Kepos: Garden Spaces in Ancient Greece: 
Imagination and Reality

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
at the
University of Leicester
by
Margaret Helen Hilditch
BEd (Reading), BA (Open), MA (Open)

School of Archaeology and Ancient History
University of Leicester

September 2015
Abstract: *Kepos: Garden Spaces in Ancient Greece: Imagination and Reality*

Margaret Helen Hilditch

This is the first examination of the significance of ancient Greek gardens. It analyses the use of the word κῆπος (*kepos*) using linguistic and contextual analysis, based on two databases of literary and epigraphic sources. It also uses iconographic, archaeological, ethnographical and palaeobotanical evidence to examine how Archaic and Classical gardens were perceived, the associations they invoked, and how ‘the garden’ functioned within the real Athenian landscape.

Little is known about ancient Greek gardens, largely because the sources are so meagre, as is the research context. Consequently, inaccurate assumptions are made, based on Roman practice and influenced by contemporary perceptions. Understanding Greek garden practice is important because gardens are a vital part of a traditional society’s agrarian landscape. It is equally important to understand Greek perceptions of ‘the garden’, because they can illuminate societal attitudes towards both landscape and people: ‘the garden’ is easily co-opted as a symbol to express ideas about the surrounding culture and its beliefs. Therefore, the scanty sources that do exist relate more to ‘gardens of the mind’ than to real plots of land. Such gardens illuminate aspects of Greek perceptions, whilst their real counterparts play a vital role in negotiating overall city space.

This study found that κῆπος was a shifting, elusive word and concept, having multiple uses and functioning in different ways, like the gardens themselves, which defy categorisation into discrete types. It is clear that conceptual and real garden spaces were constantly interacting and mutually reinforcing and that both the word and the real plots of land carried specific, long-enduring associations. The three essential ‘resonances’ were: of care for something highly valued; of luxury, privilege and eastern elements; and of the tempting yet risky presence of women. These, combined with the Greek landscape, made the garden an ambivalent, borderline space.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

‘Ancient Greek communities inhabited three landscapes: the natural, the human, and the imagined.’

(Cole 2004: 7-8)

1.1.1: The garden

Every society has different ideas about what constitutes a garden. In contemporary Britain, its primary meaning is a private plot attached to the home. In the past, except for elite owners, it was largely a productive space, but today, although it may produce fruit and vegetables, it functions primarily as a relaxation space, often being described as an ‘outdoor room’. It is very much a private space. Secondly, there are public open spaces: secular or sacred gardens, such as parks, cemeteries and commemorative gardens. Roman gardens functioned in a similar manner; the domestic garden is particularly well-known as a result of Jashemski’s archaeological explorations in Pompeii. The gardens attached to private houses seem similarly to have functioned as ‘outdoor rooms’ and to have been governed by aesthetic considerations. Again, open public garden spaces, sacred and secular, were part of the environment.

Every society will have a different cluster of conceptual associations around its word for ‘garden’, based on its own cultural experiences. In modern England, because of the garden’s function, the word evokes relaxation and privacy, tranquillity, beauty, sometimes productivity and labour, mostly within a domestic context. There is no firm connection with any one social class, although perhaps the broad band of ‘middle classes’ is most closely linked. Although status is involved in perceptions of the garden, it is not as significant as was the case in Roman times. Interpretive investigations of the social and symbolic context of Roman gardens show how they related to the built...

1 The Roman gardens studied have, however, been overwhelmingly urban and elite. Rural Romans’ perceptions of their own plots will have been as different as the plots themselves, but are less evidenced and thus less studied.
environment and were used to promote status and identity. This function of the garden as a constructed status-marker would have been reflected in the Roman conceptual ‘resonance’ of the garden. Pliny’s description of his Tuscan villa (Ep. 5.6) indicates that notions of literary, constructed artifice as well as status must have accrued around the word.

