234] This emphasis on physical characteristics echoes the traditional approaches of Ericson et al. (1972) and Henrickson and McDonald (1983), who proposed that the presumed function(s) of pottery could be determined based on their physical properties and assigned by their maker(s) and user(s).

[235] Talcott 1935.

[236] Lynch 2011, 44.

an Athenian well deposit, her domestic assemblage appears to be more diverse. While most scholars emphasize the importance of the krater as the vessel which was "most intimately connected with the symposium,"[237] Lynch devotes little space to the discussion of vessels used for mixing wine because no krater was found in her deposit. She does, however, recognize the importance of the krater in defining a 'sympotic' assemblage; she suggests that the household must have used a metal krater instead, which, she argues, explains the absence of a krater from her deposit.[238] This explanation, however, seems unusual because her assemblage is not associated with a clearly identifiable, highly decorated *andron*. Lynch may have chosen to overlook this fact as she argues that an architecturally distinct dining space was not necessary to host symposia. For her, then, a 'sympotic' context did not require an *andron* and a 'sympotic' assemblage did not need a (ceramic) krater.

The significance of the *andron* in identifying formal group drinking in the archaeological record has already been discussed. While her discussion of mixing vessels is necessarily brief, Lynch dedicates an entire chapter to drinking shapes from her deposit, which implies the relative importance of cups in defining a sympotic assemblage. Her assemblage is made up largely of black- and red-figured cups, which she suggests would have been used exclusively at symposia. A consideration of the broader distribution of black- and red-figured vessels during this period, however, reveals that this was not the case. For example, we might consider a well deposit (B 15:1) from near the Kolonos Agoraios dating to 425-400 BCE.[239]

[237] Rotroff 1996.

[238] A similar argument was also proposed by Cahill (2002) for the site of Olynthos.

[239] Corbett 1949.

Due to its lack of architectural context, the nature of deposit B 15:1 (domestic, civic, ritual, commercial) remains ambiguous. While Lynch considered the high proportion of drinking vessels in well J 2:4 to be a defining characteristic of its domestic nature, drinking vessels are only the second most abundant category of vessels in deposit B 15:1. The latter deposit has a higher proportion of table vessels than it does drinking vessels. This is significant because in a 2016 article, Lynch determined that the defining feature of the pottery assemblage from a brothel was its "higher proportion of table vessels", totaling 32% of the assemblage.[240] She attributed this significant difference in assemblage composition not only to context, but also to a shift by the mid-fourth century toward a cultural preference for plates and bowls. The same phenomenon could explain the abundance of table vessels in the B 15:1 assemblage.

In addition to its high proportion of table vessels, six kraters of varying levels of decoration (red-figured, black gloss, and "semi-glazed") were found in deposit B 15:1. The presence of a krater, however, does not necessarily indicate a symposium. In well deposit H 4:5, identified as debris from a public dining place in the northwest corner of the Athenian Agora, 53 black- and red-figured kraters were found among numerous fragments of decorated cups, many of which were marked with the symbol for *demosion*, indicating that they were public property.[241] Building Z, which was identified by Lynch and others as a "commercial dining establishment" or brothel, also produced at least five kraters.[242] This broad range of contexts in

[240] Lynch 2016, 55.

[241] Rotroff and Oakley 1992.

[242] Lynch 2016, 55.

which kraters have been found is unsurprising given the fact that a total of over 700 kraters dating between 530 and 300 BCE were found in the Agora excavations.[243]

Lynch has identified the symposium with Dietler's category of diacritical feasting.[244] As we have already seen,[245] for a commensal event to be considered 'diacritical,' it must involve special foods or recipes, service vessels, dining space, and/or behaviors. It is not enough for special types of ceramic tableware, particularly decorated tableware, to be found throughout a settlement, nor is it enough for it to be found in every dining space or every house. It must be found only in a limited number of houses, such as those with clearly identifiable, decorated *andrones*, for it to be considered indicative of 'diacritical' commensality. In the absence of symbolic diacritica,[246] Lynch's identification of a household which participated in symposia is unconvincing. Focusing only on identifying the symposium blinds us to potential alternative modes of group drinking. Clearly, a new framework for understanding the range of commensal practices in the Greek world is needed.

3.3 Discussion

I began this chapter with a definition of the symposium proposed by Murray in the 1980s. Throughout the chapter, I have shown how textual, iconographic, and archaeological evidence

[243] Rotroff 1996.

[244] Lynch 2018, 236.

[245] See Chapter 1.2.3.

[246] As we have seen in chapter 1.2.3, symbolic diacritica frequently involved the use of foreign drink or drinking customs. In addition, they may be "based upon the use of rare, expensive, or exotic foods or food ingredients…the use of elaborate food-service vessels and implements or architecturally distinguished settings that serve to 'frame' elite consumption as a distinctive practice even when the food itself is not distinctive" (Dietler 2001, 86).

has been manipulated to fit that definition, or some version of it, in the decades since. In most previous studies of Greek social drinking, Athenian evidence has largely been privileged.

Iconography on Athenian vases has been seen as a window into the Greek symposium. However, as my close analysis of patterns in depictions of symposia from the Beazley archives indicated, it is not possible to pin down a single, standard image of the formal symposium in Athenian vase painting. Even more intriguing, though, is the fact that a vast majority of images of the symposium that did adhere to a template were not found in Athens, but were instead exported abroad, primarily to Italy. The findspots of these images have implications for how we interpret them.[247] It is possible that the meanings of the images differed between the (Greek) producers and (Italian) consumers: potentially a symposium for one, and a funerary banquet for the other.[248]

Literary texts have similarly been seen as important sources of information about sympotic behavior. However, the literary sources which preserve depictions of Greek social drinking were written and likely read primarily by elite Athenians, and therefore only tell us about the perceptions of drinking practices by that group. They cannot be used to understand the drinking practices of the entire Athenian population, let alone the Greek world. Moreover, although traditional scholarship has sought to relate terms found in the texts to the archaeological record, there exists no clear connection between literary terms and material culture relating to social drinking. For example, although the architecturally distinct formal dining room has been

[247] See, for example, discussions in Osborne 2001; Lynch 2009; Bundrick 2019.

[248] See, for example, the discussion of Athenian pots found in Etruscan tombs in Osborne 2001 and Bundrick 2019, esp. 51-92.

identified with the literary *andron*, or 'men's room', this space is not described in enough detail in the texts to be so closely identified with the square room with off-center doorway and raised platform identified in the archaeological record.

Of the three sources of evidence for Greek social drinking, archaeological evidence has received the least attention. Within this category of evidence, architectural spaces (*androne*s) are mentioned more frequently than drinking equipment. The two types of archaeological evidence have rarely been discussed together. However, the relationship between architecture and drinking equipment is important for differentiating between sympotic and non-sympotic drinking. This becomes apparent when we shift our perspective away from identifying 'sympotic' assemblages, which suggests that certain shapes – including kraters and stemmed cups – were used exclusively at formal drinking parties, to identifying 'drinking' assemblages, which instead acknowledges the broader use-contexts of shapes traditionally associated with symposia. When we make this shift, the architectural space with which the assemblages are associated becomes more important. As we saw, Kathleen Lynch's identification of deposit J 2:4 in the Athenian Agora as a sympotic assemblage becomes decidedly less convincing in the absence of an architecturally distinct *andron*. Instead, the deposit likely represents other, less formal drinking events that utilized elaborately decorated drinking and mixing vessels. Examples of Athenian deposits comparable to well J 2:4 which represent contexts for less formal group drinking have already been discussed.[249]

[249] See section 3.2.3.2 Ceramic Evidence.

In the next chapter, we will look more closely at the relationship between Athens and Olynthos through an analysis of the production of several drinking and mixing shapes. Following this, we will turn to the distribution of those shapes across the settlement of Olynthos and determine what this distribution tells us about the range of social drinking events that co-existed at the site in the late 5th and early 4th centuries BCE.

Chapter Four

The Organization of Pottery Production at Olynthos

This chapter considers how the choices made by potters in what to make and how to make it are influenced by consumer demand, which in turn is shaped by local dining practices. Specifically, this chapter will focus on the production of a selection of drinking and mixing vessels – skyphoi, one-handlers, bolsals, kantharoi, and bell-kraters – found at Athens and at Olynthos. As Chapter 2 demonstrates, direct comparison of the assemblages from Athens and Olynthos and their uses in relation to domestic drinking practices is not possible. The goal of this chapter, instead, is to identify and assess standardization among the pottery from these sites by evaluating the similarities and differences in metrical and stylistic characteristics of their 'sympotic' pottery. By using these criteria, as well as applying anthropological and ethnographic approaches to studying craft production, this chapter will draw some conclusions about the organization and intensity of pottery production in the Chalkidiki; how much Athenian drinking equipment was in demand at Olynthos (i.e., by identifying the proportion of imports to local products); and to what extent Athenian imports influenced local production. Considering these observations, the chapter will culminate in a brief discussion of how consumer demand for Athenian pottery affected local drinking practices. The central question to be addressed in this

chapter is whether Olynthians sought to emulate Athenian drinking practices through the use and/or imitation of Athenian drinking equipment.

4.1 Approaches to the organization of craft production

Discussions of the organization of craft production have a long history in anthropological and archaeological scholarship. In general, these studies tend to focus on the context of production, the concentration of production facilities, the scale of production units, and/or the intensity of production.[250] Most scholars focus on the fourth parameter – intensity of production – which deals primarily with degrees of specialization, a term which has been variously defined. What these definitions have in common is their focus on economic output. Notably, Cathy L. Costin argued that specialization served to promote "extra-household exchange relationships".[251]

This definition is reflected in two major approaches to the concept. On the one hand, among archaeologists and anthropologists there is traditionally a distinction between "attached" and "independent" specialization, introduced by V. Gordon Childe (1950) and further developed by Elizabeth M. Brumfiel and Timothy K. Earle (1981). According to Costin, attached specialists produce "high-value goods for elite consumption," whereas independent specialists produce "utilitarian goods for broad distribution".[252] On the other hand, there is among economic historians a distinction between "horizontal" and "vertical" specialization, which closely follows

[250] Costin 1991; Costin and Hagstrum 1995.

[251] Costin 1991, 4.

[252] Costin 1991, 5.

a dichotomy first introduced by Max Weber (1947). The difference here is not one embedded in notions of hierarchy, but instead in the ratio of producer(s) to product. Horizontal specialization is characterized by a sense of a single producer per product (i.e., a shoemaker makes shoes), whereas vertical specialization implies numerous individuals collaborating on a single product (i.e., employing carpenters, masons, and sculptors to work on a single temple).

To reconcile these disparate approaches to craft specialization, Costin formulated a more streamlined and broadly applicable typology of specialization "by abstracting from previous work general parameters that describe the organization of production," outlined above.[253] Indeed, what economic historians Edward M. Harris (2002) and Alain Bresson (2016) would call either horizontal or vertical specialization would be subsumed under a different category – scale of production, which describes the composition of the production unit – in Costin's framework. Although Costin's approach was at first adopted by some,[254] the concept of specialization has recently been critiqued by others, including Michael E. Smith, who advocates for doing away with the term altogether in discussions of the organization of craft production, since the terms are often (incorrectly) used interchangeably.[255] Less radical approaches to the issue have been suggested by Emma Baysal (2013) and Kim Duistermaat (2016), who both advocate for moving away from the typologies introduced by Earle and others. Instead of using these typologies, they argue that approaches to specialization should be structured based on the available materials and evidence, as well as with an eye toward context (historical, geographical, and archaeological)

[253] Costin 1991, 8.

[254] Longacre 1999; Arnold 2000; Roux 2003.

[255] Smith 2004, 82-83.

and period. Neither Baysal nor Duistermaat advocate for doing away with Costin's approach in its entirety; instead, they show that what Costin believed to be a typology "with broad ethnographic and archaeological applicability" should be used with discretion.[256]

4.2 Evidence for the organization of production

4.2.1 Standardization

Despite the concerns about Costin's approach, of value to this project is Costin's discussion of how direct and indirect archaeological evidence might be used to identify the presence and organization of craft specialists. Although a few studies of the ceramics from Olynthos have been published, the organization of ceramic production at the site has not been discussed at length.[257] This is in part due to the fact that very little direct evidence for production (tools, test pieces, kilns, etc.) has been found at the site.[258] As Costin has shown, however, indirect evidence, taken from finished objects, can "yield information about the organization of production without implicating its exact location".[259] Indirect data often includes assessments of standardization, in addition to skill in manufacture, efficiency in manufacture, and "spatially discrete regional variations or falloff curves in the distribution of particular artifact types".[260] This chapter will focus on the degrees of standardization in assemblages of drinking and mixing

[256] Costin 1991, 8.

[257] McPhee 1981; Robinson 1933a; Robinson 1950; Ault et al. 2019.

[258] Mylonas 1929; Hasaki 2002.

[259] Costin 1991, 18.

[260] Costin 1991, 32.

vessels from Classical period Athens and Olynthos.

Like craft specialization, several definitions have been offered for standardization. In general, most scholars have recognized that uniformity in materials, form, and/or decoration is a defining feature of standardized products. When it comes to drawing conclusions about the causes of standardization, scholarship on the topic can be generally divided into two categories. Scholars whose work falls into the first category tend to focus on the question of efficiency, while the second category deals more with the relationship between standardization and consumer demand. Efficiency is an economic factor that is closely related to time and labor investment on the part of producers. Producers may be part- or full-time specialists; however, higher degrees of standardization are commonly associated with higher rates of production by fewer, full-time producers.[261] This conclusion is largely drawn from studies focused on evidence gathered from ethnographic research. The organization of production in ancient contexts is considerably more difficult to access. There is, however, considerable written, iconographic, and archaeological evidence which sheds some light on the nature of craft production in ancient Athens.

It has been estimated that between 200 and 1000 people were making pottery with figural decoration in ancient Athens from the mid-6th to late 5th century.[262] Philip Sapirstein's work has convincingly supported the idea that the lower figure of 120-200 artisans working in the fifth century was perhaps more likely, and would have included painters, potters, and assistants. If this

[261] Costin and Hagstrum 1995; Roux 2003; Gandon et al. 2008.

[262] Cook 1959; Sapirstein 2013; Rotroff 2021, 269-281.

was the case for a large, densely populated city like Athens, then certainly a smaller city like Olynthos would have had only a fraction of this workforce at any given time. The organization of the Athenian pottery industry ranged from small, one-man enterprises through family workshops to shops whose workforces "probably extended beyond the family and economically beyond the status of a household industry to a dedicated professional concern".[263] It is likely, then, that the artisans of ancient Athens were a mix of part- and full-time producers.

The division between part- and full-time producers maps onto social divisions between citizens and non-citizens in Athens. We know from signatures on surviving pots that many artisans had non-Athenian names, such as Thrax (Thracian), Skythes (Skythian), and Amasis (a Hellenized Egyptian name). As Susan Rotroff and others have observed,[264] some of these individuals "may be slaves…but many were probably metics" who, "prohibited by law from owning land," made their living as full-time artisans and traders of the city.[265]

The task of distinguishing between part- and full-time craft production at a site like Olynthos, where no relevant literary or epigraphic evidence survives, relies heavily on an analysis of the level of standardization in products. In general, highly standardized crafts have been correlated with greater time and labor investment on the part of producers. Therefore, if we find assemblages of objects with low intra-group variability (or high standardization), we should expect that those artisans were full-time producers. By contrast, if intra-group variability is

[263] Rotroff 2021, 275.

[264] Pevnick 2010; Rotroff 2021.

[265] Rotroff 2021, 276.

relatively high (in other words, the assemblage exhibits low standardization), then we should expect the opposite. That is, the artisans producing such vessels were likely part-time producers.

In addition to producing standardized vessels because it is more efficient to do so, another possible cause of standardization is consumer demand. For example, functional items needed for exact or specialized work, such as projectile points, transport amphorae, or ceramic rooftiles,[266] are more likely to be standardized than those objects that are used for less-specialized work.[267] The latter includes objects with attributes considered stylistic rather than functional, such as painted decoration. Traditional approaches to ancient Greek ceramics, which frequently divide assemblages into sub-groups of plain coarse- and decorated fine-ware, reflect a similar dichotomy.

Both Costin (1991) and Barbara L. Stark (1995) have argued against the utility of "gross formal and stylistic diversity within an assemblage" for studies of standardization.[268] Stark cautions against two things. First, she notes that stylistic attributes are often affected by factors outside of the production context. Second, Stark also argues that "different industries may have non-comparable repertoires and uses of designs" in painted decoration.[269] This is not an issue for the present study because, as Nikos Akamatis illustrates in a study of local red-figure pottery from Pella, the local fine-ware products of many cities were "heavily influenced by Attic

[266] Stevens 1950.

[267] Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 493-504.

[268] Costin 1991, 34.

[269] Stark 1995, 235.

models" in shape and decoration.[270] While some scholars have challenged this trend of Athenocentrism in Greek pottery studies,[271] the fact that different regions produced many of the same shapes and decoration during the same periods remains. Consistency in shape may be because most vessels during the Classical period were either produced on the wheel or by using a mold. While motifs may vary from workshop to workshop and region to region, decoration is commonly placed within designated zones on certain shapes. Such 'zones' include around the rim, neck, or base; around or under the handles; in the space between handles; or on the interior floor.

By contrast, Costin's reservations about the role of stylistic characteristics in assessing standardization in a ceramic assemblage stems largely from her focus on economic specialization. This is at the expense of potential insights to be gained about the influences of sociopolitical processes on ceramic production. The reality, however, is that the two approaches - economic and social - cannot be so easily divorced in studies of the organization of production.[272] Indeed, studies which focus only on one or the other provide an incomplete picture of the process of craft production. Artisans do not produce crafts in a vacuum; potters make choices about how certain vessels were made and decorated based on knowledge of the cultural contexts in which they would be used and exchanged. Considering traditional approaches to the Greek symposium, which emphasize that the event was highly formalized and equipped with a

[270] Akamatis 2014, 178.

[271] Pemberton 2003.

[272] See, for example: Rice 1981; Arnold and Nieves 1992; Costin and Hagstrum 1995; Eerkens and Bettinger 2001; Roux 2003; Roux 2019; Gandon et al. 2018.

particular set of equipment, we might expect to find a similar approach employed in the production of so-called "sympotic" vessels.

4.2.2 Methods for assessing standardization

The present study analyzes and compares assemblages of a selection of drinking and mixing vessels – namely, kraters, kantharoi, skyphoi, bolsals, and one-handled cups – from Olynthos and Athens dating between 500 and 300 BCE. Scholars have selected from several analytic methods when assessing and comparing standardization in two or more assemblages. Compared with other approaches for assessing standardization, the coefficient of variation has been recognized as "a stable and reliable measure of variation" in both ethnographic and archaeological research.[273] The coefficient of variation (CV) is defined as the standard deviation of a sample assemblage, or sets of artifacts produced by a single workshop, divided by the mean of the sample. The resulting value is then multiplied by 100 and expressed as a percentage.

Although it has been argued that the CV "relies on an intuitive grasp of what constitutes a 'significant' difference" between populations,[274] scholars have more recently proposed more concrete boundaries defining high and low degrees of standardization in each assemblage. Jelmer W. Eerkens and Robert L. Bettinger have proposed, based on values derived from the Weber fraction,[275] that variation (i.e., CV values) below 1.7% indicate the use of templates to measure

[273] Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 494.

[274] Arnold and Nieves 1992, 107.

[275] Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 494-5. Roux 2003 also utilizes a minimum CV value of 1.7% in their ethnographic study (Roux 2003, 777).

and manufacture objects, including standardized tools and amounts of clay used to produced specific shapes, therefore facilitating higher degrees of standardization. At the other end of the spectrum, variation above 57.7% indicates very high degrees of variability.[276] By contrast, Enora Gandon and colleagues have suggested that highly standardized ceramics may be characterized by CV values of around 3%.[277] In addition to potters' tools and the apportionment of clay, high degrees of specialization (i.e., producing only one shape and size of a specific object) among potters may also contribute to highly standardized vessels.

A major caveat to using the coefficient of variation for archaeological assemblages is that inadvertently lumping multiple size classes of pots may artificially inflate CV values.[278] When I initially began calculating the CVs of the different shape categories from Athens and Olynthos in my sample, they yielded very high CVs (above 57.7%). Considering the relationship between high CV values and the potential presence of multiple size classes within a single assemblage, I decided to break down my larger assemblages into more specific size categories. First, I converted the raw data for height and rim diameter measurements into histograms using Google Sheets (Fig. 4.1). Then I used the size ranges produced by the histograms to create the size categories that were in turn used to calculate the CVs of each shape group. In most cases, this exercise revealed multiple size classes for each shape category in my sample.

[276] Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 494-5.

[277] Gandon et al. 2018, 301.

[278] Stark 1995; Eerkens and Bettinger 2001.

4.3 Data

The dimensions (height and rim diameter) of 351 drinking and mixing vessels dating between 500 and 300 BCE were collected for this study from published excavation reports from the sites of Athens and Olynthos, as well as personal autopsy of selected vessels from the recent excavations of house B ix 6 at Olynthos.[279] In Olynthos, dimensions were measured on 161 vessels (Appendices II and IV), including 40 kraters, 64 one-handlers, 34 kantharoi and cup-kantharoi, 14 skyphoi, and 20 bolsals. In Athens, dimensions were measured on 190 vessels (Appendix III), including 52 kraters, 38 kantharoi and cup-kantharoi, 22 skyphoi, 17 bolsals, and 15 one-handlers. The vessels that have been published were selected based on two criteria: their close relationship with drinking and dining practices and their state of preservation.

4.3.2 Close relationship with drinking and dining practices

Chapter 2.2.1 illustrated that of the five drinking and mixing shapes included in my sample, the krater and kantharos are the shapes most frequently associated with the formal symposium. Very few kylikes were found at Olynthos, and they are found exclusively in burial contexts. This suggests that, although the kylix is traditionally closely associated with formal symposia in Athens, it did not play a significant role in the drinking events hosted in the houses at Olynthos. Their occurrence in burial contexts at the site may find parallels with Attic drinking equipment found in Etruscan graves, which may have been used in funerary ritual (see Chapter 3).

[279] During a research trip carried out in March 2022, I was able to conduct my own close analysis of about a third of this sample, which involved taking more detailed measurements, photographs, and recording the color of clay fabrics using a Munsell Soil Chart.

As we saw in Chapter 3, Lissarrague argued that the krater was an essential part of the formal drinking party and stood as a symbol for it. It has continued to be seen as indicative of formal group drinking on the Greek mainland and beyond.[280] This view, however, is too limiting. We can infer that, based on high levels of conspicuous consumption, reflected in highly decorated dining rooms, provisioning of food and drink, and elaborately decorated equipment, hosting lavish formal symposia was a preserve of the elite. Ceramic kraters do appear in contexts that are clearly sympotic, such as in houses with decorated *androne*s,[281] but they are found much more frequently in contexts that are non-sympotic, such as in the debris from a public dining place in Athens.[282] This may at first seem unusual if we continue to adhere to the assumption that the krater was a metonym for sympotic activity, but it becomes less dubious when we remember that the literary sources tell us that the Greeks frequently defined themselves, men who drank their wine diluted with water, in opposition to those who drank their wine neat. Therefore, it is highly probable, based on the literary and archaeological evidence, that the krater was used in a variety of contexts and not just relegated to use at symposia.

Relatedly, it has been argued that, in the Classical period, the symposium was 'democratized.'[283] This shift was characterized by a widespread adoption of the practice, rather than allowing it to remain restricted to the aristocracy. In the Archaic period, metal drinking

[280] Greek mainland: e.g., Lynch 2011; beyond Greece: e.g., Rabinowitz 2004.

[281] e.g., House A vi 3 at Olynthos.

[282] Rotroff and Oakley 1992.

[283] Lynch 2007; Dibble 2010.

equipment was used at aristocratic banquets. Susan Rotroff has argued that during the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, more people began to use cheaper, ceramic versions of metal vessels in emulation of aristocratic practices.[284] As a result, there was increased conspicuous consumption by elites, including more elaborate spaces and equipment for group drinking. The equipment was not only more elaborately decorated, but some shapes were also produced in metal (Fig. 4.2). As a result, several scholars have suggested, for example, that a house may have owned a metal krater when no ceramic krater is found in a domestic assemblage. While this is an interesting hypothesis, it is untenable since it is an argument from absence, since metal kraters do not survive from the 5th and 4th centuries BCE.

There are a few reasons for this absence. First, it is highly probable that metal kraters were melted down and repurposed in antiquity. Second, they may have been looted or removed from their original contexts of use. The latter argument is employed by Nicholas Cahill in his work on household and city organization at Olynthos to explain the absence not only of kraters, but also "cups and other vessels used at Olynthian symposia".[285] These vessels, he argued, were likely made of bronze - rather than silver or gold - and were carried off by fleeing Olynthians or looted by Philip's troops during the siege of Olynthos. Similarly, Kathleen Lynch hypothesized that if the Archaic Athenian house where deposit J 2:4 was found had a metal krater, "the Persians could have taken it as booty as they destroyed the house".[286] These conclusions are based on the idea that metal vessels were inherently more valuable and desirable than pottery,

[284] Rotroff 1996, 27.

[285] Cahill 2002, 187.

[286] Lynch 2011, 130.

which echoes the assessment of Vickers and Gill.[287] If metal vessels were not being used, they argue, then we should expect to find ceramic kraters, cups, and other service vessels stored in some room of the house.

The shape's popularity in clay in the late 5th century and throughout the 4th is well attested in both Athens and Olynthos during this period. Of the kraters found at Olynthos, 2 were column kraters, 3 were calyx kraters, and 32 were bell kraters. Just one krater found at Olynthos was discovered in a grave; the rest were found on the North and South Hills and in the Villa Section. The overwhelming majority (n=30) were found on the North Hill and in the Villa Section. All but one of these were bell kraters (a calyx krater was found in the House of the Comedian). Nonetheless, the high proportion of kraters found in the settlement areas of Olynthos suggests that the krater was an important part of everyday life for Olynthians in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE.

Like the krater, the kantharos has obvious connections with formal drinking events. While it has been suggested by Flint Dibble that the high handles of the kantharos made it ideal for use in Athenian wells "to fetch water to be consumed on the spot",[288] it seems unlikely that this was the vessel's primary use. A more likely and widespread use-context for the kantharos would have been drinking events. As Marek Węcowski has pointed out, the kantharos was "an emphatically Dionysian prop from the 6th century onwards".[289] According to the Beazley archive

[287] Vickers and Gill 1994.

[288] Dibble 2010, 49-50.

[289] Węcowski 2014, 287.

pottery database (BAPD), Dionysus is depicted with a kantharos in a sympotic scene on over 400 vases between 500 and 300 BCE. While this is not the vessel that is most frequently associated with Dionysus – the drinking horn is found in 59% of these scenes – its appearance is not insignificant, making up 35.6% of the cups identified in scenes with Dionysus (Fig. 4.3).[290]

Most often Dionysus holds or drinks from the kantharos himself, but it may also be depicted sitting on a table nearby or in the hands of a satyr in a Dionysiac scene. The numbers of kantharoi found at Olynthos suggest that the shape was significant in drinking events at the site. Of all the kantharoi found at Olynthos, only 28% were found in grave contexts. Of the drinking and mixing vessels from identifiable household assemblages from the North Hill and Villa Section, 19.8% were kantharoi.

Although it frequently appears in vase painting scenes depicting group drinking, the skyphos was probably not used exclusively for wine-drinking at formal symposia. Kathleen Lynch has suggested that the sturdier forms of the skyphos – namely the Attic-type skyphos and the cup-skyphos – were designed for more frequent, daily use.[291] This would have opened the shape up to being used for a wider variety of liquids or even foods. Indeed, the likelihood of this widespread use of the skyphos is further emphasized by its popularity in the Athenian repertoire. As Sparkes and Talcott have observed, the skyphos was the commonest plain drinking shape, and the second most popular in red-figure after the kylix, produced in Athens between the 6th and

[290] A third drinking shape – the stemmed cup – is also sometimes depicted in these scenes. It is notable, however, that Dionysus is usually not holding this cup in such scenes; instead, multiple cups – likely including a kantharos, drinking horn, or both – can be depicted in one scene. In these cases, the stemmed cup is held by another individual.

[291] Lynch 2011, 79.

4th centuries.[292] Although some red-figured skyphoi have been identified, the plain black skyphos (Attic type A) and the skyphos with a ray pattern painted in a small zone just above the foot (Corinthian type) are the most common decorative schemes at Olynthos.

According to David M. Robinson, approximately 86% of all skyphoi found at Olynthos were found in burial contexts.[293] This includes nearly all examples of red-figured skyphoi found at the site during his excavations. It is therefore unsurprising that few skyphoi can be identified in household assemblages from the North Hill and Villa Sections (approximately 6% of my sample of drinking and mixing shapes). Skyphoi make up the lowest proportion of drinking shapes in my sample.

Given the high proportion of skyphoi found in graves at Olynthos, it is unsurprising that a similarly high percentage of all bolsals found at Olynthos were also found in these contexts (72.2%). This is because Robinson frequently identified bolsals as skyphoi in the publications from the Olynthos excavations of the 1920s and 1930s. This is likely because the two shapes have similar profiles that exhibit a double curve, and two horizontal horseshoe handles on either side of a wide mouth. Bolsals, however, are not as deep as skyphoi, and although both have a concave lower wall, this is more pronounced in bolsals. Bolsals also have flaring feet and, although bolsals are found in red-figure, this is a less frequent occurrence than Attic red-figured skyphoi. Bolsals also frequently carry stamped decoration whereas skyphoi do not (Fig. 4.4 and 4.5).

[292] Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 81.

[293] Robinson 1950, 42.

The formal similarities between bolsal and skyphos may suggest similarities in use. Whereas the skyphos appears in scenes of wine-drinking, the bolsal never appears in Athenian vase painting. On the one hand, however, the shape of the vessel, which recalls that of the cup-skyphos, may suggest that the bolsal was used at symposia or other less formal drinking events. On the other hand, the bolsal may have been used for a wider range of purposes, due to its shallow bowl and sometimes thick walls. Although the bolsal appears in small quantities at Olynthos, its utility can be inferred from its wide distribution across the site. While a few were found on the South Hill, a much larger proportion (22.2%) was found in domestic contexts on the North Hill and in the Villa Section.

Of the drinking and mixing shapes included in my sample, the one-handler is perhaps the vessel whose use is the most ambiguous. The one-handled cup, or one-handler, is so-named because of its characteristic single-handled form, which differs significantly from other traditionally two-handled cups, such as the kylix, kantharos, and skyphos. The thick walls of the one-handler, in addition to its traditionally simple, black-glazed surface decoration, suggests an everyday utilitarian use. Therefore, unlike many other cup shapes, the one-handler need not be relegated to use for wine-drinking, or, more specifically, at the symposium. Both Lucy Talcott and Brian Sparkes (1970) and Flint Dibble (2010) have acknowledged the probability of multiple functions for the one-handler. They have suggested that it may have been used for soups, stews, solids, and/or porridge. Dibble also argues that it may have been used as a ladle or scoop on account of its sturdy single handle; specialized ladles, both ceramic and metal, however, have

been found in excavations in the Greek world.[294]

The high numbers and distribution of one-handlers at Olynthos strongly support the idea that one-handlers were not restricted to a single use-context. Of the shapes in my sample, one-handlers are the most numerous, accounting for 31% of the total number of drinking and mixing vessels found in identifiable household assemblages at Olynthos. Among these, significantly more have been uncovered on the North Hill (n=35) than in the Villa Section (n=3). In the Villa Section, they are found only in the House of Many Colors and the House of the Comedian.

4.3.3 State of preservation

The other criterion for selecting drinking and mixing vessels for this study was that the vessels must be reasonably well-preserved. In examining the published catalogs from each of the sites, this was determined to be true if a measurement for height was recorded in the publication. In most cases, the vessel was also illustrated, either in a photograph, profile-drawing, or both. Illustrations allowed me to confirm the state of preservation of many of the vessels in my sample; sometimes, however, it was revealed that, although a height was recorded, the vessel was still too fragmentary to be of use to my study. For example, although a height was recorded for bell krater **XIII.41**,[295] the corresponding illustration revealed that the vessel was missing its foot and most of its rim, therefore rendering the height inaccurate.[296] In such cases, the vessel

[294] For example, Sparkes and Talcott (1970, 229) identify "two long handles made of cooking ware, inv. nos. 1991-1992, each preserv[ing] a bit of shallow bowl" as ladles.

[295] Robinson 1950, pl. 56, no. 41.

[296] Robinson 1950, pl. 56.

was not considered. Illustrations were also particularly useful for evaluating surface decoration, whether painted, stamped, or incised.

4.3.4 The Olynthos Project

50 drinking and mixing vessels excavated during the Olynthos Project between 2014 and 2019 were also integrated into the present analysis of pottery production at the site. This number is included in the total of 351 vessels mentioned above; however, while I was highly selective in my choices of which vessels from the published volumes to include in my study, I was able to be more inclusive in my sample of vessels from the recent excavations. Therefore, the 50 vessels examined from the Olynthos Project excavations include both conserved vessels, which frequently preserve full profiles, and fragmentary ones. My analysis prioritized diagnostic sherds that I identified as belonging to one-handled cups, bolsals, skyphoi, kantharoi, and bell-kraters, such as rim and base fragments. I did not examine handles unless they were attached to diagnostic rims.

4.4 Measurements

4.4.1 One-handlers

Several discrete size categories can be identified for the one-handlers in my sample. In what follows I will discuss the height and maximum rim diameter size categories.

Table 4.1. Frequency table for heights of one-handlers from Athens (n=11).

Size	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of

category			variation
1	2.0-2.7	4	11.3%
2	2.7-3.4	2	
3	3.4-4.1	4	1.5%
4	4.1-4.5		
5	4.5-5.2	1	

Given the significant differences in sample sizes from Athens and Olynthos, it is only possible to compare a few of the size categories presented in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. Of these, the most standardized size category for heights of one-handlers from Athens is category 3 (3.4 to 4.1 centimeters), whose CV is 1.5% (Table 4.1). The same category at Olynthos appears to be somewhat less standardized, however, with a CV of 4.8% (Table 4.2). Overall, however, the heights of one-handlers found at Olynthos are more consistently standardized than those from Athens.

Table 4.2. Frequency table for heights of one-handlers from Olynthos (n=44).

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	2.0-2.7	2	
2	2.7-3.4	5	8.2%
3	3.4-4.1	17	4.6%
4	4.1-4.5	14	2.5%
5	4.5-5.2	5	3.8%
6	5.2-5.9	1	

Compared with their heights, both sites yield highly standardized rim diameters for the one-handlers they produce, particularly for the ones measuring between 9.0 and 11.0 centimeters wide (Tables 4.3 and 4.4). Overall, the rim diameters of one-handlers for categories 3 and 4 are more standardized at Olynthos (4.3% and 4.2%) than at Athens (6.3% and 7.5%). One might expect more variability with higher productive outputs (n=23 and n=25); however, their relatively low CVs suggest otherwise.

Table 4.3. Frequency table for rim diameters of one-handlers from Athens (n=10).

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	5.0-7.0	1	
2	7.0-9.0	2	
3	9.0-11.0	4	6.3%
4	11.0-13.0	3	7.5%

Table 4.4. Frequency table for rim diameters of one-handlers from Olynthos (n=60).

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	5.0-7.0	2	
2	7.0-9.0	10	8.5%
3	9.0-11.0	23	4.3%
4	11.0-13.0	25	4.2%

Although the assemblage of one-handlers from Athens is much smaller than that for Olynthos, there is somewhat more variability in the rim diameters produced. This is seen not only in the relatively high CVs for categories 3 and 4 (6.3% and 7.5%, respectively), but also in the fact that there are two outliers – 16.9 and 17.6 centimeters (Fig. 4.6). There are also two outliers in the sizes of one-handlers from Olynthos, one from house B vi 8 measuring 5.5 centimeters tall by 15.8 centimeters in rim diameter (**O68**), and another from house B ix 6 measuring 14 centimeters in rim diameter (**OP25**).

4.4.2 Skyphoi

Black-gloss, black- and red-figured skyphoi are all represented in my sample of the shape from Athens and Olynthos dating between 500 and 300 BCE. There is great variability in which skyphoi from Athens and Olynthos were provided with which measurements in their respective publications. For some skyphoi the height is recorded, and for others the rim diameter is given, but rarely are both measurements provided; therefore, this section will focus on the measurement

provided for most examples (rim diameter; Fig. 4.7). The frequency of the skyphoi in my sample according to their rim diameters is presented in the following tables (Tables 4.5 and 4.6).

Table 4.5. Frequency table of rim diameters of skyphoi from Athens (n=38).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	2.5-8.5	5	44.0%
2	8.5-13.5	7	19.3%
3	13.5-18.5	19	7.3%
4	18.5-23.5	7	6.7%

Table 4.6. Frequency table of rim diameters of skyphoi from Olynthos (n=11).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	2.5-8.5	4	4.6%
2	8.5-13.5	5	9.1%
3	13.5-18.5	2	

In general, the skyphoi found at Athens become more standardized the larger they get. The most standardized size category of skyphoi found at Athens corresponds with the largest examples of the shape, measuring 18.5-23.5 centimeters in rim diameter (CV=6.7%). By contrast, the opposite is true of the skyphoi found at Olynthos, whose most standardized size category is number 1 (CV=4.6%). The same size category for the skyphoi found at Athens has a much higher CV of 44% due to its wide range of measurements, ranging from 2.9 to 8.0 centimeters; however, if the outliers (2.9, 3, 4.6, and 6.1) are removed, only one value would remain (8.0) and it would not be possible to calculate the CV for this category. A comparison of size category 2 at Athens and at Olynthos may be more illustrative because the counts are much closer to one another. Like size category 1, category 2 is also significantly more standardized at Olynthos (9.1%) than at Athens (19.3%).

When it comes to decoration, black-figured skyphoi only appear in the Athenian assemblage, and exclusively measure below 8 centimeters in rim diameter. Red-figured skyphoi are more ubiquitous when it comes to size categories, although the majority of these tend to measure above 13.5 centimeters tall. Red-figured skyphoi make up the entirety of size category 4 at Athens. At Olynthos, one red-figured skyphos (**O79**, Villa CC)[297] measured 19.4 centimeters in rim diameter. Finally, black gloss skyphoi are similarly common and found across a wide range of size categories, although they rarely are found in sizes above 18.5 centimeters in rim diameter.

Most of the skyphoi found at Olynthos measure between 7.3 and 13.5 centimeters in rim diameter. By contrast, four black- and red-figured skyphoi from Athens measured below 7.3 centimeters: 2.9 centimeters (**A91**), 3 centimeters (**A89**), 4.6 centimeters (**A87**), and 6.1 centimeters (**A88**). It is possible that such small skyphoi were neither produced in nor imported to Olynthos; alternatively, it is also likely that, if Olynthians were using smaller skyphoi like the ones found at Athens, they may have been disproportionately discarded during the excavations under Robinson because they were too fragmentary to be deemed valuable.

Compared with the skyphoi found at Olynthos, most Athenian skyphoi in my sample fall between 13.5 and 23.5 centimeters in rim diameter; size category 3 (13.5-18.5 centimeters) has nearly 20 examples alone. There are three outliers in the Olynthian skyphoi that fall within this range. These include two examples from the recent excavations of house B ix 6 (**OP46** and

[297] Robinson 1950, pl. 76, no. 55.

OP43, measuring 14 and 17 centimeters in rim diameter, respectively; Fig. 4.8) and one from Villa CC (measuring 19.4 centimeters in rim diameter).[298]

4.4.3 Bolsals

As with other shapes, it is likely that more than one size category was being produced in Athenian and Olynthian workshops specializing in bolsals (Figs. 4.9 and 4.10). At Athens, three size categories can be identified (Table 4.7), while at Olynthos there are only two (Table 4.8). The fewer number of size categories for the bolsals found at Olynthos may be due to the relatively small number of bolsals that survive from settlement contexts.

Table 4.7. Frequency distribution table of heights of bolsals found at Athens (n=17).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	3.0-4.5	3	16.0%
2	4.5-6.0	11	9.5%
3	6.0-7.5	2	
4	7.5-9.0	1	

Table 4.8. Frequency distribution table of heights of bolsals found at Olynthos (n=10).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	3.0-4.5	5	6.4%
2	4.5-6.0	4	9.4%
3	6.0-7.5	1	
4	7.5-9.0		

Although the dataset is very small for bolsals found at Olynthos compared with those found at Athens, some tentative comparisons can be made between the heights of bolsals found at each site. In general, the smaller (3.0-4.5 centimeter tall) bolsals are significantly more standardized at Olynthos (CV=6.4%) than at Athens (CV=16%). The CVs of the bolsals falling

[298] Robinson 1950, pl. 76, no. 55.

within the second, somewhat larger size category (4.5-6.0 centimeters) are relatively equal for both Athens and Olynthos (CV=9.5% and 9.4%, respectively).

The data for rim diameters of bolsals from Athens and from Olynthos is also informative (Table 4.9 and 4.10). One significant observation is that bolsals with rim diameters smaller than 9.0 centimeters are more common at Olynthos than at Athens. The smallest bolsal found at Athens that has been included in my sample measures 7.0 centimeters in rim diameter (**A59**). Overall, the bolsals found at Olynthos are significantly more standardized across all four size categories than the bolsals found at Athens.