Perhaps because our understanding of the garden and its Roman precedent are similar, there is an underlying assumption that all gardens in antiquity functioned in the same way and evoked the same mental images. This is wrong and imposes a preconceived idea of what constitutes a garden upon ancient society – a danger demonstrated by Grimal (1969: 71). When considering the Greek precursors of Roman sacred gardens, he wrote (of leased temple gardens) that:

Ces terres, même lorsqu’elles comportaient des κῆποι, ne peuvent être considérées ici comme des jardins. Les seuls domaines divins qui méritent ce nom sont des ‘enclos’ qui ne sont pas cultivés ……… mais qui constituent une partie rituelle du sanctuaire.

To decide that only a specific type of plot deserves the word ‘garden’ is to ignore what the Greeks themselves considered gardens to be and forces the evidence into the restriction and distortion of a preconceived plan. The Greek word for garden (κῆπος - kepos) has different usages, only some of which conform to our understanding. The kepoi of Greece need to be studied from the sources alone, in order to discover what that society considered ‘the garden’ to be. It is clear that they functioned in ways that were different from both Roman and contemporary practices, but there is, as yet, no common understanding of the physical or conceptual ground they occupied in ancient Greece. Yet, in such an ancient, agriculturally based society, it is essential to gain insight into the ways in which every part of the landscape was used and viewed. In Archaic and Classical Greece, kepoi were very largely part of the agricultural world. With low rainfall and shortage of good agricultural land, in much of Greece and in

---

2 For example, Purcell (1996) on the garden as a domestic building; Gleason (2008) on the garden as a constructed space; von Stackelberg (2009) on the garden in its spatial context.
periods of high population, adequate food supply could only be maintained by
maximising productivity on every parcel of land (Cole 2004: 10-12); the kepos was the
most privileged part.

1.1.2: Introductory comments on the nature of gardens in Greece

A scrutiny of literary and epigraphic sources shows that very different places, both real
and imagined, could be subsumed within the term κῆπος (section 6.1.2); equally,
other terminology was used (sections 2.1.3, 3.1.3). Whilst the word is translated
‘garden’ in this work, a narrow modern perspective should be avoided. From the
multiplicity of terminology and contexts, a basic distinction regularly appears between
three fundamental aspects of gardens, which often shape ‘categories’ of productive,
sacred and amenity gardens. Whilst private, domestic gardens attached to homes did
occasionally exist, they appear to function within these basic categories. Although the
categories are mine, they have evolved from clusters suggested by the evidence of
those who experienced the gardens as ‘fields of care ..... [which] can be known in
essence only from within’ (Tuan 1974: 241).

There are indications that some garden spaces may have functioned in multiple ways;
this has implications for the notable lack of references to gardens specifically created
as pleasurable, ornamental gardens. Writers on garden history note their absence
(Hobhouse 1994: 22, King 1979: 28). Beautiful gardens dedicated to pleasure alone
were known in preceding ancient societies in Egypt and the Near East, and Roman
private pleasure gardens are justly famous; yet there is no immediate evidence for the
Greek world until after the period under review and even then to a limited extent.
Persian paradeisoi gardens were certainly well known to Athenians of the Classical
period, but without apparent direct effect in most of the Greek world; it seems to have
been expressed in more subtle ways. Foxhall has already raised the possibility of
ornamental orchards acting as a form of pleasure garden (Foxhall 2007: 223-233) and
it seems that some types of sacred garden may also have worked in this way. Further,
we do not know how many plots were named. Thus how garden spaces actually functioned will be important to this study.