Table 4.9. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of bolsals found at Olynthos (n=16).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	7.0-9.0	5	5.2%
2	9.0-11.0	2	4.1%
3	11.0-13.0	9	4.3%

Table 4.10. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of bolsals found at Athens (n=16).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	7.0-9.0	1	
2	9.0-11.0	9	8.3%
3	11.0-13.0	3	6.1%
4	13.0-15.0	3	2.5%

The bolsals found at Athens are much less standardized as a whole assemblage (Table 4.10). The category with the smallest rim diameters (category 2) at Athens is the least standardized for this site, with a CV of 8.3%. By contrast, categories 3 and 4, which consist of bolsals measuring between 11.0 and 15.0 centimeters in rim diameter, are more standardized with CVs of 6.1% and 2.5% respectively. This suggests that, at Athens, potters specialized in larger bolsals (more than 13.0 centimers in rim diameter; Fig. 4.9) while at Olynthos they were

more versatile and possibly produced a much wider range of sizes with relative ease (Fig. 4.10).

Overall, most bolsals from Olynthos fall between 3.0 and 6.0 centimeters in height and 7.0 and 11.0 centimeters in rim diameter. However, there are several outliers in this sample. These include bolsal **O26** from house A 8, measuring 7.3 by 15.9 centimeters; and bolsal **O33**, measuring 11.9 by 20.6 centimeters. Bolsal **O33** is the only red-figured bolsal that has been found at the site.

4.4.4 Kantharoi

Although several discrete size categories can be identified for the kantharoi in my sample, not all these categories are equally represented. The majority of the kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at both Athens (n=34) and Olynthos (n=15) fall between 6.2 and 8.6 centimeters in height (Fig. 4.11 and 4.12).

Table 4.11. Frequency distribution table of heights of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Athens (n=52).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	5.0-6.2	4	6.3%
2	6.2-7.4	14	3.9%
3	7.4-8.6	20	4.3%
4	8.6-9.8	8	3.3%
5	9.8-11.0	4	1.5%

At Athens, the kantharoi and cup-kantharoi measuring between 9.8 and 11.0 centimeters in height (category 5) are the most standardized, with a very low CV of 1.5% (Table 4.11). Similarly standardized are the somewhat smaller kantharoi and cup-kantharoi in categories 4 (CV=3.3%), 2 (CV=3.9%), and 3 (CV=4.3%). A similar pattern can be found in the sample of

kantharoi and cup-kantharoi from Olynthos (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12. Frequency distribution table of heights of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Olynthos (n=23).

Size category	**Measurement range (cm)**	**Frequency**	**Coefficient of variation**
1	5.0-6.2	3	3.7%
2	6.2-7.4	9	5.8%
3	7.4-8.6	7	4.4%
4	8.6-9.8	1	
5	9.8-11.0	3	1.5%

In general, only cup-kantharoi found at Olynthos measured below 6 centimeters (n=3); no examples of either shape type measured above 11.0 centimeters in height at Olynthos. Although there are similarly few examples in this size category (category 1), the CV of 3.7% shows that, at Olynthos, the cup-kantharoi measuring under 6 centimeters in height were more standardized than those found at Athens (CV=6.3%). Like the Athenian kantharoi and cup-kantharoi, the largest size category (9.8-11.0 centimeters) is also the most standardized at Olynthos (CV=1.5%). This may, however, be more reflective of the relatively small sample of the shape measuring over 9.8 centimeters found at both sites than the practices of ancient potters.

The data for rim diameters of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi from Athens and from Olynthos is also informative. One significant observation is that kantharoi and cup-kantharoi are generally more abundant in Athens than at Olynthos. Overall, the rim diameters of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi at Olynthos are more standardized in the larger size categories, whereas the opposite is true for the ones found at Athens.

Table 4.13. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Athens (n=52).

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	7.5-9.0	14	3.6%
2	9.0-10.5	26	4.9%
3	10.5-12	7	4.1%

Table 4.14. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Olynthos (n=24).

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	7.5-9.0	7	7.1%
2	9.0-10.5	11	4.4%
3	10.5-12	5	1.9%

The category with the smallest rim diameters (category 1) of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Athens is the most standardized for this site, with a CV of 3.6%. By contrast, the same size category for the kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Olynthos is much less standardized, with a CV of 7.1%. This size category corresponds with size categories 2 and 3 represented in tables 4.11 and 4.12. In both height and rim diameter, the CVs for these size categories are more standardized in Athens than in Olynthos. This higher degree of variability at Olynthos suggests that these vessels were produced in local workshops.

The size category with the largest kantharoi and cup-kantharoi (category 3), is the most standardized for Olynthos, with a CV of 1.9%. However, as with the heights, this may be due to the small sample size that is represented by this size category. Nevertheless, the difference between the CVs of Athens (4.1%) and Olynthos (1.9%) for this size category suggests that these larger kantharoi and cup-kantharoi are the most likely to have been imported at Olynthos. Moreover, the single outlier in the assemblage of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found in house B ix 6 at Olynthos (**OP02**) measures 17 centimeters in rim diameter.

4.4.5 Kraters

As with the other shapes, several discrete size categories can be identified for the kraters in my sample (Figs. 4.13 and 4.14). There are more size categories for kraters found at Athens than at Olynthos, largely because more kraters were identified and catalogued at the former site.

Kraters with heights under 20 centimeters were excluded on the basis that they were too fragmentary and therefore not accurate representations of the heights of those vessels.[299] Given the low number of kraters represented in my sample after this exclusion, an examination of the rim diameters of the kraters found at Athens and at Olynthos proved more useful. Most kraters found at Athens (70.7%) and at Olynthos (73.3%) measure over 25 centimeters in rim diameter.

In comparing the rim diameters of kraters found at Athens and at Olynthos, several patterns emerge. At both sites the kraters appear to become more standardized as they increase in size (Table 4.15 and 4.16). For Athens, size category 1 (10.0 to 15.0 centimeters) is the least standardized with a CV of 10.4%. At Olynthos, size category 2 (15.0 to 20.0 centimeters) is the least standardized with a CV of 5.6%. Direct comparisons of the CVs of kraters from both sites are only possible for size categories 5 and 6. For both size categories, the rim diameters of the kraters found at Olynthos are significantly more standardized (2.5% for size category 5 and 2.6% for size category 6) than those found at Athens (4.7% for size category 5 and 3.7% for size category 6).

[299] The CVs of these size categories suggest high variability (Athens: 17.24% for 5.00-10.71 cm; 12.56% for 10.71-16.43 cm; Olynthos: 15.80% for 5.00-13.00 cm), which may be linked to their fragmentary nature as well.

Table 4.15. Frequency distribution table of rim diameters of kraters found at Athens (n=41)

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	10.0-15.0	5	10.4%
2	15.0-20.0	2	
3	20.0-25.0	5	6.7%
4	25.0-30.0	9	6.1%
5	30.0-35.0	6	4.7%
6	35.0-40.0	9	3.7%
7	40.0-45.0	3	0.8%
8	45.0-50.0	2	

Table 4.16. Frequency distribution table of diameters of kraters found at Olynthos (n=15)

Size category	Measurement range (cm)	Frequency	Coefficient of variation
1	10.0-15.0	1	
2	15.0-20.0	4	5.6%
3	20.0-25.0		
4	25.0-30.0	3	
5	30.0-35.0	3	2.5%
6	35.0-40.0	3	2.6%
7	40.0-45.0	2	

There are also significantly more outliers in the sample of kraters from Olynthos than those from Athens. Several of these outliers fall between 10.0 and 20.0 centimeters in rim diameter. Whereas those kraters falling in this range in height were omitted from the current study because they were too fragmentary, rim diameters in this range have different implications, since rim diameter can be calculated from even the tiniest fragment of a vessel's rim. The small rim diameters suggests that kraters that were smaller than the average 32.5 centimeters were in semi-regular circulation in Olynthian households. Four kraters from Olynthos measured between 10.0 and 20.0 centimeters in rim diameter: krater **O94** from house A 7;[300] kraters **O91 and O93** from house A 8; and krater **O80** from house A v 2. In addition to these smaller kraters, two

[300] Robinson 1933, pl. 105, no. 168.

kraters were significantly larger than the average, measuring 41.0 (krater **O86**, house A viii 8)[301] and 41.3 centimeters in rim diameter (krater **O83**, house A iv 5).

4.5 Decoration

In working closely with the catalogues of pottery from the excavation publications from Athens and from Olynthos, I realized that there are two major gaps related to production in the scholarship on ancient Greek painted pottery. First, there have been few systematic analyses of formal relationships between vessels of the same shape category. The pottery publications from the excavations at Olynthos and the Athenian Agora are, by virtue of the volume of material included, cursory in their descriptions of the excavated material. Clearly, short-hands and formulas were devised to make the catalogue more standardized and the task of populating it with descriptions more streamlined. This, however, inevitably led to important details about the formal features of these vessels being left out. In most cases, comments are made only about whether a feature (rim, neck, base) is high or low, concave, or convex, moulded or plain. Adjectives such as "spreading", or "bulging" may occasionally be used to describe vessel features. If the handles have a particular orientation, such as tilting upward or downward, this may also be noted.

Where these formal features of individual vessels within a shape category are compared with one another, it is primarily to establish a chronological typology. To my knowledge, at least one study of Greek painted pottery has gone beyond such traditional typological approaches and

[301] Robinson 1950, pl. 52, no. 39.

considered the significance of the formal characteristics of an assemblage of vessels from a production perspective.[302] The previous section of this chapter sought to apply a similar approach to a sample of 5th and 4th century drinking and mixing vessels from Athens and Olynthos. I analyzed measurements of height and maximum rim diameter for each vessel category in my sample to determine how standardized the products of Athenian and Olynthian workshops were.

The current section aims to perform a close analysis and provide a systematic discussion of decoration which includes, but is not limited to, figured decoration. Figured decoration continues to be privileged in the scholarship on ancient Greek painted pottery. Many scholars have engaged in such discussions, adopting and at times challenging the numerous attributions of Attic pottery made by Sir John Beazley. This section, however, will consider the full range of decorative techniques observed in my sample, including slip applied by dipping, ribbed decoration, stamped decoration, and figured decoration. The final category will not only include analyses of the figures themselves, but also will consider more marginal decorative motifs, such as palmettes and meander borders.

Taking such a holistic view of the decoration of the 5th and 4th century painted pottery in my sample will allow me to do two things. First, it will help me recognize patterns in the decoration of vessels both within and between shape categories. Second, considering these patterns in relation to those recognized in the previous section on formal measurements will allow me to better understand the boundaries and relationships between workshops. This, in turn, will help me more confidently identify Athenian imports and differentiate them from vessels

[302] Smyrnaios 2017.

produced locally at Olynthos.

4.5.1 Applying slip by dipping

The first of the decorative techniques to be considered here is applying slip by dipping. Of the vessels included in my sample of drinking and mixing shapes from identifiable household assemblages at Olynthos, only one (skyphos **O74**)[303] was decorated using this method. At Athens, applying slip by dipping was carefully and precisely executed. The whole pot was immersed in the slip, producing an all-black finish marked only by the potter's fingerprints on the base. In other places, like Olynthos, the lower part of the vessel was not dipped at all. The slip left an irregular edge on the lower wall, or it dripped down the wall in rough smears.[304]

Including skyphos **O74,** only twelve vessels were identified by David Robinson and his team as slipped by dipping (Table 4.17). This assessment is based largely on the presence of a reserved base and/or band on the lower body of the vessel.

Table 4.17. Vessels identified by David Robinson as slipped by dipping.

Inventory number	**Shape**	**Context**	**Date**
XIII 326[305]	Squat olpe	East Spur Hill	5th or Early 4th c.
XIII 341	Olpe	House A VII 5	4th c.
XIII 344	Olpe	Trench VII	4th c.
XIII 346	Olpe	House A V 7	4th c.
XIII 354	Olpe	Trench VII	4th c.
XIII 363	Olpe	North Hill house	4th c.
XIII 366	Olpe	House A VII 10	4th c.

[303] Robinson 1950, pl. 202, no. 583.

[304] Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 41.

[305] Vessels from Olynthos were given more standardized, simplified 'inventory numbers' consisting of publication number and catalogue number.

XIII 369	Olpe	House A V 1	4th c.
XIII 390	Oinochoe	N end of North Hill	4th c.
XIII 591	Skyphos	Grave 316	4th c.
V 748	Pitcher	Riverside Cemetery	5th c.

Further evidence of the practice of applying slip by dipping at Olynthos was found during personal autopsy of a broader corpus of vessels at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros, where many of the vessels catalogued by Robinson are now housed. Five additional vessels – all one-handled cups – have features consistent with this method:[306] unevenly applied slip, often dripping down to the base, and traces of fingerprints or marks where the cup was held in the process of dipping.[307] As noted above, Robinson acknowledges the first characteristic on only one of these vessels.[308] He does not, however, connect it with the practice of applying slip by dipping.

Brian Sparkes and Lucy Talcott have argued that "the method of glazing by dipping cannot be localized or limited by date".[309] The frequent use of this method of applying slip on vessels of similar fabric at Olynthos, however, strongly suggests their production by local workshops. The highly standardized form of one-handled cups found and likely produced locally at Olynthos further implies that function was of higher priority than appearance in the production of these vessels. In this light, one-handled cups may have served as exact measures of food or

[306] These are XIII 696, XIII 700, XIII 702, XIII 723, and V 8994.

[307] For example, see **O69** (Robinson 1950, no. 723, pl. 218) and **O53** (Robinson 1938, no. 899, pls. 178-181).

[308] Robinson 1950, no. 723: "black glaze put on unevenly."

[309] Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 208.

drink.[310]

4.5.2 Ribbing

The second decorative technique to be considered here is ribbing. Ribbing appears equally in my sample of kantharoi and cup-kantharoi from Olynthos (n=5) and from Athens (n=5) (Table 4.18).

Table 4.18. Ribbed kantharoi and cup-kantharoi from Olynthos, with Athenian comparanda.

Catalogue Number	**Provenance**	**Date**	**Shape**	**Height (cm)**	**Max. Rim Diameter (cm)**
O13	Olynthos	Early 4th cent.	Kantharos, moulded rim	8.30	10.50
O16	Olynthos	Early 4th cent.	Cup-kantharos, globular	7.70	9.00
O18	Olynthos	Early 4th cent.	Kantharos, plain rim	7.00	7.50
O14	Olynthos	4th cent.	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim, pointed body	10.00	9.40
O23	Olynthos	Early 4th cent.	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim, globular	9.80	10.00
A16	Athens	375-350	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim, globular	8.60	9.20
A18	Athens	375-350	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim, pointed body	9.30	9.00
A21	Athens	375-350	Cup-	8.10	9.20

[310] To date, no studies have considered one-handled cups in this respect. For other approaches to standard measures, see Steiner 2018; Steiner and Bidgood 2018; Lynch and Bidgood 2020.

			kantharos, plain rim		
A22	Athens	350	Cup-kantharos, plain rim	8.50	10.00
A51	Athens	350-325	Kantharos, plain rim	9.40	8.70

At Olynthos, ribbing is found on kantharoi with moulded and plain rims, a globular cup-kantharos, and a cup-kantharos with moulded rim and pointed body. By contrast, at Athens ribbing appears to be found primarily on cup-kantharoi of various styles. Some of these, including the cup-kantharoi with globular and pointed bodies, are also found at Olynthos (**O16, O23**[311] and **O14**).

In addition to globular cup-kantharoi, ribbed kantharoi with plain rims are also found at Olynthos. Only one example (kantharos **O18**)[312] is represented in my sample from the site because it is the only kantharos of this type (ribbed, plain rim) that was found in a domestic context; however, there are several more from other areas of the site.

4.5.3 Stamped decoration

Another form of decoration that is frequently seen on kantharoi and cup-kantharoi, as well as many bolsals, is stamped decoration. Stamps can be useful not only for dating pottery from the 5th and 4th centuries, but also for understanding the relationships between workshops producing black-gloss vessels.

[311] Robinson 1950, no. 521, pl. 82.

[312] Robinson 1950, pl. 190, no. 522A.

Of the 24 kantharoi and cup-kantharoi in my sample of vessels from Olynthos published by Robinson, more than half (n=14) were described as bearing stamped decoration. The most popular stamped decoration found on the kantharoi and cup-kantharoi from Olynthos was the stamped palmette. Stamped palmettes were found on slightly more cup-kantharoi (n=7) than on kantharoi (n=4); the same is true of the distribution of linked palmettes, of which only five examples were identified.[313] The second most popular stamped decoration on these vessels was one or several circles of rouletting (n=9; Fig. 4.15). As in Athens, rouletting and stamped palmettes were frequently found together. This combination appears on eight examples. By contrast, only one vessel was decorated with rouletting alone.[314] Finally, just one cup-kantharos is described has having a different configuration: stamped palmettes surrounded by a "tongue pattern" (**O8**).[315]

Kantharoi and cup-kantharoi are not the only vessels found at Olynthos that were decorated with stamped patterns. Such decoration is also observed on the interior floors of several bolsals. Popular among the stamped decorations in Athenian bolsals (n=4) is a 'palmette cross'

[313] Of the five examples of linked palmettes on kantharoi and cup-kantharoi, two were found on kantharoi and three on cup-kantharoi.

[314] This decorative motif is not uncommon on kantharoi and cup-kantharoi found at Athens. See, for example, P 12690, P 11796, P 12704, P 22670, P 4444, and P 12691.

[315] The decoration of the cup-kantharos is not illustrated in the Robinson publication. Although stamped palmettes are commonly found on the shape in both Athens and Olynthos, the tongue pattern does not appear on kantharoi or cup-kantharoi found at Athens. In a discussion of stamped decoration on Attic black-gloss vessels from a fifth century well in Athens, Lucy Talcott discusses the tongue pattern decoration only on stemless cups (Talcott 1935, 483-486). In their publication of black and plain pottery from the Athenian Agora, Lucy Talcott and Brian A. Sparkes illustrate several examples of the tongue pattern decoration. However, kantharoi or cup-kantharoi are not included; instead, cups, cup-skyphoi, salt cellars, plates, and many bowls are among the shapes represented which have this decorative motif (Sparkes and Talcott 1970, pls. 49-59).

configuration, which describes four stamped palmettes, frequently around an incised circle. An illustrative example from Athens is bolsal **A65**.[316]

The palmette cross and circle can also be found on two bolsals from Olynthos. It has already been argued that bolsal **O25** is a likely Athenian import based on its measurements; however, this conclusion is strengthened by its stamped decoration,[317] a clear parallel with Athenian bolsal **A65**. In addition to bolsal **O25**, there is a second bolsal from Olynthos that bears a motif that bears resemblance to the palmette cross configuration found at Athens.[318] Bolsal **O32** differs both in style and quality from bolsal **O25** and its Athenian counterparts. Rather than the usual four palmettes there are only three, and the stamps themselves are crude and lacking in definition.

4.5.4 Figured decoration

Compared with the other decorative methods employed on the vessels from Olynthos in my sample, the red-figured vessels are discussed in more detail. Robinson and his team attributed these works to ancient painters. These discussions can be divided into three groups: those which provide specific attributions, those which discuss comparable vases in other collections, and those which are believed to have come from the same workshop.

[316] P 23918, Sparkes and Talcott 1970, no. 551, pl. 24.

[317] Robinson 1938, no. 547, pl. 152.
[318] Robinson 1950, no. 668, pl. 212.

Attribution to specific painters

Of the kraters in my sample, three were attributed by Robinson to the "Filottrano Group," or Filottrano Painter (**O83, O86, and XIII.41**). The Filottrano Painter was a prolific vase painter in late Classical Athens who primarily decorated bell-kraters (cf. Krater **A185** from Athens[319]). More than forty kraters were attributed to this painter by John Beazley. Several of the Filottrano Painter's vases were first discovered in the cemetery of S. Paolina di Filottrano, located in the Northwest Adriatic near Ancona, from which the painter gets his name.

The preliminary attribution of krater **O86**[320] was the Symposium Painter and the "Filottrano Group," but this attribution has not been adopted in more recent scholarship. To date, only one krater (no. 34.359 from Mekyberna, port of Olynthos) attributed to the Filottrano workshop, depicting Theseus and the Marathon bull, and included in Sir John Beazley's catalogues, was found in Northern Greece. According to Nikos Akamatis, the Filottrano Painter primarily painted "Grypomachies, symposia, komoi, Dionysiac and other mythological scenes."[321] Depicting a symposium, particularly with a figure with their right arm lifted and their left arm on a pillow, krater **O86** might seem to fit the criteria for attribution to the Filottrano workshop. Moreover, other characteristics of **O86**, including the meander-and-checkerboard pattern below the figures of the scene and the use of added white are also consistent with

[319] Not illustrated in Moore 1997. For description, see Moore 1997, no. 526.

[320] Robinson 1950, pl. 52, no. 39.

[321] Akamatis 2019, 91.

decorative motifs used by the Filottrano workshop.[322]

Robinson, of course, was not the only person to make such attributions. Several decades later, Ian McPhee attributed the one red-figured bolsal found during the excavations at Olynthos (**O33**) to the Bolsal Painter.[323] In total, McPhee only attributed three vessels to this painter: one skyphos, one bolsal, and one fragment, possibly from an oinochoe. The female protome with peaked, Phrygian cap, "wavy locks at the neck, and curls over forehead" were deemed the most characteristic features of the work of the Bolsal Painter.[324] Because so few vessels have been attributed to this painter, and because no red-figured bolsals were found at Athens, it is not possible to determine at this time whether this attribution holds up.

Attribution by comparison

Where exact attributions were not possible, Robinson often included commentary on vessels that were closely related in style from other collections. For example, when discussing krater **O95**,[325] he compared the shape of the vase to "the early work of the Hippolytus

[322] Two additional kraters were identified with the Filottrano Painter by Robinson: krater 41 (Fig. 4.25) and krater 36 (Fig. 4.26). Of the three kraters, krater 36 seems the most likely to have been produced by the Athenian workshop, due to the Dionysiac scene and the rendering of the nude upper body of one of the maenads in added white, a particular characteristic of the Filottrano workshop's style.

[323] McPhee 1931, 305. For images of the bolsal, see Robinson 1938, no. 273, pl. 123.

[324] McPhee 1981, 305.

[325] Robinson 1950, pl. 36, no. 27.

Painter."[326]

According to Schefold, the Hippolytus Painter was one of the leading masters of the early Kerch style of Athenian vase painting, which may be dated to around 370-60 BCE. The Kerch style is generally characterized by slender figures and the use of added white, yellow, and red in their compositions. The Filottrano Painter and his workshop, which was discussed at length above, is considered to have produced vase painting in this style. This is likely because of the Painter's frequent use of added white to depict the exposed body parts, such as a shoulder, hand, face, or foot, of female figures in symposium scenes. It is possible that Robinson compared krater **O95** to the work of the Hippolytus Painter for a similar reason. Indeed, added white is used on this krater to depict columns in the background of the scenes. The use of added white, however, is not enough alone to differentiate between the many painters and workshops that are included under the heading 'Kerch style'.

Identifying workshops

Sometimes, when neither a specific attribution nor a compelling comparison to vessels in other collections could be made, Robinson acknowledged the possibility that certain red-figured vessels could have been decorated by the same painter. This was the case with kraters **O80,**[327]

[326] Robinson 1950, 82. In addition, several kraters from Olynthos have also been attributed to Group G (e.g., krater no. 37, Robinson 1950), the Black Thyrsus Painter (red-figure fragment no. 361, Robinson 1933), and the Painter of Montesarchio.

[327] Robinson 1950, pl. 41, no. 32.

O81,[328] **and O82**,[329] which he suggested might have been decorated by the same painter as krater **O95** (whose work Robinson compared with the Hippolytus Painter).

4.6 Distinguishing imports and local products

Overall, out of the 161 vessels sampled from the settlement at Olynthos, 16 are likely to have been imported based on measurements alone. These vessels were identified as outliers in either height or rim diameter (Table 4.19). Since only 16 imports could be identified, it is likely that most of the drinking and mixing vessels from Olynthos were locally produced, spanning all five shape categories represented in my study. The small proportion (9.9%) of potential imports is comprised mostly of drinking and mixing vessels measuring more than 14 centimeters in rim diameter, suggesting that locally produced vessels tended to be on the smaller side.

Table 4.19. Vessels identified as outliers in either height or rim diameter.

Catalogue No.	Shape	Height (cm)	Rim Diameter (cm)
O68	One-handler		15.8
OP25	One-handler		14
O79	Skyphos (RF)		19.4
OP46	Skyphos		14
OP43	Skyphos	15.4	17
O26	Bolsal		15.9
O33	Bolsal (RF)		20.6
OP15	Bolsal		14
OP02	Kantharos		17
O94	Bell-krater		11
O91	Bell-krater		17
O80	Bell-krater		18
O93	Bell-krater		19
O86	Bell-krater		41
O83	Bell-krater		41.3

[328] Robinson 1950, pl. 41, no. 33.

[329] Robinson 1950, pl. 42, no. 35. Robinson 1950, p. 89: krater **35** (**O82**) is "probably by the same painter as nos. 27, 28, 32, 33". Note that krater 28 is not included in the present study because it is not from a domestic context.

OP50	Bell-krater	30.5	28.5

Analyzing height and rim diameter, however, is not enough alone to distinguish between Athenian imports and local products with any degree of certainty. Patterns in height and rim diameter might suggest that certain vessels were imports, such as when there are clear outliers in the dataset. However, when patterns in decoration and clay fabrics are also considered alongside those observed in measurements, the relationship between outliers and workshops becomes more complex.

In an early analysis of red-figure vases from the Chalkidiki, Ian McPhee noted several characteristics of Olynthian vessels that made it possible to differentiate them from Athenian ones. Regarding the fabric of the vases from Olynthos, McPhee states that "the colour of the fired clay varies from a light brown to a reddish-yellow (Munsell 7.5 YR 6/4-6, 7/6)".[330] Such an observation is confirmed by my own personal autopsy of a selection of vessels from the site, where the reddish-yellow clay of locally produced vessels stands in stark contrast with the redder clay of Athenian wares. Despite these observations, as well as those made by Robinson and his team (see below), no formal, scientific analysis of the clay fabrics of the pottery found at Olynthos has been undertaken.

4.6.1 Imported vessels

[330] McPhee 1981, 297.

If all the outliers identified in my analysis of the measurements of drinking and mixing vessels found at Olynthos are imported from Athens, then we should expect them to all have red clay. To be sure, several examples, which include both outliers and non-outliers in size, fell into this fabric category.

Bolsal **O25** (Fig. 4.20) is likely an Athenian import because it is one of three outliers in rim diameter (ca. 11.40 centimeters). Its size and overall form are comparable to several examples from Athens (Table 4.20). This is unsurprising, since the CVs for height size category 2 for both Athens and Olynthos are nearly equal (9.5% and 9.4%, respectively). Moreover, the color of its clay is redder than most local products (Munsell 10 R 6/6-5/6 (light red-red)), further suggesting its Athenian manufacture.

Table 4.20. Bolsals from Athens comparable in size to bolsal **O25** from Olynthos.

Catalogue Number	**Shape**	**Date**	**Height (cm)**	**Max. Rim Diameter (cm)**
A58	Bolsal	420	5.20	10.80
A60	Bolsal	420	5.70	12.40
A64	Bolsal	420-400	5.70	11.00
A66	Bolsal	425-400	5.70	11.50
A69	Bolsal	380-350	5.30	10.90

So far only one comparable example from a settlement context at Olynthos has been identified. Bolsal **O29** measures approximately 5.3 centimeters tall by 10.60 centimeters in rim diameter.[331] The form of **O29** differs slightly from **O25**, however: it presents a taller foot with a more pronounced concave lower wall and horizontal handles which rise above the level of the rim, rather than parallel with it as in **O25**.

[331] Robinson 1950, pl. 208, no. 658.

Although Sparkes and Talcott note that there was much experimentation in the third quarter of the 5th century BCE with the forms of the foot and occasionally the handles, they conclude that "the concave shape of the lower part of the wall is a difficult factor to assess…and indeed there were many varieties of it in the late 5th century which seem to signify neither workshop nor chronological differences".[332] The situation, it seems, remains largely unchanged into the 4th century. Based on close parallels in **A62**[333] and **A63**,[334] it seems likely that the two forms of the bolsal were contemporary and date to the late 5th century BCE.

Similar conclusions can be drawn for several cup-kantharoi with moulded rims found at Olynthos. Cup-kantharos **O3** measures 7.0 centimeters tall by 9.0 centimeters in rim diameter.[335] Somewhat wider than **O3**, a second cup-kantharos, **O6**, measures 7.0 centimeters by 9.5 centimeters.[336] Finally, an additional cup-kantharos (**O4**)[337] presents similar measurements, measuring 6.7 centimeters tall by 9.8 centimeters in rim diameter. All three of these vessels fall within size category 2 for rim diameters. Significantly, as observed with the bolsals discussed above, the CVs calculated for cup-kantharoi found at Athens and at Olynthos that fall within this size category are comparable (4.9% and 4.4% respectively).

[332] Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 107.

[333] P 23898, Sparkes and Talcott 1970, no. 548, pls. 24 and 53.

[334] P 21359, Sparkes and Talcott 1970, no. 549, pls. 24 and 53.

[335] Robinson 1950, no. 504, pl. 183.

[336] Robinson 1950, no. 509, pl. 82.

[337] Robinson 1950, no. 505, pl. 183.

Close analysis of the decoration and clay fabrics of these cup-kantharoi further suggests that they were imported to Olynthos from Athens. Specifically, there are significant similarities in the decoration used on cup-kantharoi **O3** and **O6**. Both cup-kantharoi are decorated with stamped decoration of six linked palmettes encircled by several bands of rouletting on the interior floor. Although the decoration cannot be determined as a large portion of the floor is missing, it is possible that a third cup-kantharos with moulded rim (**O4**) was produced by the same workshop. Finally, all three cup-kantharoi found at Olynthos are identified as 'light red' on the Munsell soil chart (Table 4.21).

Table 4.21. A selection of cup-kantharoi analyzed at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros, with Munsell readings.

Catalogue number	**Shape**	**Height (cm)**	**Rim diameter (cm)**	**Munsell**
O3	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim	7.0	9.0	7/6-6/6 2.5 YR (light red)
O4	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim	6.7	9.8	6/6 10 R (light red)
O6	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim	7.0	9.5	6/6 2.5 YR (light red)

These Munsell readings are significant because, as McPhee observed, vessels produced locally in the Chalkidiki almost always have clays that are 'reddish-yellow' (which may appear 'orange'). A comparison with an Athenian cup-kantharos with moulded rim illustrates close similarity in the color of the clay, in addition to overall form (**A1;**[338] **A7; A12**).

In addition to the fabric observations made during my personal autopsy of vessels found at Olynthos, the fabric designations included in the pottery publications from Olynthos should

[338] P 26063, Sparkes and Talcott 1970, no. 652, pl. 28, fig. 7.

also be considered. This examination illustrates why re-evaluation of the fabrics is necessary. Although Robinson indicates that several kraters found at Olynthos were Athenian imports,[339] only three are given fabric descriptions. However, these descriptions are inconsistent: **O86** is "reddish buff", **O87** is "brownish buff", and **XIII.41**[340] is "reddish brown".

The "buff" description of two of the kraters identified by Robinson as Athenian imports (**O86**, "reddish buff"; **O87**, "brownish buff") might suggest local production. This is because it is relatively close to the reddish-yellow color that frequently appears in Munsell readings of locally produced vessels found at Olynthos as described by McPhee (see above). However, this relationship is not always so straightforward. For example, as discussed above, three cup-kantharoi with moulded rims might be likely candidates as Athenian imports based on fabric color alone (light red; Table 4.22). Robinson's descriptions of the fabrics of these cup-kantharoi (all "reddish-buff"), however, if we accept the logic above, would correspond with the reddish-yellow color more typical of local products. The measurements and stamped decoration of these vessels, in addition to their fabric color, combine to strengthen the conclusion that they were probably imported from Athens (see above).

Table 4.22. A selection of cup-kantharoi analyzed at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros, with Munsell readings and Robinson fabric descriptions.

Catalogue number	**Shape**	**Munsell reading**	**Robinson's description**
O3	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim	7/6-6/6 2.5 YR (light red)	Reddish buff
O4	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim	6/6 10 R (light red)	Reddish buff
O6	Cup-kantharos, moulded rim	6/6 2.5 YR (light red)	Reddish buff

[339] Nos. 39 (**O86**), 40 (**O87**), 41, 130, 142, 306

[340] Krater **XIII.41** was not given a catalogue number in the present study because it is not well enough preserved to provide accurate measurements of its height and/or rim diameter.

Given its "reddish buff" fabric, a color also used to describe the fabrics of cup-kantharoi **O3, O4**, and **O6**, it is likely that krater **O86** was correctly identified by Robinson as an Athenian import.[341] On the one hand, its rim diameter (41 centimeters) is a clear outlier in my sample of kraters from Olynthos, which generally tend to fall between 25 and 40 centimeters in rim diameter. On the other hand, it is probable that krater **O86** was produced by a potter and/or painter in the Filottrano workshop in Athens. This is because it shares several decorative characteristics with this workshop, as well as the subject of its main figural scene. Krater **O83**, which is another outlier in rim diameter (41.3 centimeters), is similar in decoration to the work of the Filottrano workshop and is described as having "red-buff to brown-buff" clay. It is likely that **O83** is another krater found at Olynthos that was imported from Athens. Moreover, krater **O83** is one of 7 red-figured kraters found at Olynthos that preserves evidence of mending in antiquity.

In addition to bolsals **O25** and **O29**, and kraters **O86** and **O83**, there are two other vessels in my sample – bolsal **OP15** and skyphos **OP43** – which were probably imported from Athens. We may be reasonably certain that the bolsals and kraters discussed in this section were imports based on their fabric color, in addition to measurements and decoration comparable to those found in Athens. For bolsal **OP15** and skyphos **OP43**, there are fewer features which certainly indicate that they were produced in Athenian workshops: their status as outliers in their respective shape categories and the color of their clay.[342]

[341] In the same vein, one-handler **O68** may also be an Athenian import, given its status as an outlier and designation as "reddish buff" by Robinson.

[342] The Munsell reading for bolsal OP15 is 6/8 2.5 YR (light red); for skyphos OP43 it is 5/6 2.5 YR (red) with a reddish-gray core.

4.6.2 Local products

Next, we must consider what characteristics point to local production. Although it is tempting to identify all outliers in rim diameter and height as imports, upon closer inspection, such a relationship is not so simple. The identification of local products comes down to the color of the clay fabric. As we have seen, the Munsell color most often associated with vessels made locally at Olynthos is "reddish-yellow."

Table 4.23. Selection of one-handlers analyzed at the Archaeological Museum of Polygyros.

Catalogue number	**Shape**	**Date**	**Height (cm)**	**Rim diameter (cm)**	**Munsell**
O39	One-handler	Early 4th c.	4.00	10.70	2.5 YR 6/4 (light reddish brown)
O35	One-handler	400	3.70	10.10	5 YR 6/6 (reddish yellow)
O36	One-handler	Late 5th/ Early 4th cent.	3.10	8.50	5 YR 6/6 (reddish yellow)
O40	One-handler	Early 4th cent.	3.90	10.40	5 YR 6/6-5/6 (reddish yellow – yellowish red)
O37	One-handler	Early 4th cent.	2.20	5.70	10 R 5/6 (red)
O54	One-handler	4th cent.	4.60	10.50	7.5 YR 6/3-6 (light yellowish brown)
O68	One-handler	Early 4th cent.	5.10	Est. 14.90	10 R 5/6 (red)
O112	One-handler		5.10	14.90	5 YR 5/4-1 (reddish brown – gray)
O53	One-handler	4th cent.	3.60	10.00	5 YR 6/6 (reddish yellow)
O69	One-handler	Early 4th cent.	3.60	10.20	5 YR 5/4-6 (reddish brown – yellowish red)

The color of the clay of most one-handlers in my sample from Olynthos is reddish-yellow

(Munsell 5 YR 6/6; Table 4.23), which suggests that they were locally produced.[343] This is particularly interesting when one considers how several of these examples were also highly standardized in size and form, especially one-handlers **O35, O53, O40,** and **O69**. Only minor differences can be identified. One difference is distinctly chronological: fourth century examples of the shape are characterized by a more pronounced outturned rim than fifth century ones. For example, we might compare **O35** (c. 400 BCE)[344] with **O40** (early 4th century BCE).[345]

A second difference may have more to do with differences in individual or workshop techniques. Base diameters of one-handlers from Olynthos are especially illuminating in this respect. Along with height and rim diameter, base diameter is also highly standardized among the one-handlers that are closest in size and form (Table 4.24). The one exception to this is **O40** whose base is more than one centimeter wider than the narrowest one in this group (6.70 centimeters in diameter).

Table 4.24. Standardized one-handlers from Olynthos, with base diameters.

Inventory number	**Shape**	**Date**	**Height (cm)**	**Rim diameter (cm)**	**Base diameter (cm)**
O35	One-handler	400	3.70	10.10	5.90
O40	One-handler	Early 4th cent.	3.90	10.40	6.70
O53	One-handler	4th cent.	3.60	10.00	5.60
O69	One-handler	Early 4th cent.	3.60	10.20	5.20

[343] One example (**O68**), found in house B vi 8, was described by Robinson as having "brick red clay." This, combined with its status as an outlier in rim diameter (15.8 centimeters) suggests that it may have been imported. The other outlier (**OP25**), from house B ix 6, had an observed Munsell reading of 6/2 10YR light brownish grey.

[344] Robinson 1950, no. 691, pl. 214.

[345] Robinson 1950, no. 702, pl. 216.

There are several possible explanations for this discrepancy in base diameter in an otherwise highly standardized assemblage of one-handlers. The most likely possibility is that one-handler **O40** was produced in a different workshop from the others. Although it is clear from the consistency in height and rim diameter that both workshops participated in the same community of practice, there may have been different skills involved in the forming of bases.

In addition to the reddish-yellow clay identified using a Munsell soil chart, we have seen that other fabric designations, including "reddish buff," are used by Robinson and his team. We have already established that "reddish buff" likely corresponds with vessels that were imported from Athens and possibly produced by the Filottrano workshop. Despite also being connected to this workshop by Robinson, krater **XIII.41** is described as having "reddish brown" clay.[346] These fabric descriptions might indicate either significant qualitative differences or minor variations on the same fabric (such as those caused by different firing regimes), but it is not possible to determine which is more likely at this stage. If the clay pastes identified by Robinson as "reddish buff" and "reddish brown" were significantly different, then this, combined with krater **XIII.41**'s approximate measurements, might suggest local production.

If krater **XIII.41** was locally produced, similarities between its decoration and the vessels produced by the Filottrano workshop may have resulted from close imitation of the workshop's products. Compared with acquiring technical knowledge, which frequently required prolonged contact between learner and instructor, copying a decorative style could be achieved from visual

[346] Robinson 1950, p. 93, pl. 56.

observation alone. This process frequently involves some degree of personalization that is brought into localized versions of copied iconography.[347] Such personalization may account for the minor differences observed between the products of Athenian workshops and the decorative characteristics on red-figured vessels found at Olynthos.

For example, the single red-figured skyphos in my sample found in a settlement context at Olynthos stands out as a probable Athenian import primarily because of its measurements.[348] It is a clear outlier in both height and rim diameter, measuring 19.3 by 19.4 centimeters respectively. Large skyphoi equivalent in size are not uncommon at Athens, and many of them are red-figured. Despite these observations which point to its identification as an import, two characteristics of skyphos **O79** suggest that this vessel may have been locally produced instead. The decorative features of skyphos **O79** suggest imitation of Athenian prototypes. The overall composition, including the figural scenes and the decorative motifs, has no parallel on Athenian red-figure skyphoi. Certain features, such as the egg pattern on the rim or the double-palmette with tendrils under the handles, [349] appear on their own, but these tend to be rare. Closer parallels for skyphos **O79** may be found in Athenian bell-kraters, on which these decorative motifs appear much more frequently. The use of decorative motifs commonly found on kraters on a skyphos of larger proportions raises questions about how this vessel may have functioned in antiquity: Was it used as a mixing bowl?

[347] On "personal interpretation", see Wallaert-Petre 2001, 485.

[348] Robinson 1950, pl. 76, no. 55.

[349] For the egg pattern on the rim, see, e.g., P 16900 (Moore 1997, no. 1271); P 17424 (Moore 1997, no. 1286); P 202 (Moore 1997, no. 1290); P 14570 (Moore 1997, no. 1299). For the double palmette with tendrils under the handles, see, e.g., P 6502d (Moore 1997, no. 1243).

In addition to its decoration, the fabric of skyphos **O79** may also indicate that it was produced locally. Robinson describes the color of the fabric as "buff gray". Since it is "buff" rather than reddish- or brownish-buff, it may be possible to identify this description with local production. However, as we have already seen, Robinson's designations are frequently ambiguous and misleading. Therefore, macroscopic and scientific analyses of the fabric of not only skyphos **O79**, but of every vessel in my sample, are necessary to confidently differentiate between imports and local products. These analyses would not only solidify or clarify the preliminary observations I have made in this chapter but would also be particularly useful for determining the provenance of vessels for which we have no Athenian parallels, such as the red-figured bolsal **O33** found at Olynthos.