An aptitude for symbolic transfer, for using the garden to express societal attitudes, persists across the centuries. In the construction of the *Odyssey*, Laërtes’ toil in the garden (24.220-257) acts as an attestation of his character by its association with the flourishing plot of Alkinoös (7.112-132) and the encomium to Penelope (19.107-114). Thucydides’ single use of the term ἀκήπος (2.62.3) equates it with an ornament of the wealthy. The farm garden of Demosthenes (47.52-61) is used to represent the violation of inner, private space. Theopompos (in Athenaios 12.533a) uses Kimon’s gift of free garden fruit to help construct a benevolent character. The garden is also used as a metaphor to describe such widely disparate things as fertile territory in general, the physiological processes of the body, loving care, the field of literature, bad taste or character, luxury, aristocratic or tyrannical tendencies and employed as an extended sexual metaphor; interestingly, it is frequently associated with the presence of women. Equally, there is evidence that, because the word carried a heavy symbolic burden, its use could be avoided; in Demosthenes (53.15-16) a plot that was ornamental as well as productive, which grew fruit, vines, olives and roses, was described by the anodyne term χωρίον. Thus, the cluster of associations that formed the concept of the ἀκήπος has a great deal to say about how garden spaces were used and perceived, and therefore about the societal attitudes that surrounded it.

1.1.3: Research context

It is understandable that a full-scale analytical examination of the topic has yet to be undertaken: the source material is very limited, the vocabulary opaque and inconsistent and the associated concepts elusive.

Consequently, the body of secondary literature on this topic is very limited and forms only a minimal ‘research context’. Most considerations of ‘the garden’ in ancient Greece have treated it only briefly and tangentially. The sole book to cover the topic is
Carroll’s German work (Carroll-Spillecke 1989) which itemises what is known about gardens, divided into different types. The most illuminating aspect of the book is the association of the garden districts of Athens with a ring zone of cultivation around the city. The focus of this archaeological work, however, is on the slight material remains; the work contains no analysis; the sources used are a fraction of the whole and the poetic and conceptual are ignored. The work contains a brief English summary and Carroll has also contributed a similar English article (Carroll-Spillecke 1992). Osborne has contributed a more analytical and evaluative article (Osborne 1992a), which focuses not only on what gardens were, but also what they meant and the article provides the springboard for this research. He raises a crucial aspect, evident from Homer on: the ease with which gardens can become an ideological tool (Osborne 1992a: 374). In this brief journal article, however, there was no opportunity to follow through the ideas raised and the questions posed, which my research aims to address.

Selected types of gardens and orchards have received some attention: the gardens of Homer (Ferriolo 1989, de Romilly 1993-1995), the Gardens of Adonis (Atallah 1966, Detienne 1994), the orchard and vineyard plots in Chersonesos (Dufkova and Pečírka 1970, Carter 2000), ornamental orchards (Foxhall 2007), the sacred landscape (Motte 1971), the orchards on Thasos (Launey 1937, 1944), the plots on Delos (Kent 1948, Bruneau 1979) and aspects of gardens in Athens (Thompson and Griswold 1982). Several chapters of A Cultural History of Gardens: Vol. 1 (Gleason 2013) touch on aspects of the gardens of Greece. Whilst these are valuable contributions, they are all peripheral to the central question: what was the nature and meaning of the garden in Greece?

Owing to the paucity of works focusing specifically on gardens and to the fact that the topic has footholds in multiple areas, information must be drawn from authors writing in fields that are widely varied: farming and food, landscape and religion, irrigation and economy, housing and botany – and more. Among the most useful are agriculture and rural life (Isager and Skydsgaard 1995, Osborne 1987), the Greek household (Nevett 2010, 2005, 1999, Morgan 2010), the utopian aspect of gardens in the classical world (Giesecke 2007) and traditional Greek farming methods (Halstead 2014, Forbes, 2012,