4.7 Discussion

The results of the analysis of height and rim diameter measurements for the five drinking and mixing shapes in my sample from Olynthos show that the production of these vessels was highly standardized. Overall, the CV percentages for every shape were relatively low, and rarely exceeded 10%; the highest CVs calculated were for skyphoi measuring between 8.5 and 13.5 centimeters in rim diameter (9.1%) and bolsals measuring between 4.5 and 6 centimeters in height (9.4%). The low variability observed in this analysis strongly suggests that the potting community at Olynthos was largely made up of full-time producers.

To determine the degree of specialization that likely existed within the potting community at Olynthos, however, we must look at both measurements and decoration. Overlap

in the sizes of different ware categories for several of the shapes represented in my sample may suggest their production in a single workshop or by a single potter. This phenomenon is observed especially for the skyphoi as well as the kraters. As we have seen, red-figured and black-gloss skyphoi frequently appear in the same size categories. Similarly, red-figured, black-gloss, and even one plain krater found during the excavation of house B ix 6 have sizes in common.

Differences in the decoration applied to these vessels can have several implications. In a single workshop there may be a single painter who specialized in one style, such as those workshops that produced a variety of dipped or stamped vessels. This might also lend support for identifying the large, red-figured bolsal found at Olynthos (**O33;** Fig. 4.22) as a local product, rather than an import since there exist no parallels for it – in shape, size, or decoration – at Athens. There might also be a workshop that employed a single painter who could produce several decorative styles, or one with multiple painters who each specialized in one style. Either of these scenarios could account for workshops that produced skyphoi or kraters decorated differently, but similar in size. Finally, there may have even been a single painter who specialized in a single style, like red-figure decoration, but moved between workshops. This might explain why the style of the red-figured skyphos (**O79**)[350] found at Olynthos finds closer parallels with the decoration of red-figured kraters rather than other red-figured skyphoi produced at Athens (see above). Alternatively, it is possible that the high number of red-figured kraters that were probably imported from Athens made it easy for local painters of red-figured skyphoi to adopt the decorative motifs of the krater and apply them to a different, more familiar shape. The likelihood of imitation of Athenian prototypes playing a role in the decoration of red-

[350] Robinson 1950, pl. 76, no. 55.

figured dining vessels found at Olynthos and probably produced locally is increased when we consider krater **XIII.41** which, although its fabric suggests local production, finds close parallels with the decoration commonly found on kraters produced by the Filottrano workshop in Athens (see above).

Although I initially hypothesized that there was a relationship between outliers in height and rim diameter and imports, close examination of patterns in decoration and fabric color alongside the measurements discussed above revealed that only some outliers were in fact imports.[351] Among these are bolsal **O25**, bell-krater **O86**, and bell-krater **O83**; additional imports which were not clear outliers for their shape were identified by close examination of decoration and form alongside Athenian parallels, as well as fabric color (e.g., bolsals **O25** and **O29**; cup-kantharoi **O3, O4,** and **O6**). Fabric color also played a role in the identification of some outliers, including a red-figured skyphos (**O79)**, as local products. Although large, red-figured skyphoi are found in abundance in Athens, the decoration found on **O79** has no direct parallels on Athenian *skyphoi*. While this re-evaluation of my initial list of probable imports brings the total down to 12 from its original 16 (Table 4.25), the fact remains that the demand for Athenian pottery was relatively low at Olynthos.

Table 4.25. Imported vessels found at Olynthos.

Catalogue No.	**Shape**	**Outlier?**	**Fabric Color**
O68	One-handler	Yes	Reddish-buff
OP43	Skyphos	Yes	Red
OP15	Bolsal	Yes	6/8 2.5 YR (light red)
O25	Bolsal	Yes	10 R 6/6-5/6 (light red-red)

[351] The origin of several of the other outliers in Table 4.19 could not be confirmed by macroscopic analysis of fabric color or by fabric designation provided by Robinson. In the latter case, this is because fabric descriptions for vessels found in 1928 and 1931 were largely omitted (Robinson 1933a).

O29	Bolsal	No	
O3	Cup-kantharos	No	Reddish-buff
O4	Cup-kantharos	No	Reddish-buff
O6	Cup-kantharos	No	Reddish-buff
O80	Bell-krater	Yes	
O86	Bell-krater	Yes	Reddish-buff
O83	Bell-krater	Yes	Reddish-buff
OP50	Bell-krater	Yes	5/8 2.5 YR (red)

Clearly, then, imported pottery did not play a significant role in the drinking events that took place at the site. In general, there was more demand for locally produced drinking equipment, which included shapes that were perhaps better suited to local drinking practices than what was traditionally used and produced in Athens. The high number of one-handlers represented in my sample (n=64), very few of which can reliably be identified as imports, is a case in point. Unlike the Athenian formal drinking party, which has traditionally been closely identified with the stemmed cup or kylix, social drinking at Olynthos may have largely been dominated by plain black one-handled cups. This is unsurprising since the stemmed cup was less frequently produced and used in the 4th century BCE.[352] Moreover, the multifunctional nature of the one-handled cup, used for both drinking and eating (see above), may have contributed to its popularity as well. The other vessels – skyphoi, bolsals, kantharoi, and even kraters – whether imported or locally produced, may have only been supplements to a well-established system of social drinking at Olynthos.

The social implications of the distribution of drinking and mixing vessels across the site of Olynthos will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters. Chapter 5 will consider

[352] Sparkes and Talcott (1970, 88) note that "the vogue for the stemmed cup declines after [480 BCE] and the stemless cup in its many varieties takes its place."

the distribution of drinking and mixing vessels across the settlement, focusing especially on their co-occurrence with *androne*s, or formal dining rooms, in houses located on the North Hill and in the Villa Section. The following chapter (Chapter 6) will focus on the distribution of drinking equipment among houses without *androne*s and some conclusions about the nature of drinking in those houses will be offered.

Chapter Five

Social Drinking in Context

This chapter will focus on drinking assemblages from domestic contexts at Olynthos. Building upon the analysis of a selection of drinking and mixing vessels commonly included in traditionally defined "sympotic" assemblages in the previous chapter, this chapter will determine what patterns, if any, arise in the distribution of these vessels across the site of Olynthos. It will especially focus on those vessels that frequently appear in houses with *androne*s. The goal of this analysis is both to determine whether traditionally defined "sympotic" assemblages can be identified at Olynthos and to understand the nature of drinking assemblages at the site more broadly.

5.1 Commensal politics at Olynthos

The *andron*, or formal dining room, has widely been recognized as the most distinctive, and perhaps most important room of the ancient Greek house (Fig. 5.1). It was first recognized as such by David M. Robinson and J. Walter Graham in their descriptions of *androne*s from the site

of Olynthos in 1938.[353] Many of the key features of the space, outlined in Chapter 1 and initially identified by Robinson and Graham, have been explored in subsequent scholarship on the Classical *andron.*[354]

Of the thirty *androne*s found at Olynthos, twenty-one are approximately square. Robinson and Graham determined that "under normal circumstances, the normal-sized Olynthian andron contained three couches."[355] The data from the *androne*s found at the site, however, suggests otherwise. Of the twenty-five completely excavated *androne*s at Olynthos, just 6 measured under 4.00 meters to a side, accommodating at most three couches (A-4;[356] A 10, *i*; A v 8, *ac*; A vi 5, *d*; House of the Comedian, *j*). The smallest *andron*, found in B vi 5 (room *e*) and measuring 3.50 by 2.85 meters, likely accommodated no more than three couches between 2.00 and 2.25 meters in length. More than twice as many (n=15) measured between 4.50 and 5.00 meters to a side, accommodating approximately five couches each. Four additional *androne*s measured larger than 5.00 meters to a side, including A vi 5 (room *a*) the largest *andron* on the site at 8.70 by 4.95 meters.[357] This *andron* would have accommodated at most nine couches.

Another feature related to the presence of couches in the *andron* is the off-center doorway. The door to the *andron* was placed off-center to accommodate the couch which frequently shared a wall with it. It was also placed off-center to promote privacy, making it more

[353] Robinson and Graham 1938, 171-185.

[354] See Chapter 1.2.1 for a full discussion of the features of *androne*s.

[355] Robinson and Graham 1938, 173-174.

[356] No room number was given for this house.

[357] For a plan of house A vi 5, see Robinson and Graham 1938, pls. 35, 98.

challenging for outsiders and especially women of the household to look in on what went on in the space.[358]

We might consider, like Robinson and Graham, the *andron* to be the most important room of the ancient Greek house because, as Sean Corner has noted, "the symposium was an occasion of homosocial fraternity, of hetaireia, and symposiastic hetaireia has tended to be understood by scholars in terms of the aristocratic political club."[359] In other words, as the locus of the symposium, the *andron* was a space where important social and political business took place. This idea is further emphasized by the space's elaborate decoration. Classical *androne*s were frequently equipped with fine pebble mosaics and walls covered in brightly colored painted plaster. At Olynthos, the raised platform characteristic of the space was also often painted.

Although not as common in descriptions of the Classical *andron*, the location of the space and its significance is occasionally discussed. The location of the *andron* is prominent in Robinson and Graham's description of its features. The authors identify two major guiding principles for locating the *andron* in Olynthian houses. First, the *andron* should be in the northern half of the house because it is the most important room.[360] Of the twenty-five completely excavated *androne*s at the site, this was the case for 17 of them. The only exceptions, he found, were "secondary andrones," or *androne*s of small dimensions. The second principle for determining the position of the *andron* in Olynthian houses was that at least one wall of the room

[358] Antonaccio 2000, esp. 539-542; Nevett 1995, esp. 374-75.

[359] Corner 2015, 238.

[360] Robinson and Graham 1938, 177.

should be adjacent to a street. The reason for this may be so the room could be equipped with windows for additional lighting. As Lisa Nevett has observed, "where the andron was preceded by an anteroom, this may…have restricted the amount of light entering from the court during daylight hours."[361] Intentionally placing the *andron* next to a street, Robinson argued, would explain why *androne*s are also found in the southern part of some houses.

5.1.1 Block A vi

Many of the common features identified in *androne*s at Olynthos can be found in Block A vi, located on the North Hill.[362] It is situated between streets vi and vii and is made up of two sets of five houses separated by an alleyway (*stenopos*). The most *androne*s were found during Robinson's excavations in this block.

There are a few features that all the *androne*s found in block A vi share. These *androne*s can be identified by the presence of a raised platform along the walls of the space. In most cases, the platform is clearly interrupted where the door to the room would have been; it is not possible to identify the location of the door to A vi 8, room *i*. The excavators suggest that this *andron* was a later addition to house A vi 10. If this is the case, then it is likely that the door to this room would have been on the eastern wall. Moreover, most of the raised platforms are characterized by plain cement. The platforms in the *androne*s of houses A vi 5 (*a*) and A vi 6 (*j*), however, were painted yellow. This decorative choice was not restricted to this block. It was also found in the *androne*s of house A vii 4 (*k*) and the House of Many Colors (*d*).

[361] Nevett 1999, 71.

[362] For plans of Block A vi and the individual houses, see Robinson and Graham 1938, pls. 33-38; pl. 97; fig. 4.

In addition to the presence of a raised platform, all but one of the *androne*s in this block were found in a corner of the house, with at least one wall abutting the street, one of the two major principles Robinson and Graham determined guided the location of *androne*s in Olynthian houses, discussed above. Two *androne*s are in the northwest corner of the house (A vi 3; A vi 5, *a*); two in the southeast corner (A vi 4, A vi 8); one in the northeast corner (A vi 1); one in the southwest corner (A vi 6); and one on the eastern side of the house (A vi 5, *d*). The northwest and northeast corners of the house were popular locations for *androne*s in the houses of Olynthos. In at least four houses (A vi 3, A vi 4, A vi 5, A vi 8), it can be determined that the *andron* was located next to or near the entrance of the house.

One final similarity between the *androne*s of block A vi can be seen in the shape and size of the rooms. On average, the *androne*s found at Olynthos measured between 4.45 and 5 square meters. The *androne*s of A vi 3 (*b*), A vi 4 (*l*), A vi 6(*j*), and A vi 8 (*i*) were perhaps closer to 5 meters square. Although approximately square in shape like the others, the area of A vi 5 room *d* was likely much less than that of the others. It may have been similar in size to B vi 7, room *f*, which was regarded by the excavators as the smallest *andron* found at the site.

By contrast, there are two examples of *androne*s in block A vi that are either oblong in shape, larger in area, or both. *Andron c* of house A vi 1 is characterized by a U-shaped raised platform, which was likely necessitated by the fact that the room was narrower in width than in length. Similarly, *andron a* in house A vi 5 was also oblong in shape, its width approximately equal to twice that of an average-sized *andron*. Moreover, this was the only house in the block

that was equipped with more than one dining space.

Several archaeologists have recognized the role of the size of an *andron* in producing the kind of sympotic atmosphere that supported the kinds of intimate gameplay and conversation described in the texts (see Chapter 3). The size of the *andron* dictated the number of couches that were able to fit in the space to accommodate guests at symposia. Katherine Dunbabin has argued that the arrangement of couches in Classical *androne*s provided "little opportunity for any difference in status" between guests.[363] This contrasts with the arrangements in dining rooms of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, where a distinct hierarchical arrangement was more distinguishable and better suited to royal and ritual banquets than to the traditional symposium. The spaces to accommodate such banquets were either much larger, accommodating anywhere between 35 and 100 couches (Fig. 5.2),[364] or consistently smaller, accommodating just three couches in a pi-shaped arrangement (e.g., Roman *triclinia*; Fig. 5.3).[365]

There are two major differences between the *androne*s found in block A vi: one relates to anterooms and the other to decoration. The anteroom was a smaller space that visitors to the household *andron* passed through to get to the formal dining room. It was frequently decorated similarly to the *andron*, with stuccoed walls and a cement or mosaic floor. The principal function of the anteroom was to promote privacy, which is often confirmed by the position of the doorway in relation to that of the *andron*. Of the 25 completely excavated *androne*s found in the

[363] Dunbabin 2001, 83.

[364] Hoepfner and Brands 1996, 1-46; Carney 2015, 235; Nielsen 2001, 107; Diod. Sic. 17.16.4; Ath. 12.538c, 539d.

[365] See Dunbabin 2001, esp. 89-98.

houses at Olynthos, only 9 have been identified with an anteroom. At least one of the *androne*s in block A vi (A vi 6, *j*) was equipped with an anteroom (room *i*). It is possible that the *andron* in the neighboring house (A vi 4) also had an anteroom (room *j*). The infrequent appearance of anterooms attached to *androne*s at Olynthos suggests that an anteroom is not necessarily a prerequisite for identifying ancient dining spaces. To be sure, very few scholars have identified the space as a significant feature of the *andron* in their work.[366]

Compared with the numerous references to the size of the space,[367] details about how the *andron* was decorated are generally scarce in the written sources. The surviving texts describe dining spaces from a range of contexts, including public and ritual ones as well as domestic *androne*s. In general, the descriptions are quite varied. At one end of the spectrum are specific references to tapestries (κρεκάδια), throws (στρώματα), fleeces (κώδια), and rugs (δάπιδες). At the other end are more general descriptions, such as "splendid furnishings" (τὸν κόσμον…ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητον),[368] and "adorned as finely as possible" (…στρώσαντες ὡς εἶχον κάλλιστα).[369] Where these descriptive terms and phrases are used specifically in literary descriptions of sympotic space, they provide little useful information for identifying *androne*s in the archaeological record. This is because most of the decorative features mentioned by the ancient authors - tapestries, fleeces, rugs - were made of perishable materials.

[366] Robinson and Graham 1938*;* Nevett 1999; and Nevett 2010, 43-62.

[367] See Westgate 2015, 71; Bergquist 1999, 39; Dunbabin 2001, 88; Ath. II.29; McCartney 1934, 30-35.

[368] Hdt. 3.123.

[369] Hdt. 6.139.

What does survive in the archaeological record are the remains of painted wall plaster and the elaborately decorated mosaics that frequently appear in Greek *androne*s, but which are not mentioned at all in the literary descriptions of such spaces (Fig. 5.4). Although painted wall plaster was far more common in the *androne*s of the houses of block A vi than anterooms, the colors of the plaster and its application varied widely. The excavators recorded remains of white, red, and dark blue painted plaster. [370] Red painted plaster was perhaps the most popular color used in the *androne*s at Olynthos, appearing in 12 rooms in houses located in both the North Hill settlement and the Villa Section. White painted plaster was found in five rooms, while "blue", "dark blue", and "blue-black" painted plaster was found in three rooms.

It is possible that descriptions of floor mosaics were omitted from the written sources either because it was commonly known that *androne*s were equipped with decorated mosaics, or because decorated mosaics were not as common a feature of *androne*s as we think. Indeed, at Olynthos, in contrast with painted wall plaster, elaborately decorated mosaics were not found in all the *androne*s found in block A vi. Plain cement floors were most popular in the *androne*s at Olynthos (n=17). In block A vi there are three examples (A vi 1, *c*; A vi 5, *a* and *d*). Perhaps significantly, all these examples were found in atypical *androne*s, as discussed above: A vi 1 *c* and A vi 3 *a* are both oblong, and A vi 5 *d* is the smallest *andron* in the block.[371]

Second in popularity for the site are abstract mosaics patterned with geometric designs

[370] For descriptions of the painted plaster of the *androne*s found in the houses at Olynthos, see table "Record of Olynthian Androne", Robinson and Graham 1938, 184.

[371] For sizes of the *androne*s in houses A vi 1, A vi 3, and A vi 5, see table "Record of Olynthian Androne", Robinson and Graham 1938, 184.

(n=6). In block A vi there are three examples, including one ray pattern (A vi 4, *l*), one four-spoked wheel (A vi 6, *j*), and one palmette cross (A vi 8, *i*). The four-spoked wheel pattern is found in at least two other houses. It appears in *andron j* of the House of the Comedian, in this instance a black wheel on a background of white and with a much less pronounced border.[372] The four-spoked wheel is also featured in a mosaic in room *e* of the Villa of Good Fortune, part of a pair of rooms that mimic the traditional *andron*-anteroom configuration.[373] The wheel is depicted with a smaller one to its southeast and the inscription ΑΓΑΘΗΤΥΧΗ on a light background. According to Robinson, the motifs and inscriptions found in the mosaics in rooms *e* and *f* of the Villa come from "stock expressions and signs of good omen current at the time," and should be likened to the modern salutations of "Welcome" or "Home Sweet Home".[374] This conclusion, in addition to the lack of raised platform characteristic of *androne*s, suggests that this space was more likely a principal living space of the household rather than a formal dining room.

Finally, compared with the more numerous plain cement floors and abstract mosaics, just four mosaics with representational scenes were found in the *androne*s at Olynthos. Significantly, one of these was found in the *andron* of house A vi 3 (Fig. 5.5). As discussed above, the *andron* (*b*) is situated next to the door in the northwest corner of the house. It was entered from the south directly from the *pastas*, rather than through an anteroom, as was the case in several other houses. Room *b* can be securely identified as an *andron* because it has all the features characteristic of this room-type: a raised platform, an off-center doorway, and a central mosaic.

[372] For a plan of the House of the Comedian, see Robinson and Graham 1938, pls. 17, 87.

[373] For a plan of the Villa of Good Fortune, see Robinson and Graham 1938, pls. 14-16 and 84-86.

[374] Robinson and Graham 1938, 60.

Andron b had a small panel just inside the entrance to the room, a common feature in Olynthian dining rooms which can also be seen in the *androne*s of houses A vi 4 and A vi 6. This entrance panel depicted two griffins attacking a stag. The central mosaic of the room shows Bellerophon on the winged horse Pegasus slaying the Chimera. Both mosaics are particularly well-preserved compared with the mosaic found in the courtyard because they were protected by the plaster that had fallen from the walls of the room. The mosaic in the courtyard, however, was largely destroyed because it was continuously exposed to the elements as the space was either totally or partially unroofed.

Several scholars have analyzed the social and economic significance of the decorated mosaics that do survive in Classical and Hellenistic houses. In general, scholars tend to agree that mosaic floors attested to "the wealth and taste of the owner".[375] This was particularly the case in situations like an evening of drinking where outsiders would spend ample time in the *andron*, giving the owner the opportunity to show off that wealth and taste to his fellow citizens. It also provided an opportunity for competitive display, as evidenced from the hierarchy of pavement types identified by Ruth Westgate.[376] This hierarchy was based on the relative cost of the materials, which was determined by the time and labor required to lay the pavement. Factors that affected time and labor input included "the complexity of the decoration and the regularity and size of the materials used".[377] The size of the room could also affect the time and labor

[375] Franks 2014, 156.

[376] For Classical houses, see Westgate 1997-98; for Hellenistic houses, see Westgate 2000.

[377] Westgate 2000, 393.

required to lay pavements.

5.1.2 *Androne*s and vessel distribution

To better understand how social drinking was organized in the houses at Olynthos, we must look at the distribution of the vessels used in these events. In this section we will consider the distribution of drinking equipment in houses with *androne*s to determine whether sympotic drinking can be identified at the site. 13 drinking and mixing vessels of the types included in my sample (i.e., kantharoi, bolsals, one-handlers, skyphoi, and kraters) were found in Block A vi. These vessels were found in more than half of the houses in the block; four houses did not have any of these vessels in their assemblages. It is impossible to know whether this absence is a result of poor preservation, unsystematic collection and recording procedures, or both.

Of the drinking vessels found in the houses of Block A vi, one-handlers were the most abundant (n=7; Fig. 5.6). One-handlers were found in houses A vi 2, A vi 5, A vi 7, and A vi 9. Although a single one-handler was found in a house with an *andron* (A vi 5), the most one-handlers in one household assemblage were found in house A vi 9 (n=4). This distribution pattern is reflected more widely in the household assemblages at the site. Of 25 houses with completely excavated *androne*s at Olynthos, one-handlers were found in only five (A vi 5, A vii 4, B vi 7, the House of the Comedian, and the House of Many Colors).

The second most popular drinking vessel from my sample in Block A vi after the one-handler is the kantharos (n=4; Fig. 5.7). Kantharoi of both types (kantharoi and cup-kantharoi) are found in two houses in the block (A vi 6 and A vi 9), as well as a more generically labeled

context called “Block A vi.” Two of the four kantharoi in this block were found in a single house with an *andron* (A vi 6), while one kantharos each was found in a house without an *andron* (A vi 9) and an unspecified context in Block A vi. Although kantharoi were more popular in houses with *androne*s in Block A vi than those without, as with one-handlers, in general, kantharoi were also only found in five houses with *androne*s (A 10, A vi 6, A vii 4, B vi 5, and the House of the Comedian).

Although they appear in much smaller quantities than one-handlers and kantharoi in the houses of Block A vi, bolsals, skyphoi, and kraters are perhaps the most significant vessels here. Of 13 total drinking and mixing vessels found in the block, just one bolsal (**O25**) was found in a house without an *andron* (A vi 7; Fig. 4.20). No skyphoi were found in the houses of Block A vi. Overall, very few bolsals and skyphoi appear in household assemblages at the site of Olynthos; they are found in much higher quantities in the cemeteries. As we have seen, according to Robinson, 86% of skyphoi and 64% of kylikes uncovered during the early excavations of Olynthos were found in graves. These numbers almost certainly include bolsals, which are commonly identified as “skyphoi” and “kylikes” in the publications. My own survey of bolsals found by Robinson and his team at Olynthos indicated that 72% of this shape were found in graves. It is therefore unsurprising that they also never appear in houses with *androne*s. It is possible that bolsals and skyphoi were simply not important shapes in the drinking activities that took place in the houses of 5th and 4th century Olynthians.

Of the vessels represented in this block, the krater is most frequently associated with

sympotic drinking.[378] Just one bell-krater was found in Block A vi and it, significantly, was found in the *andron* of a house (A vi 3). However, this is the only such instance at the site of Olynthos (Fig. 5.9). Krater fragments were found in at least three other houses with *andrones*, including house B vi 7, the House of Many Colors, and the House of the Comedian. The remaining twelve kraters found on the North Hill and in the Lower City were found in houses that did not betray evidence of a formal dining room.[379] Several more were found in South Hill contexts. Kraters do occasionally appear in graves at the site (10%), but much more infrequently than bolsals and skyphoi.

As we have seen, scholars have traditionally argued that the lack of ceramic kraters in domestic assemblages was due to the use of metal ones instead.[380] What tends to be missing in these studies is the consideration of a completely different possibility: that some households simply did not use a krater, or the full range of vessels traditionally included in a "sympotic" assemblage. Lynch acknowledges the former possibility for deposit J 2:4 in the Athenian Agora, suggesting that the household used black gloss psykters set in lekanai, household utilitarian mixing bowls, instead of a ceramic krater, since at least three psykters were found in the deposit.[381] A psykter is a type of Greek vase that is characterized by a bulbous body set on a high, narrow foot (Fig. 5.10). The vessel would be filled with ice, snow, or cold water, and it in turn would be placed inside of a krater full of wine to chill the drink. Despite this thoughtful

[378] See above discussion, Chapter 3.1.

[379] Cahill 2002, 186, n. 60.

[380] See above, Chapter 3.1.

[381] Lynch 2011, 130.

suggestion, Lynch's study remains limited by its focus on identifying a "sympotic" assemblage. Such an assemblage is frequently defined by a collection of certain vessel types, including a krater, but has also sometimes been defined by its relationship to an *andron* or other dining space. When we refer to "sympotic" assemblages, we are assuming that a particular activity - the symposium - took place where evidence for that activity is actually very limited. If we re-frame the conversation to consider "drinking" assemblages instead, which share many of the same types of vessels as those traditionally identified as "sympotic," then broader interpretations of the nature of group drinking in certain contexts are possible. This is because we are no longer starting from the assumption that the symposium was the only or primary mode of group drinking that occurred in the Classical Greek world.

5.1.3 Discussion

Although several drinking and mixing vessels of the types included in my sample were found in Block A vi, very few of these shapes were found in significant quantities in the individual houses at the site. In general, in no house with an *andron* in Block A vi were all five vessel types represented. Occasionally only one or two of the shapes were found together in the same house,[382] but never all five. The same pattern is represented in other blocks of the site, including Block B vi.[383]

A comparison with the pottery assemblage recovered from house B ix 6, excavated

[382] For example, in house A vi 7 one bolsal and one one-handler were found, and in house A vi 9 one kantharos and one one-handler were found.

[383] Two one-handlers and a krater were found in house B vi 8.

between 2014 and 2019, shows that the numbers of drinking and mixing vessels found in the houses excavated by Robinson are not accurate representations of full drinking assemblages at the site. At least 50 drinking and mixing vessels were recovered in house B ix 6. Of these, one-handlers were the most abundant (n=26; Fig. 5.11). This is consistent with the patterns identified in the previous section, which suggest that one-handled cups were the most popular drinking shape at Olynthos. Another commonality with the patterns observed at the site at large is the very small number of kantharoi represented in the assemblage: only four were found in house B ix 6. This number includes rim and base fragments from both kantharoi (Fig. 5.12) and cup-kantharoi (Fig. 5.13).

The patterns observed in the numbers of skyphoi, bolsals, and kraters is where house B ix 6 and the houses excavated by Robinson differ. Significantly, although no skyphoi were found in the houses excavated by Robinson in Block A vi, at least six were found in house B ix 6 alone. This suggests that fragments of skyphoi, including diagnostic ones such as bases, were largely overlooked by the earlier excavation team. This contrasts with the more meticulous collection practices of the more recent Olynthos Project team. Another shape whose representation is very different from that discussed above is the bolsal, of which at least 12 can be identified in house B ix 6 (Fig. 5.14). In its entirety, only one bolsal was identified in Block A vi, and only eight in the entire settlement. Finally, while only one bell-krater was found in Block A vi, at least two were found in house B ix 6. Neither of these were red-figured; instead, the excavators found one small, black-gloss bell-krater (Fig. 5.15) and one undecorated one (Fig. 5.16).

Clearly, then, the inhabitants of house B ix 6 were in possession of a large and varied

collection of drinking pottery. What did it mean to have such a drinking assemblage? Several conclusions are possible. First, such a large number and range of drinking vessels in a single house likely indicates that multiple types of social drinking events occurred there. These different types of drinking events potentially required different levels of formality and therefore also different types of drinking vessels. For example, the small, black-gloss bell-krater may have been used for more intimate, formal drinking parties, while the larger, undecorated one was used for more informal parties.

The quantities of vessels may also indicate differences in drinking events. Twenty-six one-handlers were found in house B ix 6. This large number suggests that this shape was important and used widely in a variety of drinking events at Olynthos. Bolsals were similarly popular, although more carefully and elaborately decorated, often with stamped designs (Fig. 5.17). Therefore, these were likely used more frequently on more formal occasions than informal ones. Finally, skyphoi and kantharoi were equally rare. Their rarity and decoration combined made kantharoi the most formal drinking cups of them all, and perhaps used the most infrequently. They might have been used at events where the black-gloss krater also made an appearance. It is more likely that skyphoi, which tend to be decorated more modestly, are rare either because they were used for more intimate yet informal gatherings or were generally not desired by Olynthian consumers.

In addition to the number of vessels represented in house B ix 6, the relationship between

mixing vessels and dining space should also be noted.[384] In a recent publication, the excavators of house B ix 6 tentatively identified room h as an *andron* (Fig. 5.18). This identification was based on "the use of ashlars on the walls facing the street," as well as an off-center doorway and overall dimensions, which are like those of the *andrones* identified by Robinson and Graham.[385] Room h differs significantly from the *andrones* identified by Robinson and Graham, however, because it does not preserve a mosaic floor or cement pavement.[386] It is for this reason that I do not categorize the space as an *andron* here. This does not necessarily mean that drinking did not occur in this space; however, since room h is not considered here to be an *andron*, I do not believe that formal symposia took place in house B ix 6. The nature and possible location(s) of social drinking that took place in B ix 6 and houses like it (i.e., houses without formal *andrones* where kraters were found) will be discussed in the next chapter.

[384] Because the results of the recent excavations of the Olynthos Project have not been published, it is not possible at this time to comment more specifically on the distribution of drinking and mixing vessels across the space of house B ix 6.

[385] Nevett et al 2020, 358.

[386] Cf. The *andrones* identified in houses A vi 3 (Fig. 5.5) and B vi 8 (Robinson 1946, pls. 120-122).

Chapter Six

Widening the Lens – Social Drinking Beyond the *Andron*

As demonstrated in Chapter 3, the variable nature of the evidence traditionally used to identify and characterize the Greek symposium has led to a lack of consensus in modern scholarship on how to define the institution. Several core features remain consistent, including male aristocrats, drinking separated from feasting, and musical entertainment. These, however, do not find equal support in the literary, iconographic, and archaeological sources available to us. For example, while entertainers and musical instruments appear in texts and vase painting, there is virtually no archaeological evidence of this feature of the symposium. I argued that the difficulties that modern scholars have with consistently defining the symposium result from the fact that social drinking in the Greek world was not as homogeneous as once believed. Instead, many different modes of drinking – including formal symposia – are represented in our sources. The relationship between architecture and artifact assemblages may also suggest a wider range of social drinking activity than previously assumed, as illustrated in Chapter 5.

This chapter aims to identify and characterize the social drinking practices of a broader range of people, beyond the small group of elite men usually associated with sympotic drinking.

To do this, a critical reconsideration of the evidence and theoretical approaches traditionally used to identify and characterize the Greek symposium is necessary. Three major questions will guide this discussion. First, where were people drinking in houses without *androne*s?[387] Second, how were they drinking? Finally, who was drinking in these houses?

6.1 Where were people drinking?

Scholars working across numerous disciplines, including archaeology, have illustrated the utility of studying the built environment to better understand the social behaviors of humans. Donald Sanders, drawing on the field of semiotics, has viewed architecture as a language "comprised of a system of signs for the communication of information" about accepted sociocultural rules and conventions.[388] The built environment 'cues' expected behavior through fixed (permanent architectural features, such as floors and walls), semi-fixed (moveable furnishings), and non-fixed (people and their activities and behaviors) features.[389] In her study of Greek and Roman dining rooms, Dunbabin states that the "remarkable homogeneity in lay-out and scale" of *androne*s, which allowed a Greek to "find himself in familiar surroundings when invited to a *symposion*" no matter where he was in the Greek world.[390] The key features of an *androne* would, at least in theory, signal to him the appropriate and expected behaviors of an

[387] Although it naturally follows that we should also ask where people were drinking in houses with *androne*s, it is not possible to draw reliable conclusions from the material evidence found in houses with *androne*s at Olynthos. Of the houses with *androne*s identified at the site, only two (B vi 7 and B vi 5) have sufficient assemblages for analysis; however, these assemblages largely come from wells and cisterns, which make it difficult to pinpoint the original use-contexts of those vessels in their respective houses.

[388] Sanders 1990, 46.

[389] Rapoport 1990, 15.

[390] Dunbabin 2001, 82.

evening of drinking in that space.

The key architectural or fixed features – off-center doorway, raised platform, and floor mosaic – of *androne*s have already been discussed (see Chapter 1). These, however, would not be enough alone to cue the behavior expected of a symposium guest. This is because, as Amos Rapoport argues, activities are organized in both time and space: "a space successively becomes different settings through temporal sequences, or … by changing semi-fixed features the same space becomes a series of different settings".[391] Therefore, the fixed features of the *androne* would only realistically cue expected sympotic behavior *in combination with* certain semi-fixed features, such as couches, cushions, tables, elaborate dining vessels, and other furnishings, and non-fixed features such as other male drinkers.

When these semi- and non-fixed features were removed or changed, the space likely signaled different things and activities to different groups of people. Goldberg argues that the *androne* was a shifting rather than fixed space whose actual use depended upon choices that both men and women of the house made every day when making household decisions.[392] Such decisions might include allotting daily chores and the spaces in which they would be carried out, which may have at times included the *androne*. Nevett has observed that artifacts associated with female activity, such as loom weights, are found throughout Greek houses, including in *androne*s.[393] This might suggest that *androne*s were, at least some of the time, used by other

[391] Rapoport 1990, 15.

[392] Goldberg 1999, 153.

[393] Nevett 2015, 109-110.

members of the household, including women.

The spatial distribution of artifacts in ancient households has often been used in Mediterranean archaeology to draw conclusions about the use of space. Penelope M. Allison has convincingly critiqued the antiquated labelling practices of artifacts found in Roman houses. These practices, she argues, "make assumptions about fixed and often specific functions for particular artefacts on the bases of textual analogy rather than any available archaeological information".[394] Instead, she advocates for a more contextual approach to artifacts, which includes both their spatial location and their relationship to other artifacts in that space. Such an approach has been particularly useful in the identification of spaces for cooking – which are frequently labelled 'kitchens' based on contemporary analogy. As Foxhall has illustrated, these spaces tend to be equipped with both fixed (hearths) and semi-fixed (vessels with residual soot) features that can be observed archaeologically.[395] Identifying spaces for other activities, including social drinking, based on artifact assemblages is not as straightforward.

One reason for this difficulty is that there are several site formation processes that may have contributed to the distribution and density of artifacts found in modern excavations. Two site formation processes that likely occurred at the site of Olynthos will be highlighted here: artifacts discarded or stored in their primary contexts and artifacts introduced into the archaeological record unrelated to primary contexts. First, the artifacts discovered in the houses at Olynthos may have been discarded in their original location of use. Modern interpretations of

[394] Allison 1999, 64.

[395] Foxhall 2007, 235.

historical accounts suggest that the site was rapidly abandoned during Philip II of Macedon's siege of the city in 348 BCE. Therefore, it is possible that what we find in the archaeological record reflects the final activities of the inhabitants of Olynthos. It is not, however, a complete picture of those activities.

On the one hand, looting by Philip's troops during the siege, or from choices that households made when choosing what to take with them as they fled, may have contributed to the low numbers of household artifacts found during modern excavations. On the other hand, the selective collection practices of the excavators may have played a much bigger role in the distribution and density of artifacts found in the houses at Olynthos excavated by Robinson. Nevett has observed that "the numbers of artifacts recovered in any one house were at times as few as ten and rarely more than a hundred".[396] The pottery catalogues from the early excavations at Olynthos illustrate the selective collection practices of the excavators well, which appear to have been heavily biased toward saving and recording finer pieces, especially figured and stamped wares. Several plain wares were also catalogued, but these were most often the most intact examples, whereas even the more fragmentary fine wares were kept. A comparison with the recent excavation of House B ix 6 on the North Hill, which yielded over 920 kilograms of ceramic material, suggests that at least some of the household assemblages identified by Robinson may not be representative of the full range of household activities which took place at Olynthos.[397]

[396] Nevett 2021, 384.

[397] Nevett et al. 2020, 353, n. 24. See also Chapter 5 for a comparison of the household assemblages recovered by Robinson versus that recovered in the excavation of house B ix 6.

The introduction of artifacts into the archaeological record unrelated to primary contexts presents similar problems for identifying household activities at Olynthos. Although Robinson remained firm in his assertion that the site was abandoned in 348 BCE, this has not been accepted by everyone. James Dengate, for example, argued that "the large number of coins dating between 348 and 316 BC…is enough to prove that Olynthus was reoccupied after its destruction by Philip".[398] This reoccupation has parallels elsewhere in the Greek world, as Ault notes that "instances of squatting…have been identified at numerous sites, including Halieis (House D; third century) …and Thorikos (the tower compound in Insula 3; Roman)" as well as in the Northwest Quarter of Olynthos.[399] The lack of clear stratigraphic information from the early excavations at Olynthos makes it difficult to differentiate between primary periods of occupation and periods of reoccupation at the site. The artifacts from later periods were likely mixed in uncritically with those from earlier ones. It is also possible that objects had fallen from upper stories when the buildings collapsed or were objects "from structures further up-slope that…washed downhill over the centuries since the destruction".[400] It is not possible at this stage to determine what percentage of the household assemblages at Olynthos are intrusions, so I proceed from the assumption that at least some of the objects under consideration were found in usage or storage contexts.

Houses A iv 5 and B vi 8 were selected as the primary case studies for this chapter

[398] Cahill 2002, 52.

[399] Ault 2005, 146.

[400] Nevett 2021, 384.

because reasonably large numbers of artifacts, including drinking and dining pottery, found in these houses were recorded by Robinson and his team (Tables 6.1 and 6.2). If we assume that these artifacts were found in or near their primary contexts, these houses become particularly good examples of commensality characterized by the presence of fine ware drinking cups and a decorated krater. No formal dining space was found in either of these houses. It is not therefore possible to draw conclusions about where social drinking took place in these houses based on their architectural features. Close analysis of the distribution of drinking and mixing vessels in these houses bears more fruitful results.

House A iv 5 is located on the north side of the southernmost housing block (Block A iv) excavated by Robinson and his team during the early excavations of Olynthos.[401] The house is relatively well preserved, allowing the excavators to identify at least eleven rooms, in addition to a courtyard and the covered porch (*pastas*) characteristic of Olynthian houses. An *oikos* unit was identified in rooms c, f, and e. This identification was based on the discovery of fragments of a bathtub and "coarse kitchen pottery" in room f.[402] The excavators also identified room m as a "vault or strong room",[403] due to the large number and wide variety of objects, including fragments of pottery, terracotta figurines, marble statuettes, bone, and metal, found there.

Table 6.1. Artifacts found in house A iv 5 by room.

Room	**Designation according to Robinson**	**Artifacts**
Room a		Roof tiles, bronze vase loop handle, fragments of black

[401] For a plan of house A iv 5, see Robinson 1946, pls. 56-59.

[402] Robinson 1946, 69.

[403] Robinson 1946, 71.

		gloss pottery, pieces of lead for mending
Room b		6 loomweights, bronze boss, iron nails, sheets of bronze, lead arrowhead, millstone, burnt ashes
Room c	Oikos unit	Loomweight, bronze coin, terracotta cicada
Room d	Pastas	Terracotta head, bronze coin
Room f	Oikos unit	Bathtub fragments, loomweights, coarse kitchen pottery, iron arrowhead
Room g		Bronze fibula, bronze ring vase handles, roof tiles, black gloss pottery fragments
Room h		2 bronze coins, figurine fragments, black gloss saucer, terracotta female mask, tile fragments, 3 amphora toes, blue bead
Room i		2 black gloss saucers, bronze boss, 2 loomweights, lead clamps, pieces of bronze and iron, amphora handle
Room j		Bronze ball, bronze coin, pithos fragments, black gloss and coarse ware fragments, terracotta fragments, black gloss oinochoe, unstruck coin flan, bone ring, bronze leaf, iron rod
Room k (?)	Court	Silver coin
Room l		Black gloss saucer, 2 bronze vase handles, bronze boss, lead slingbullet, 6 coins, plastic vase, leg of marble statuette, red-figure krater fragments, amphora fragments, lamps, cups, black gloss oinochoe, alabastron, pithos cover mended with lead, pieces of bronze and iron
Room m	“storage room”	Bronze discs, lead slingbullet, parts of red-figure vase with mending, many fragments of

		red-figure vases and coarse ware, terracotta female figurine, terracotta dog, terracotta head of satyr, terracotta fragments, 3 black gloss oinochoai, terracotta lamp, marble fragments, bronze ring, unstruck bronze coin flan, 2 amphora handles

In general, pottery associated with drinking and dining was found in most rooms of the house, including room m (Table 6.1). The size of this room, however, makes it unlikely to have been used as a dining space. Its identification as a storage space, especially for drinking and dining equipment, is strengthened by its proximity to other rooms where similar equipment was found. These include rooms g, h, i, j, and l. Of these, room l had the highest concentration of fine ware vessels associated with the service and consumption of both wine and food, including a saucer, an oinochoe, several cups, and fragments of red-figured kraters (Table 6.1). The excavators also identified bronze vase handles which, although the exact shape is not specified, may also have been used during drinking and dining events.