Understanding the physical and conceptual place of the the Classical Greek *kepos* within the total landscape is essential. Scholarship has long focused on the urban, and more recently started to address the neglected rural landscapes, but the place of ‘the garden’ is ignored – yet it is part of both the rural and the urban and unites the two. Understanding this needs a perception based upon the way the πόλις (*polis*) was enmeshed with its χώρα (*khora*), in a geographical landscape that is mostly harsher and more arid than Roman Italy. The prime concern was control over unpredictable, brutal natural forces, where the threat of starvation was closer. In most Greek communities, including Athens, the χώρα can best be envisaged as a series of circles, with the defensible, tightly packed city within its walls as the conceptual, if not the geographical, centre. Further out lay the community’s arable spaces, further still the pastoral lands, and at the extremes the ἐσχατία (*eskhatia*), the far zones - only marginally cultivable, but certainly exploited for their resources. These distances from the πόλις centre may not always be physical - mountainous extreme zones may interrupt cultivable areas and there were always exceptions, but they were certainly conceptual: the further out the space, the more it was perceived as less secure, less civilised. This is evident in the ekphrasis of the Shield of Akhilles in *Iliad* 18.478-608, normally visualised as having scenes running from the central boss out in concentric circles. The two cities are central, followed by descriptions of essential arable activity – ploughing, reaping and grape harvesting, close to the city; farther out, towards the rim, is pasture for sheep and cattle. Homeric similes reinforce this picture: the wilder, more distant areas, where rude rustics live are dangerous places, with lurking beasts of prey (for example, *Iliad*, 11.548-555; *Odyssey*, 6.127-134). At the heart of the *Odyssey* lies the paradigm of the safe and civilised - the well-regulated kingdom of Alkinoös. Of all the places that Odysseus visited, this alone is a *polis*-state, founded upon well-regulated agriculture just outside the city (6.293-294). This spatial vision endured: Plato’s *Protagoras* (320d-322d) articulates the history of humankind as a progression from isolated, primitive, pre-agricultural men, destroyed by wild beasts;
only by eventually gathering together did they save themselves by founding cities (322a5) and learning the skills of civilisation. A fundamental distinction between civilised, superior city and its rural hinterland underlies Aristophanes’ Clouds; indeed, the rustic, uncivilised rural world was viewed with disdain until the Hellenistic period.

For Athens alone there is a reasonable body of evidence, but such evidence as exists for other city-states suggests similar patterns, with variations. Although there are exceptions, during the Classical period, the majority of kepoi for which we have evidence are found neither within the city walls, nor within the agricultural landscape outside, but in a borderline zone immediately outside the city walls. They needed to be close to the water supply on which the city was founded and to the manure it produced, easily accessible to those living within the city for daily care and cultivation, and to be close for protection, but outside the tightly packed walled area. Poised between city and agricultural land, this border zone is physical; but it is also conceptual, bound up with specific imaginative associations.

Spaces on borders exist in two worlds, and privileged spaces attract attention. Perhaps because of these features, and also because of their concentrated nature, kepoi are associated with a set of attitudes and carried a heavy symbolic burden; this is clear from Homer on. Osborne has noted that ‘gardens were good to think with’ (Osborne 1992a: 374). Therefore, the ways in which the concept of the kepos is used as a symbolic ideological tool will reflect the attitudes of the society and its social, political, economic and religious concerns. This work attempts something that has not previously been undertaken: to take the κῆπος (word and concept), to ask how it was used to think with and to relate these rather elusive factors to the reality of the built landscape of Athens.

Close reading of the sources makes it clear that kepoi were places endowed with meaning and with their own specific place in space. In Greek terms, the defining characteristic of a κῆπος seems to be its fertility: fertility in the sense of fulfilling maximum productive capacity - whether for food production or as an expression of
sacred space. It offers the resources of the land at its best, because scarce resources and human effort are all concentrated into a small focused space. This has significant implications, for it indicates that gardens were the most privileged part of the landscape, receiving the greatest care and occupying the best, watered sites. They were, therefore, very important spaces to contemporaries and to those who try now to understand how Greek society operated.

1.1.4: Aims and scope of this thesis

The sources condition the nature of study and it was clear from early researches that most textual sources for the earlier periods (literary and iconographic) do not relate to real productive gardens, but to gardens of the conceptual landscape. Because of this lack of evidence for early gardens of the real world, the emphasis of this work is upon the ideas that the word κῆπος evoked - the ‘resonances’ of the word. By investigating the imaginative constructions that surrounded the word, it will be possible to discern what the word meant for the Greeks of the Archaic and Classical period and how this most privileged landscape element was used and regarded.

Given the enormous spatial and chronological span of ancient Greek culture, limitations are necessary. Because of the disjunction between Mycenaean Greece and its successors, and because of source scarcity, Bronze Age horticulture is not addressed. Equally, although the evidence increases greatly from the end of the fourth century, influences from external cultures become involved; occasional later sources are, however, referred to (pp. 15-16). This work will, therefore, cover the Archaic and Classical periods, with occasional reference to the later Iron Age, although many of its conclusions are relevant far later; the earliest literature of this period formed concepts and attitudes that endured. Spatially, because of the Athenocentric nature of the sources and because of Athenian primacy, this city will be the focus. However, evidence from across the Greek world will be adduced where this is extant and relevant. All dates in this work are BC unless otherwise stated and unacknowledged translations mine.
The topic of ‘the garden’ could find a home in many disciplines: in ancient history, archaeology, ancient agriculture and palaeobotany etc., all of which would cover only part of the topic. The concept of landscape offers the best framework for exploration: it involves an interaction between the land itself and the work of humans upon it. The landscape that humans create reveals practical aspects such as their priorities, organisational and conceptual principles, their religious ideas or historical memory. Landscape has been receiving increasing interest in recent decades from disciplines as diverse as archaeology, geography, history and anthropology (Knapp and Ashmore 1999: 1-3). It is an abstraction that integrates the natural environment and cultural interaction, leading to a changed, constantly altering material and conceptual world (Anschuetz, Wilhusen and Scheick 2001: 158-164, Dommelen 1999: 278). Landscape studies seek to ‘read’ the ‘text’ that has been thus produced (Tilley 1994: 34, Crumley 1999: 271) in order to extract meaning from those changes. Apart from the natural background, Knapp and Ashmore (1999: 8-11) define two basic categories - those of ‘constructed’ and ‘conceptualised’ landscapes.

Cole’s quotation at the beginning of this chapter differentiates three types of landscape: the natural, the human (political and economic - such as mountain and river state boundaries and food supply) and the imaginary (the population of the landscape with stories), but that they were mutually reinforcing and inextricably enmeshed - apparent from all the sources. The interactions that the Greeks imagined between the landscape and creatures of myth, ritual and belief were fundamental to their world view. Some of these are examined by Buxton (1994: 80-113).

This is true especially of garden spaces; thus, whilst the focus of this research is on the garden as a conceptual space, it is inseparable from physical gardens. Vase paintings and poetic myth demonstrate that, although the theme might be mythical, inspiration clearly derived from the landscapes familiar to the creators and their viewers. This is particularly evident in the Meidias Painter’s works. In the same way, the conceptual gardens of literature and art must have influenced perceptions and practice in real, physical gardens.
1.1.5: Research questions

This thesis seeks to answer the questions:

1. How were *kepoi* viewed as conceptual and symbolic spaces? What were the social, political and religious attitudes and ideologies associated with them?
2. How did this conceptual landscape relate to the real human landscape?
3. How did garden spaces function as landscape elements, conceptually and physically, between the farmed and built spaces of Athens?

1.1.6: Sources, methodology and approaches

Ancient gardens are an emerging study of academic interest, as indicated by publications such as Miller and Gleason (1994) *The Archaeology of Garden and Field*, Leach (1997) ‘The Terminology of Agricultural Origins’, Leslie and Hunt (2013) *A Cultural History of Gardens* (six volumes) and Gleason’s collation of *Gardens of the Roman Empire* (forthcoming). My research offers a significant contribution to this new research area by providing a foundation study specifically focused on ancient Greece.