A similar pattern in the distribution of drinking and dining pottery can be observed in house B vi 8.[404] This house was in a block northeast of Block A iv on the North Hill. The excavators were able to identify seven rooms, as well as an entrance passage (room f) and a *pastas* or courtyard (room d). As with A iv 5 and other houses, several of the rooms of this house were given labels by the excavators. Room a was considered by the excavators to have been "the

[404] For a plan of house B vi 8, see Robinson 1946, pls. 120-122.

most important room of the house",[405] but they do not provide any justification for this statement. Room b was identified as a "storeroom" since the remains of two large, broken pithoi sunk into the ground were found here. Located east of the entrance, room g was identified as a shop. Finally, although a full *oikos* unit was not identified, the excavators argue that room i was the "kitchen" because fragments of a bathtub and ashes, along with "much black glazed pottery", were found in this space.[406]

Table 6.2. Artifacts found in house B vi 8 by room.

Room	**Designation according to Robinson**	**Artifacts**
Room a	"most important room"	Roof tiles, 2 bronze nails, bronze pin, 2 loomweights, black gloss saucer, 8 coins, sheets of metal, bronze, bronze spindle
Room b	"storeroom"	2 broken pithoi, many tiles, part of a cup (for mixing plaster)
Room c		Black gloss plate, 2 bronze coins, iron arrowhead
Room e		3 bronze coins, black gloss oinochoe, pieces of bronze and iron, bronze ring, tack, spearhead, lead slingbullet, lead weight, lead loomweight, whetstone
Room g	"shop"	14 pieces of pottery, including skyphos, krater, saucer, 2 stamnoi, bowl, plate, 2 loomweights, bronze décor, terracotta head, lead herm, 4 coins
Room h		2 lamps, loomweight, 2 pieces of pottery, 4 bronze coins
Room i	"kitchen"	Fragments of bathtub, much

[405] Robinson 1946, 146.

[406] Robinson 1946, 146.

		black glazed pottery, ashes, mini lamp, piece of iron, 2 coins

Just as in house A iv 5, pottery associated with drinking and dining was found in more than half of the rooms identified in B vi 8 (Table 6.2). Unlike the previous example, however, there were two spaces that had higher concentrations of tablewares than the others: rooms g and i. According to the excavators' description of the space, at least fourteen pieces of pottery, including a skyphos, krater, saucer, two stamnoi, a bowl, and a plate were found in room g. The pottery catalogues present a slightly different picture which adds two net lekythoi, a kantharos, an oxybaphon, and an additional plate fragment to this number. A similar discrepancy appears in the description of the assemblage from room i and the pottery associated with this space in the pottery volumes. In the general description, as we have just seen, there is only a vague reference to "much black glazed pottery".[407] The pottery volume defines this, listing several cups and saucers, as well as a one-handled pitcher.

How, then, are we to interpret these household assemblages? Traditional approaches which assume a close relationship between artifacts and room function have already been discussed. Although at times based on the presence of fixed and/or semi-fixed features, these approaches tend to be limited in their assumption that certain spaces were only or primarily used for certain activities. In a recent analysis of the distribution of artifacts in house B vi 7 at Olynthos, Lisa Nevett convincingly argued that, at least in this context, "there are no discrete, functionally specialized clusters which can be used pinpoint areas devoted to a narrow range of

[407] Robinson 1946, 146.

tasks".[408] Instead, she observes that items relating to certain activities, such as drinking or weaving, were widely scattered across the taskscape of the house.

Nevett's work is one of very few recent attempts to apply a taskscape approach to the study of households in the ancient Mediterranean world. Most of the work to this end has focused on the application of the theoretical concept to other questions, including ones concerning economic activity[409] and rural landscapes.[410] The concept was first introduced by Tim Ingold, who defined the taskscape as "an array of related activities" that take place within and are incorporated into a landscape.[411] The activities which constitute taskscapes involve both action by individual agents and interaction between them, a point which recalls Rapoport's 'activity systems'.[412] Taskscapes and activity systems are organized in both space and time. In other words, activities take place both in a spatial context and a temporal one. As Ingold indicates, however, "there is not just one rhythmic cycle, but a complex interweaving of very many concurrent cycles" of time.[413] Timescales may be very short, measuring rhythms on a day-to-day basis, or very long, encompassing entire seasons or lifecycles.

Applying a taskscape approach to the archaeological record can therefore be useful for thinking about activities not just in their social and spatial contexts, but their temporal ones as

[408] Nevett 2015, 110.

[409] e.g., Fitzjohn 2013; Brysbaert 2021.

[410] e.g., McHugh 2019; Foxhall 2020; Mallon 2021.

[411] Ingold 2000, 195.

[412] Rapoport 1990, 12.

[413] Ingold 2000, 195.

well. Even if we believe that the artifact assemblages found during excavation were deposited where they were used in antiquity, these assemblages are not necessarily a snapshot of one activity at one point in time. Instead, they may represent accumulations of items built up through time, whether on a day-to-day basis or on longer timescales. Such accumulations of items may be what we are seeing in houses A iv 5 and B vi 8. While many rooms in each of these houses have drinking and dining pottery, only a few present high concentrations of this pottery. Perhaps these spaces were used more frequently than the others, and the assemblages found in them represent not a single dining event, but many different events occurring over some period. These could have happened over just a few days, as more informal drinking events likely required less preparation and could occur at a moment's notice if necessary.

Although we might be able to suggest where social drinking may have *frequently* occurred in houses without *androne*s, it is not possible nor accurate to say that these spaces were the only locations for these activities. Indeed, the wide distribution of drinking and dining pottery across houses A iv 5 and B vi 8 suggests that social drinking was not confined to any one space. Instead, it is more likely that many, if not all, of the rooms in these houses were multi-functional. The function of these spaces may have been indicated by changes in semi-fixed features, including portable vessels and moveable furniture. In the absence of these cues, a space might also signal different functions for different people, such as women, children, slaves, or household visitors, or at different times of the day, month, or year. On a longer timescale, the function of a particular space might change entirely as the lifecycles of entire household groups, and their associated needs, changed.[414]

[414] Nevett 2015, 110.

6.2 How were they drinking?

Having considered where people were drinking in houses without *androne*s, we must briefly consider how they were drinking. When the symposium is centered in discussions of social drinking in the Greek world, so too is the practice of diluting one's wine with water in a mixing bowl (*krater*). How realistic is it that all Greeks engaged in this practice?

In total, krater fragments were found in 44 distinct contexts during the early excavations at Olynthos (Table 6.3; Fig. 6.1). Of these, 66% were found in spaces that might be defined as domestic. These include commonly recognized spaces such as the kitchen, fireplace or flue, courtyard, and *pastas*. It also includes spaces more ambiguously labelled 'room' by the excavators, which are particularly abundant on the South Hill.[415]

Table 6.3. Kraters found at Olynthos. Adapted from Cahill 2002, table 4, p. 183-185.

Findspot	**Room Type Where Found**	**Androne in house?**	**Shape**
North Hill			
A-1	Uncertain	No	Krater
A-i9d	Room	?	Krater
A 8 a	Kitchen	No	Bell krater
A 13	Uncertain	No	Krater
A iv 5 m	Cupboard	No	Bell krater
A v 2 g	Room	No	Krater
A v 3 h	Courtyard	No	Bell krater
A vi 3 b	Androne	Yes	Bell krater
A vii 7	Uncertain	No	Krater
A viii 8 b	North Room	No	Krater
A viii 8 i	Kitchen?	No	Bell krater
A viii 10 g	Courtyard	No	Bell krater
B vi 7	Uncertain	Yes	Bell krater

[415] cf. Cahill 2002, 183-185.

B vi 7 c1	North Room	Yes	Bell krater
B vi 8 g	Shop	No	Krater
B vi 8 g	Shop	No	Bell krater
D v 2 k	Uncertain	?	Krater
ESH 1	Uncertain	Yes	Krater
Tr. 13 (ESH 1-3)	Uncertain	?	Calyx krater
H. Comedian d	Flue	Yes	Calyx krater
Nr. H. Comedian	Uncertain	?	Krater
St. -iii near H. Twin Erotes	Street	?	Krater
St. iv E of Ave. B	Street	No	Bell krater
St. v and C v 4	Street	No	Krater
St. v and C v 4	Street	No	Krater
Villa Section			
H. Many Colors e	Anteroom	Yes	Bell krater
H. Many Colors f	Pastas	Yes	Krater
South Hill			
Sec. G Area 18	Room	No	Krater
Sec. G Area 19	Room	No	Bell krater
Sec. G Area 30	Room	No	Bell krater
Sec. G road	Street	No	Krater
Sec. G road	Street	No	Krater
H. of Pan c	Room	No	Krater
S. Hill road	Street	No	Krater
Sec. J/K 16e	Room	No	Calyx krater
Sec. J/K 5n	Room	No	Krater
Sec. N	Public area	No	Bell krater
Sec. N	Public area	No	Bell krater
Tr. 10	Public area	No	Bell krater
Tr. 3	Uncertain	No	Bell krater
Tr. 6	Uncertain	No	Krater?
Early			
Apotheke G8	(early fill)		Column krater
Apotheke G8	(early fill)		Krater
Grave 279	Grave		Column krater

The relationship between the krater and sympotic space at Olynthos is telling. Of the 29 domestic spaces where kraters were found, 6 were found in houses with architecturally distinct *androne*s. Two of these were found in the House of Many Colors in the Villa Section of the site, one in the anteroom and one in the *pastas* (Fig. 6.2). Additional kraters were found in the *oikos*

unit (flue) of the House of the Comedian,[416] and in the street south of the *andron* of the House of the Twin Erotes, both also located in the Villa Section.

Finally, of the kraters found in houses with *andrones*, only one was found in the *andron* itself. This was in House A vi 3 on the North Hill. This is unsurprising, as artifacts – including drinking assemblages – are rarely found in these spaces. After a symposium ended, the room would be swept and the equipment cleared away and stored elsewhere. Together, the kraters found in or near *andrones* only amount to 20% of the total kraters found in houses at Olynthos.

Remains of kraters are also commonly found in houses without *andrones*. For example, krater fragments were found in the *oikos* units (or 'kitchens') of houses A 8 and A viii 8. Additional krater fragments were found in the 'cupboard' of house A iv 5, another house without an *andron.* In the absence of or in addition to such spaces, the *oikos* unit may have doubled as storage for kraters and other dining equipment when out of use. Finally, krater fragments were also found in spaces identified as 'shops' by Robinson and his team, such as in house B vi 8 (discussed further below). What did it mean to have a decorated krater when you did not have an *andron*?

We know that many Greeks diluted their wine. According to Philochorus, Amphictyon, the king of the Athenians, learned the art of mixing wine from the god Dionysus (μαθόντα παρὰ Διονύσου τὴν τοῦ οἴνου κρᾶσιν πρῶτον κεράσαι).[417] This is the key function of a krater. When

[416] Robinson and Graham 1938, pls. 17, 87.

[417] FHG I 387 (see: Ath. 2.7)

kraters are found in Olynthian houses without *androne*s, such as house B vi 8, they suggest that the people who lived there engaged in this Greek practice of diluting wine. It does not, however, necessarily follow that the drinking of that wine had to take place in a formal symposium. This is because a formal symposium in Greek conception, at least from the literary sources discussed in Chapter 3, was an intimate gathering of men in a decorated space separate from other aspects of domestic life.

The situation is considerably more complex for houses at Olynthos where neither krater nor *andron* was found, such as houses A vi 2 and A vi 7. Several interpretations are possible. First, if we accept that mixing wine with water was a characteristic that all or most Greeks shared, as both ancient writers and modern scholars tend to suggest, then we might assume that, in the absence of a krater, these households were diluting their wine in other ways. This approach is taken up by Susan Rotroff who suggests that wine and water might have been mixed in the individual cups of drinkers beginning in the Late Classical period.[418] This might have been facilitated by the provision of more service vessels, such as jugs of various shapes and sizes (e.g., *oinochoai* and *olpai*).

A second possible interpretation is that the inhabitants of houses like A vi 2 and A vi 7 were drinking their wine neat. Most scholars take for granted that Greeks almost exclusively diluted their wine with water. This is because where neat wine (*akratos*) is mentioned in the literary sources, it is almost exclusively associated with either the god Dionysus or foreigners. In vase painting, Dionysos is frequently depicted with the kantharos; however, where this cup is not

[418] Rotroff 1996, 27.

depicted, he may instead use a drinking horn (*keras*).[419] Like the kantharos, the drinking horn may be linked to Dionysos' status as not only the god of wine, but also of excess and licentiousness. In Scythian contexts, the drinking horn (*keras*) played an important role in a ritual which formed bonds between men in much the same way that the Greek symposium did, but it also came to represent, to ancient and modern scholars alike, a mode of drinking distinct from Greek tradition. This is exemplified by the fact that Cleomenes of Sparta went mad and eventually died from drinking ἀκρητοπότην ("neat wine") in the company of Scythian envoys (see below). The drinking horn, then, stood not only for unmixed wine but also, by extension, uncontrolled drinking, and uncouth behavior in the eyes of many ancient Greeks.

According to Robert Curtis and others, "Greeks believed that drinking wine in moderation and in diluted form distinguished them from barbarians".[420] A passage from Herodotus, which juxtaposes the drinking practices of Greeks and Scythians, is commonly cited in support of this sentiment:

> "The Argives say this was the reason Cleomenes went mad and met an evil end; the Spartans … say that Cleomenes' madness arose from no divine agent, but that by consorting with Scythians he became a drinker of strong wine (ὁ ἀκρατοπότης), and the madness came from this…"[421]

The framing of this passage suggests that drinking *akratos* was not usual practice for Spartans up to this point. Cleomenes, who likely diluted his wine before, learned to drink this

[419] Lissarrague (1990, 91) notes that the use of a drinking horn "recalls that the vase belongs to Dionysus, who alone can drink pure wine safely."

[420] Curtis 2001, 294; cf. Lissarrague 1990, 7; Morgan 2011, 273; Lynch 2018, 234.

[421] Hdt. 6.84.1, trans. A.D. Godley 1920.

way after spending time with the Scythians (ἔμαθες την ἀκρητοποσίην παρ αυτών).[422] His adoption of this practice is frequently interpreted as a kind of cautionary tale since it led him to madness (ἡ μανία).[423] As Lissarrague has argued, "wine is a poison", so it requires specific rules for its use, including diluting it with water.[424] These rules, however, do not prevent individuals from overindulging in wine. Theognis argues that excessive wine-drinking leads to "two great dangers: parching thirst and disabling drunkenness".[425] The latter effect is illustrated in Aristophanes' *Wasps*, when several witnesses testify to Philocleon's indecent and violent behavior at a recent drinking party.[426]

Another section of the same passage from Herodotus further suggests that this anecdote need not be interpreted as evidence that the Greeks viewed drinking *akratos* as a wholly negative practice. In this section,[427] Herodotus relays that ever since Cleomenes' relationship with the Scythians, the Spartans called for 'a Scythian cup' whenever they wanted to drink strong wine (επεάν ζωρότερον βούλωνται πιείν). The conjunction επεάν suggests that this was a recurring desire. Therefore, drinking *akratos* was probably not an uncommon practice among the Spartans. Together with the widespread concern about wine-drinking in excess and both internal and external effects of the drunkenness that followed, this passage should be read not as a cautionary

[422] Hdt. 6.84.3.

[423] Lissarrague 1990, 7.

[424] Lissarrague 1990, 6.

[425] Thgn. 509-510, 837-840.

[426] Ar. *Vesp.* 1388ff.

[427] Hdt. 6.84.3.

tale about drinking unmixed wine *per se*, but about not being mindful about one's consumption of wine in general. The relationship between unmixed wine, foreigners, and overindulgence is also seen in a passage from Aristophanes' *Acharnians*.[428] Here, the Greek ambassador notes that "barbarians…recognize as real men only those who can gobble and guzzle the most".[429] This 'guzzling' probably involved undiluted wine (ἄκρατον οἶνον), which the Greek ambassadors were 'forced' to drink from extravagant goblets.

Drinking wine in moderation was a central feature of Greek culture, whereas diluting it was perhaps practiced only by some of the population. As mentioned above, the practice of diluting wine was facilitated often by a dedicated mixing bowl such as the krater. Many households, however, did not have access to a krater. In these cases, some other large vessel may have been substituted, or jugs may have been used to mix wine and water in individual cups. Of course, still other households may not have diluted their wine at all, which may have made owning a krater unnecessary or undesirable.

Finally, we might question whether these households were even drinking wine at all, or if they were drinking some other alcoholic beverage instead. Some scholars have investigated the possibility that ancient Greeks sometimes drank beer instead of or in addition to wine. On the one hand, there are those who have read the literary evidence optimistically and argued that at least some Greeks were beer-drinkers. This is the position taken by Auberger and Goupil, who

[428] Ar. *Ach*. 74ff.

[429] See also Plato's Laws 637d ff. for further associations between foreigners, neat wine, and disorderly conduct resulting from drunkenness.

argue that rather than an opposition between the Greeks, who drank wine, and beer-drinking "barbarians", the real opposition was one along class and geographic lines. In sum, the authors propose that it was wealthy, city-dwelling Greeks who drank wine whereas poor, country-dwelling Greeks drank beer.[430] This view, however, has been challenged by Max Nelson, whose own analysis of the literary sources convincingly shows that beer is "consistently and explicitly connected to foreigners".[431] Among the groups cited as beer-drinkers in by Athenaeus are the Thracians, the Paeonians, and the Egyptians.[432]

6.3 Discussion

Evidence for beer-drinking, whether literary or archaeological, is lacking for the Classical period of Greece. It is therefore most likely that the people drinking in houses without kraters or *androne*s like A vi 2 and A vi 7 were drinking wine in some fashion. While the ancient evidence does not seem to support the idea that non-elites drank other types of alcoholic beverages, like beer, it does support the fact that wine-drinking was a widespread practice in the Greek world. As discussed in the previous section, the issue was not who drank what kind of wine, but rather how much of that wine was consumed in one sitting.

The issue of excessive wine-drinking can be related to the issue of changing one's traditional habit of drinking, which features prominently in the Hippocratic treatises *On Regimen*

[430] Auberger and Goupil 2010, 52-54.

[431] Nelson 2014, 33; cf. Nelson 2005, 4; Wilkins and Hill 2009, 132.

[432] Ath. 10.447b-d.

and *Regimen in Acute Diseases*. These treatises, according to Elizabeth M. Craik, date to the late 5th to early 4th century BCE.[433] As their titles suggest, both medical texts deal with various aspects of one's regimen, including food, drink, and exercise, as well as the potential problems arising from deviations in proper regimen and the therapies for those problems. Particularly relevant here is the discussion in *Acute Diseases* of the problems arising when one abruptly changes their habits in eating, and more importantly, drinking. Although a variety of drinks are discussed in this treatise, the lengthiest discussion is of wine:

> "Again, the drinking of wine or the drinking of water, when one habit is suddenly changed to the other, diluted wine or neat wine is drunk with a sudden break of habit; the former produces water-brash in the upper bowels and flatulence in the lower, while the second causes throbbing of the veins, heaviness of the head, and thirst…"[434]

For the Hippocratic authors of *On Regimen* and *Regimen in Acute Diseases*, either diluted or undiluted wine may be consumed, so long as one maintains their habitual mode of drinking. Therefore, it is only when, as in Cleomenes' case, an individual changes their habit that problems arise. Neither diluted nor undiluted wine is necessarily better than the other in the Hippocratic treatises, except in the case of certain therapies, in which the type of ailment and individual bodily composition play important roles. Therefore, there seems to be, if not a clear acceptance, an awareness of a variety of modes of drinking in the Greek world, which challenges the traditional view of diluted wine as an uncomplicated symbol of Greekness.

This awareness of various modes of drinking in the Greek world corresponds to an

[433] Craik 2015.

[434] Hippoc. *Acut.* 37.

equally broad number of groups who drank wine. There are no identifying characteristics associated with the patients of *Regimen on Acute Diseases*. There is no indication of status or ethnicity, nor is there any reference to age or, significantly, gender. The gynecological Hippocratic treatises deal specifically with the ailments of women and, occasionally, children, whereas nosological treatises like *Regimen in Acute Diseases* deal broadly with "the great mass of mankind".[435] Although we might assume that the patients of *Acute Diseases* were men, without any indication of status it would be difficult to situate the patients of this treatise among the small group of elite men associated with sympotic drinking.