Knowing how ‘the garden’ was perceived and used is important not only because of its significance within the landscape. In a wider view, it is important to know how this space functioned within and between the other spaces of the *polis*. Scholarly attention has been paid to the political, religious, social, domestic, economic and agrarian landscapes (both real and conceptual), yet not to the garden which participates in all these apparently discrete areas. In attempting to understand how Greek society functioned, dichotomies are drawn between aspects of spatial negotiation, such as between public and private, inside and out, safe and unsafe. The garden, however, will be shown to be a place that defies such categorisation and polarisation, for it is a multi-functional, fluid space and has points of intersection with all. Then and now, humans do not live neatly separated and categorised lives; therefore, the garden is a way of gaining insight into how real lives were conducted, especially those of women. The contradiction exists that, although gardens (in Athens at least) rarely exist alongside domestic housing, they seem conceptually connected with domestic space,
sharing part of its safety and perceived propriety in spaces that are public, outside and potentially unsafe.

Lacking the material remains that landscape archaeology investigates (Miller and Gleason 1994), this study focuses on the language and images used in connection with gardens. The basic word for garden (κῆπος) is used for a variety of spaces, used in a variety of ways. A simple definition of the word is impossible, but interpretations are offered (esp. sections 3.1.3, 5.5.3).

Words, even apparently simple nouns, are not fixed descriptions of the phenomena they describe, nor do they exist in isolation from their surrounding culture. All words carry overtones of meaning, implication or experience, which form clusters of association in the minds of those who use them. Such clusters govern the selection of one word in place of another in different situations; this reinforces the ‘resonances’ of the word. Equally, images of plants, trees or flowers evoke wider associations of garden spaces based on experience, in the same way that Roy (1996) has traced evocative landscape references in drama.

Therefore, what this research undertakes is a work of analytical synthesis. It analyses the use and context of the word κῆπος and of iconographic depictions showing planted spaces with the characteristics of gardens, taken from multiple and discrete source areas, all of which require different evaluative practices. For literary sources, questions of genre, context and source agenda will be prime. In linguistic analysis, attempts will be made to suggest some of the ancient resonances and nuances of different words that might be applied to the same plot, in order to take small steps in understanding vocabulary selection. With epigraphy, the nature and purpose of the document will be considered, for these affect the features deemed sufficiently significant to be recorded. A major consideration with archaeological sources is that what remains is not the whole, but the chance survival of one or more parts of the material record in one particular place, at once particular time (Foxhall 2000).
The wide variety of primary sources, the many different fields of secondary literature and the fragmentary and meagre nature of the evidence make it impossible to provide a full and coherent picture, with a proper balance of evidence. What is possible is to scrutinise all the evidence available and then to describe and evaluate the type of gardens that lay behind the references and how they were imagined and perceived – and why.

The initial research task was to compile two data sets recording literary and epigraphic references to the κῆπος. Some of these references are well known, but most are not. The searches were made using the search functions of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae website (http://www.tlg.uci.edu/) for the literary references, of the Packard website (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main) for the epigraphy and the Beazley archive (http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/index.htm) for appropriate images. Despite dependence on the algorithms of the search engines, this is the most effective way of finding the greatest number of references. The results, entered on spreadsheets, included the citation in Greek and translated, together with categories of date, type of garden (where possible), geographical or conceptual area and authorial genre in the case of the literature. A large number had to be excluded from effective consideration: in the case of literature, because they were irrelevant to Greece, because they were too minimal and context-free or of uncertain provenance; in the case of inscriptions, because they were context-free, fragmentary or impossible to decipher. The date parameters for the searches were from Homer to the end of the fourth century BC in the case of literature, with one or two later authors being considered if their references were appropriate (particularly Plutarch, Athenaios and Diogenes Laertios). The epigraphic chronology ran from the earliest inscriptions in the later fifth century to the point where other influences, especially Roman, intruded.

However, this work is an area of study requiring a multi-disciplinary approach. Source limitation requires interrogation from any relevant area, as detailed below, together with an indication of source limitations.

3 Unfortunately, these proved too large to include with this study.
Literary sources

There are only two ancient authors of major significance for Greek *kepoi* - Homer and Theophrastos. Both have completely different things to offer, come from different periods and have difficulties of interpretation. Homer gives the fullest narrative description; he allows us physical descriptions of three gardens - one on Scheria, two on Ithaka; these are unique and priceless resources. However, although describing gardens, Homer was writing epic: he had a story to present, a dramatic structure to maintain and a moral construction to formulate. It is essential to question how his gardens functioned within the *Odyssey*, to try to establish why gardens were selected for that purpose. With careful examination, therefore, Homer’s gardens can provide information not only about the physical context, but also about how the garden was perceived. Through careful attention to ‘the archaeology of the text’ (Sherratt 1996: 148), it is possible also to estimate the date of such a specific part of the written version’s mass of oral antecedents. However, it is difficult to know to what extent earlier practices and perceptions were relevant in later periods.

After Homer’s brief illumination of the topic, no author deals explicitly with horticulture until Theophrastos in the late fourth century\(^4\). Theophrastos (from 323 head of the Lykeion and writing around this date) gives an invaluable amount of detailed information of a very different type, relating to horticultural practice. He gives us considerable detail of plant and tree crops grown and methods used. He bears witness to a depth of horticultural expertise – both knowledge and technique – that would shame most modern professional horticulturalists. This is incidental to his purpose, however: he wrote as a philosopher, attempting to categorise and explain the plant kingdom just as Aristotle had categorised animals. Therefore, his approach is philosophical, botanical and physiological. A difficulty in dealing with his testimony is that it is difficult to be sure of the area to which his information applies, for his remit is far wider than Greece. Indeed, he benefited from the observations of trained observers who accompanied Alexander the Great across Asia (Fraser 1994: 170-188).

\(^4\) Hesiod’s agriculture does not include gardens.
Sometimes, the habitat of plants described make an exotic origin obvious; at other times it cannot be established whether he is describing conditions within Greece. Equally, he does not differentiate between first hand observation and information gained through reading.

There is also considerable difficulty with the translation of words used in modern horticulture within Theophrastos’ works, given that the appropriate technical vocabulary did not exist in Greek (Raven 2000: 16). This is compounded by uncertainty over the accuracy of plant-name translation that is common to any Greek textual evidence. The original compiler of a Greek-English plant glossary, Thiselton-Dyer, has been roundly criticised (Raven 2000: 5-10) and it is his translations on which Liddell, Scott and Jones relied. In fact, given the absence of a scientific system of taxonomy, plants were categorised in ways that made certain identifications extremely difficult.

The literary references to gardens are usually fleeting and concern gardens of imaginary construction rather than concrete reality because the poets’ source material was the conceptual world of gods and heroes, not the everyday world of man. This aspect is, of course, extremely interesting, for it reveals the mental associations that the word κήπος evoked for contemporaries and thus how gardens were perceived and functioned. These were transmitted to later generations, for the poets and their myths were the first teachers (Buxton 1994: 171).

There is a clear divide between this early, poetic material and later, more factual writing, which is reflected in the gardens described. Thus, after the fifth century, it is productive gardens that occupy the majority of references, but they merit only passing attention in narratives concerned with more weighty matters.

Herodotos mentions three gardens; none is in Greece proper. Thucydides has but one reference, albeit a very telling one. In the philosophers, there are passing references to productive and sacred plots of the real world and references also to a new type of garden, evolved from ancient sacred spaces – those in which philosophers walked and
talked. References in the orators are sparse in the extreme; their rare appearance is, therefore, the more interesting. There is a considerable number of fragments which make passing reference to productive, sacred and metaphorical gardens. These bring frustrations, particularly due to their fragmentary nature – for example Ibykos, *Frag.* S166, l. 34, which refers to Spartan groves, about which little is known. A significant proportion of these fragments are of Old, Middle and New Comedy, but their value is reduced by being context-free; Arkhippos, *Frag.* 2, for example, consists of a mere two lines and is a metaphorical usage. There are similarly fragmentary contributions from little-known works of history, philosophy, mythography, astronomy and medicine. Some of these do not relate to Greece, but may offer insight into what the Greeks thought significant to record.