Instead, we should assume that everyone, poor and wealthy individuals alike, drank wine if they wanted to. Although *androne*s are not uncommon at Olynthos, far more households either could not afford or were simply not interested in investing in the construction of an elaborate, specialized room like the *andron*. When an *andron* was constructed, it is reasonable to assume that such a space was used frequently, if not only, for elite male symposia. As this chapter has shown, the absence of an *andron*, however, does not mean the absence of social drinking. It only means that, while certain household spaces may have been preferred, drinking events may have taken place in different spaces at different times according to different social and environmental conditions. For example, as with other activities, drinking might take place outdoors when the weather was warm, but in an indoor space when it was cold. This has been demonstrated by analyzing the wide distribution of drinking shapes traditionally closely associated with the symposium in houses lacking architecturally distinct dining spaces. What we might be seeing in these artifact distributions is not the activity of one specific household group (i.e., men), but an

[435] Hippoc. *Vict*. 69.

accumulation of the activities of the many different groups of people who made up a Greek household.

Therefore, we should expand the boundaries of who was drinking in the Greek world to include not only male Greek citizens, but also women, metics, slaves, and foreigners residing in Greek cities during this period. Several scholars have convincingly argued that not all Greeks shared Athenian values, especially those concerning the separation of the sexes. Scholarship on the separation and seclusion of women has largely focused on the legal status of women in the ancient world. In one such study, Barbara Levick emphasizes that the laws governing and affecting women's activities in private and in public only regulated the activities and rights of respectable women.[436] Similarly, Rebecca Futo Kennedy has observed that the behaviors of Athenians were not as homogeneous as modern scholarship suggests. The Athenian elite in the 6th and 5th centuries BCE frequently married women from places that had less strict gender divisions and where elite women were more integrated into social activities of dining and drinking.[437] Miletus, Eretria, the Black Sea settlements, and Thrace were among such places. As discussed above, Thrace is one place that Athenaeus closely associated with beer drinking.[438]

In addition to participating in drinking events involving both men and women, it is possible that Thracian immigrants to Athens and other areas of Greece, likely including Olynthos due to its proximity to the region, continued to drink beer even when residing in Greek cities. We

[436] Levick 2012, 105.

[437] Kennedy 2015, 66.

[438] Ath. 10.447b-d.

cannot know, however, to what extent this happened in antiquity. I therefore maintain that wine-drinking was a practice that almost everyone in the Greek world, citizen or non-citizen, likely participated in.

The main differences between the drinking practices of different groups may have been the strength, as discussed above, and the quality of the wine consumed. As Jouanna explains, the Hippocratic treatises "distinguish between numerous varieties of wine according to their colour (white, dark, straw-coloured), their feeling on the palate or their consistency (thin/concentrated, light/full, hard/soft, smooth/sharp), their smell (odorous, with a honeyed smell, without smell), and their age (old, young)".[439] The different types of wine might have at times signified status. In Aristophanes' *Wealth*, dark and floral-scented wine (οἴνος μέλανος ἀνθοσμίος) is associated with wealth as it appears in a catalogue of various luxuries including chests full of gold and silver (ἅπαντα... ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου τὰ σκευάρια πλήρη 'στίν) and perfumes (μύροι).[440] It is not possible to know what the wine poorer individuals drank was like, since the wine referenced earlier in the play (οἶνος),[441] when the protagonist is presumably less well off than he is in the previous passage, is given no descriptive qualities.

By contrast, the significance of the qualitative differences in wine is somewhat different in the Hippocratic treatises. Whereas the author of *Regimen in Acute Diseases* organizes his discussion of sweet wine, vinous wine, white wine, and dark wine according to their usefulness

[439] Jouanna 2012, 179.

[440] Ar. *Plut*. 802ff.

[441] Ar. *Plut*. 644.

in therapies, the author of *On Regimen* foregrounds the use of wine in regimen, recommending the best wines to drink during each season: in the winter, "drink should be dark, slightly diluted, [and] limited in quantity", while in the summer it should be "more diluted and whiter".[442] Although, as we have seen, the medical texts seem to provide recommendations for everyone, regardless of status, it is unlikely that everyone living in the Greek world would have been equally able to or interested in applying this one. Wealthier households may have been able to afford being particular with the kind of wine they purchased and consumed. We know that wine was produced in and exported from several regions around the Mediterranean –Thasos, Chios, and Mende being the most popular – so it is also possible that some households had very specific tastes regarding the origins of their wines. Poorer households, however, were likely constrained to drink whatever was available and cheap, or drank wine they made themselves.

6.4 Towards a typology of social drinking in Late Classical Olynthos

Close analysis of the treatment of wine in texts, especially the Hippocratic treatises, alongside the material evidence strongly suggests that several modes of social drinking, hosted and attended by individuals from various backgrounds, co-existed in Greek cities during the 5th and 4th centuries BCE. Several scholars have previously sought to characterize social drinking practices, including the formal symposium, in the Greek world using Dietler's model of commensal politics (see Chapter 1). The present study, however, departs from those applications of Dietler's model in a significant way. Although previous approaches viewed Dietler's categories of commensality as mutually exclusive, the current project shows that this is not the

[442] Hippoc. *Vict.* 68.

case. Empowered and diacritical feasting could occur in the same community, block, and even individual house.

Table 6.4. Categories of social drinking identified at Olynthos.

Category	**Ranking**	**Description**	**Houses**
1	Most empowered Most diacritical	Architecturally distinct *andron* Imported vessel(s)	A vi 8
2	Less empowered Less diacritical	Architecturally distinct *andron* **No** imported vessel(s)	A vi 3, A vi 5, A vi 4, A vi 1, A vi 6, B vi 7, House of the Comedian, Villa of Good Fortune
3	Less empowered Less diacritical	**No** *andron* Imported vessel(s)	A 7, A 8, A iv 5, A v 2, A vii 2, A viii 8, B vi 8, B ix 6, House of Zoilus, Villa CC
4	Least empowered Least diacritical	**No** *andron* **No** imported vessel(s)	A vi 2 A vi 7

Four distinct categories of social drinking can be identified at Olynthos, ranging from most to least empowered (Table 6.4). The criteria used to determine which houses fell into which categories – architecturally distinct *andron* and imported vessel(s) – were chosen and ranked based on the amount of time, labor, and/or economic investment required to obtain them, which in turn contributed to the status of the host. Therefore, category 1 corresponds with those households that had the most access to the time, labor, and economic resources necessary to build an *andron* and acquire imported vessels, whereas those in the lower categories had comparatively less access to the same resources and thus likely hosted more modest social drinking events.

Only one house (house A vi 8), with both an architecturally distinct *andron* and at least one import, can be included in category 1. Based on its defining features, it was a house that hosted the most empowered drinking events, as well as the most diacritical since it employs symbolic diacritica in both space and equipment. As we have seen, empowering feasts involve a big investment of resources and labor on the part of an individual, group, or community to accrue social capital. Social capital describes the securement of benefits and solutions to problems through membership in social networks. These relationships must be continually maintained and renegotiated through reciprocity. Diacritical feasts, on the other hand, are a more static form of feast. They are characterized by marked differences in taste and style along lines of social classes. Empowering and diacritical feasts overlap in that diacritical feasts involve performing one's membership in a social group. This membership can be actual or aspirational.

The second most empowered category of social drinking at Olynthos is defined, like the first category, by formal dining rooms. Although no imports could be identified, these households, too, participated in diacritical drinking, albeit at a lesser scale than seen in house A vi 8. Eight houses are represented in this category: A vi 3, A vi 5, A vi 4, A vi 1, A vi 6, B vi 7, the House of the Comedian, and the Villa of Good Fortune. The houses in this category can be further subdivided based on the differential elaboration of their *androne*s which, as we have seen, may be an indicator of the relative investment of resources and labor of each household. The House of the Comedian and the Villa of Good Fortune would be the most empowered, as they each have two *androne*s decorated with both figural and geometric mosaics; followed by house A vi 3, which has a figural mosaic; houses A vi 4 and A vi 6 both have geometric mosaics; and finally, houses A vi 1, A vi 5, and B vi 7, which all employ plain cement floors.

The final two categories of social drinking at Olynthos are defined by the fact that they do not have *androne*s. Several of the houses included in these categories (A iv 5, B vi 8, A vi 2, and A vi 7) have already been discussed earlier in the chapter. Imported drinking and mixing vessels were identified in the houses of category 3. This is unsurprising, since only one out of the ten drinking and mixing vessels that were identified as Athenian imports in chapter 4 was found in a house with an *andron*. Imports were far more abundant in houses without formal dining rooms at Olynthos, which accounts for the fact that category 3 has the most houses represented of the four. Ten houses can be included in this category: houses A 7, A 8, A iv 5, A v 2, A vii 2, A viii 8, B vi 8, B ix 6, the House of Zoilus, and Villa CC. Only a single potential import was identified in all these houses except two: three imported vessels were found in house A 8 (one bolsal and two bell-kraters) and five vessels in house B ix 6. In the last category, there are just two houses, A vi 2 and A vi 7, which are defined by their lack of both an *andron* and imported drinking equipment.

As Justin St. P. Walsh explains in his study of Athenian imports found at Morgantina, the value of imports derives from the "ability of a purchased object to signal something important about its owner and [their] status".[443] The objects' 'exotic' origin and perception as spectacular and costly contributed to this elevation of status. At Olynthos, many houses had access to drinking equipment imported from Athens. The relatively high number of potential imports found in the more recently excavated house B ix 6 suggests that the number of imports in the houses excavated by Robinson's team may have been somewhat higher than previously believed.

[443] Walsh 2013, 241.

However, Athenian imports still appear to have been supplemental, rather than central, to drinking practices at Olynthos. Instead, the imported vessels were incorporated into an established repertoire of drinking equipment at Olynthos, rather than intended to replicate Athenian practices.

Traditional symposium scholarship flattens out what was an extremely broad and diverse range of social drinking in the Greek world. Agency plays a key role in allowing us to identify and characterize the drinking practices of groups beyond the small group of elite men that we usually associate with sympotic drinking. The choices that individuals make have important consequences for defining the nature of social drinking that took place in ancient houses. The absence of a formal dining room (*andron*) raises questions of where drinking events took place, while the absence of a krater forces us to consider both alternate methods of diluting wine and alternate types of drink consumed. What I hope to have shown here is that it is not only possible but important to identify and characterize the drinking practices of non-sympotic groups if we want to expand our understanding of social drinking in the Greek world beyond the symposium of an elite few. This does not, however, mean that we should ignore the symposium in favor of searching for evidence for non-sympotic drinking events; rather, I have tried with my typology of social drinking to put the symposium in its larger context of group drinking practices which co-existed in the Greek world.

Chapter Seven

Conclusions

This chapter aims to bring together and interpret the evidence for social drinking at the site of Olynthos presented in Chapters 5 and 6. In particular, this chapter will accomplish a major goal of the dissertation, which is to use material culture – including architectural space and a selection of pottery shapes – to illustrate the range of social drinking practices and contextualize the symposium within those practices in the Greek world. In pursuit of this goal, the work of cultural anthropologists such as Michael Dietler, and their utility for better understanding social drinking in ancient Greece, will be examined. The resulting framework for thinking about social drinking in the Greek world will show that informal drinking practices can be identified just as easily as formal drinking (i.e., sympotic drinking) if we broaden our understanding of what that drinking looked like, where it took place, and who was involved beyond the symposium. Certain vessels were not relegated to sympotic activities and, as Chapter 6 has shown, drinking did not occur only in *androne*s but could happen anywhere in the house.

7.1 Defining the symposium

My analysis revealed that it is not possible to develop a standard image of the symposium – or Greek social drinking more generally – from texts and images on Athenian vases. There is so much variation in the depictions of group drinking in these sources that there is no consistency in how the symposium has been defined in modern scholarship. Some scholars argue that the *andron* was an important feature of the symposium because it is mentioned in our sources; however, other scholars have argued that the *andron* was not necessary for sympotic activity. While I agree with Morgan in their assertion that the *andronitis* was more of a conceptual rather than a physical space, I believe that the *andron* is integral to our definition of the symposium based on the material, rather than textual or iconographic, evidence.

As discussed in Chapter 5, constructing an *andron* required significant amounts of time, labor, and financial investment that were only available to a small segment of Greek society. Of the over 100 houses excavated at Olynthos by Robinson and his team, only around 30 *androne*s were found. Sometimes more than one *andron* was found in a single house, making the overall number of houses with *androne*s even lower. In addition, hosting symposia which, if the textual references are reliable, required providing wine, equipment, comfortable furnishings, and hiring entertainment, also involved a large amount of investment on the part of the host. Therefore, I argue that the *andron* was just one of several physical manifestations of the social status of households that hosted symposia. This does not necessarily mean that symposia only occurred in formal dining rooms, as previous scholars have assumed; a household could have an *andron* but use other spaces for hosting drinking parties at other times of the day, month, or year. As Chapter 6 demonstrated, the distribution of drinking pottery within an individual house can be a helpful

indicator of the use of space. Moreover, as several scholars have noted, the *andron* could also be used by other members of the household, including women, when not being used for symposia.

7.2 Contextualizing the symposium

Although hosting symposia was clearly a privilege reserved for elite members of Greek society, this did not mean that other, less wealthy inhabitants of Greek cities did not host and participate in drinking parties of their own. It is possible that non-sympotic drinking has largely been overlooked in previous studies of Greek drinking because it is not as clearly marked in the archaeological record, since it is not associated with formal dining rooms. Moreover, it might be conflated with sympotic drinking when pottery traditionally associated with the symposium, like the krater, are metonyms for the institution. Shifting our perspective towards these shapes to see them as indicative not just of the symposium, but of all forms of social drinking, allows us to be open to the possibility that multiple modes of social drinking co-existed in the Greek world.

One of the major goals of this project was to develop a more holistic understanding of social drinking in the Greek world during the Classical period. This meant investigating how consumer demand, influenced by local drinking practices, affected local production by analyzing 351 drinking and mixing vessels from Olynthos and Athens (see chapter 4). It was determined that most of the vessels from Olynthos in my study were locally produced. At least 16 drinking and mixing vessels, representing all five shape categories, were identified as probable imports based on their measurements alone. These vessels were clear outliers in size, usually somewhat larger than the average for a given shape. Upon closer inspection of decoration and fabric color, it became clear that not all outliers could be identified as imports, and some were even locally

produced. Moreover, it seems more likely that the number of imports represented in my sample is 12.

Of the 12 drinking and mixing vessels that were identified as Athenian imports in chapter 4, 10 were found during the excavations led by Robinson.[444] These include one one-handled cup (**O68**, B vi 8); one red-figured skyphos (**O79**, Villa CC); two black-gloss bolsals (**O25**, A vi 8; **O29**, House of Zoilus); three cup-kantharoi (**O3**, A v 7; **O4**, A vii 5; **O6**, A iv 5); and three bell-kraters (**O80**, A v 2; **O86**, A viii 8; **O83**, A iv 5). Once the distinction between imports and local products was made, the patterns of distribution of both types of vessels at the site of Olynthos were analyzed and discussed in chapters 5 and 6.

Chapter 5 looked closely at the distribution of pottery in relation to formal dining rooms at the site, focusing on block A vi. Several patterns emerged from this analysis. Some houses were characterized by decorated cups and the absence of an *andron*, such as in houses A vi 2 and A vi 7. However, commensality which involved specialized rooms for drinking at least some of the time was abundant in the block. Houses A vi 3, A vi 5, and A vi 6 all have both fine ware cups and differentiated dining space in the form of an *andron*. Just one house – A vi 8 – had not only evidence of fine ware cups and differentiated space, but also, significantly, made use of imported vessels. In house A vi 8, at least one bolsal (**O25;** Fig. 4.20) may have been imported. Even if the houses did not, in fact, make use of imports, it is still significant that nearly half of the houses in Block A vi were participating in more empowered drinking than their neighbors. How did this compare with other blocks at the site?

[444] Two possible imports were found during the recent excavations of the Olynthos Project: bolsal OP15 and undecorated bell-krater OP50.

Like Block A vi, significant patterns in drinking practices can also be identified in Block B vi. House B vi 9 finds similarities with the drinking which occurred in houses A vi 2 and A vi 7, which involved fine ware cups but not an architecturally distinct *andron*. *Andrones* are generally rare in this block compared with Block A vi. Only two *andrones* were found here: one in house B vi 5 and another – one of the smallest at the site, accommodating only three couches – in house B vi 7. As in block A vi, only one vessel that may have been imported from Athens was found in block B vi. In house B vi 8, a one-handled cup (**O68**) may have been imported. No *andron* was found in this house, however, which suggests that the drinking events which took place there were somewhat more informal than those that occurred in B vi 5 and B vi 7. The nature of social drinking in house B vi 8 was discussed in Chapter 6.

In addition to analyzing patterns in drinking practices in blocks A vi and B vi, the distribution of drinking and mixing pottery from the more recently excavated house B ix 6 was also considered. Compared with the houses excavated by Robinson and his team, this one house alone yielded examples of every shape represented in my sample. Given the high quantities of the shapes found in B ix 6, it became apparent that the household assemblages recorded by Robinson represented only a small fraction of what was in use by individual households at the site during this period. This raises questions about the nature of the collection and recording practices used by early excavators, and whether the assemblages we find in the excavation publications can be reliable sources of information for studies like the present one.

7.3 Theorizing social drinking

To identify and interpret these social drinking events, I applied several theoretical approaches from other disciplines to the material evidence for social drinking from Olynthos. For example, Chapter 6 illustrated the utility of taskscapes, a concept first introduced by Tim Ingold, in identifying the contexts of social drinking in houses without architecturally distinct formal dining rooms. Applying a taskscape approach to the archaeological record of Olynthos was useful for thinking about activities in their social, spatial, and temporal contexts. It allowed us to recognize the domestic spaces which may have been used more frequently for drinking events than others and hypothesize about the groups that may have participated in those events at different times of the day, month, or year. Approaches to interpreting the built environment, such as those offered by Rapoport and Sanders, further enhanced this discussion by acknowledging the fixed and semi-fixed features of spaces which could signal different uses of those spaces at different times and for different people.

7.4 Future directions

In the present study, I drew conclusions about which vessels were locally produced and which were Athenian imports largely from close analysis of shape measurements (height and rim diameter) and similarities in decorative motifs. Although there was some discussion of the clay fabrics of the vessels in my sample, this was based solely on observable macroscopic characteristics, including clay color. To check the macroscopic groupings that I formed using shape measurements, clay color designations (using a Munsell soil chart), and patterns in surface decoration, I plan to employ several scientific methods for ceramics analysis. This will involve

collecting samples from vessels, rocks, and clays found both in and around Olynthos and Athens for petrographic (thin-section) and compositional (scanning electron microscopy, x-ray fluorescence, etc.) studies.

Another future direction involves broadening the scope of the current project to present a more holistic discussion of social drinking in the Greek world. There are two approaches that will be taken. One approach might consider geographic and chronological variability. For example, although kylikes are virtually non-existent at Olynthos, at least 93 kylikes were identified during the excavations of the Athenian Agora in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE. If kylikes were so abundant at Athens, what can account for the absence of the shape at Olynthos?

Most of the kylikes found at Athens date between 500 and 460 BCE; while there are some that date to the later 5th and early 4th centuries, these are relatively few. This is unsurprising, as Sparkes and Talcott observed that stemmed cups were quickly going out of style by the end of the fifth century, replaced instead by more ornate cups, such as kantharoi, and vessels for eating.[445] Such a trend might explain why kylikes are almost non-existent at Olynthos, whose settlement underwent a major expansion (probably) in 432 BCE. A survey of ceramic assemblages from several sites across northern Greece, including Molyvoti in Thrace (ca. 4th century BCE), indicates that kylikes were not widely favored. Again, we find far more examples of other shapes, including skyphoi and kantharoi, as well as shapes more closely associated with the consumption of food.

[445] Sparkes and Talcott 1970, 88.

This pattern may reflect regional tastes, or it may fit within a broader chronological trend towards a different drinking assemblage in the later 5th and 4th centuries BCE. A future project that would broaden the geographical scope of the current one might focus on a comparative analysis of houses and their assemblages from contemporary sites around the Greek world, or it might otherwise be more diachronic in nature, including sections on earlier and later domestic drinking practices to answer questions about the composition of drinking assemblages over time.

The purpose of such an approach would be to determine whether these additional sites follow similar patterns to what was observed at Olynthos. Olynthos shows a different pattern of social drinking to what has previously been observed in traditional scholarship on the subject; it does not seem like sympotic drinking was the only mode of drinking that Olynthians participated in, nor does it appear as though they sought to imitate Athenian modes of drinking using imported vessels. The reason for this is yet to be determined: is it because Olynthos is a different city, or is it because no search for this diversity in social drinking practices has been conducted in Athens before?

A micro-scale approach to broadening the scope of this project would involve applying the model proposed in the current project to the evidence from Athens. Although well-preserved houses and household assemblages are rare in Athens, it may still be possible to identify a similar range of social drinking practices to what was observed in Olynthos.