The fleeting and fragmentary nature of the sources appears to reflect the place and status that humbler, real gardens occupied in the minds of those who composed them. The urban and urbane elite male was both author and audience for the extant literature. The muddy world of gardens, appropriate to the rural and agricultural, appear not to have been considered worthy of literary consideration (White 1977: 1-2). Perhaps this helps to explain why a fair proportion of references are mere fragments (often quotations), the works from which they come not being considered worthy of preservation. However, whilst the extant sources have been filtered through many stages of transmission, there is no evidence that the pattern would have been substantially different if the full range of contemporary source material had survived. From Theophrastos, we have indications of the existence of earlier works of botany, but it is doubtful that they would have provided more information, being equally focused on the general nature of plants rather than on the gardens that housed them.

Because of primary source scarcity, consideration will also be given to ‘secondary’ primary sources if they seem to report contemporary accounts reliably and any reference must be considered on its merits. Plutarch (writing in the first and early second centuries AD) was certainly influenced by rhetorical and philosophical considerations, as were all ancient authors. Yet his details relating to garden topics do not seem sufficiently important to be worth fabricating or adjusting to any significant
degree and many sources, no longer extant, were available to him. Athenaios (writing in the second century AD) cites an enormous number of snippets from early authors, many of which offer insights into garden-related topics, especially food. These fragments, given their re-contextualisation into Roman thought and settings, and the uncertain quality of their authors, are not solidly reliable, and Athenaios’ aim is primarily entertainment; however, citations do seem to have been treated respectfully in the ancient world and his are worthy of attention.

However, these apparent major difficulties – the scarcity and the fleeting and scattered nature of the written sources - provide both challenge and opportunity. A full range of literature on the topic would weight research heavily towards the type of gardens and the type of situation favoured by literature. Therefore, several other areas of study will be involved, which are more likely to produce a greater balance.

Other sources

Firstly, epigraphy is an additional vital source. It deals with actual gardens on the ground and, although no written source is objective, epigraphy is one stage closer to reality and ‘objectivity’. The very existence of significant numbers of gardens in the epigraphic record testifies to their importance in the life of the polis. Unfortunately, gardens do not appear before the mid fifth century, but references increase greatly from the fourth century onwards. To a far greater extent than the literary sources, they provide information from across the Greek world; the majority refer to gardens that were productive, but some to purely sacred plots. Then there is the major category of gardens that were both at the same time. A large proportion of the epigraphic evidence relates to this mixed category: gardens that were owned by sanctuaries, but were leased out to be gardened productively. It is from this type of evidence that interesting features about horticultural practice, unattested elsewhere, are recoverable: details of location and size, crops and specific techniques and of ownership. A major source in this area is the temple records from Delos, Rheneia and Mykonos that were evaluated by Kent (1948), as well as the evidence from Thasos
Attic epigraphic records, such as lease documents and *horos* stones, although less informative, attest similar practices.

The fact that the overwhelming majority of epigraphic evidence relates to productive plots of different types helps to redress the balance of the early literary sources. However, inscriptions bring their own limitations: they are not a simple equivalent to literary references, but have different aims. Whilst literary sources aim to provide an effect, being heavily influenced by rhetoric and the resonances of vocabulary, epigraphic evidence (while not immune to rhetorical intent) often seeks to make a tangible, legal or contractual record of an existing situation, to impose conditions or record a donation. Thus epigraphy supplies some of the evidence lacking in forensic oratory.

Yet a different set of limitations apply. One cannot know if epigraphic conditions were adhered to or for how long. Many inscriptions are extremely fragmentary, terse and prone to grammatical and spelling peculiarities and dialectical variation – for example, Roesch, *IThesp.* 55 from Boeotia. The provenance and archaeological context of many is unknown. Therefore, the nature of this challenge means that many conclusions based on this evidence have to be tentative. For example, *IG II²* 2494 records the leasing of a temple garden, potentially giving invaluable information for Attica to compare with that of leased temple properties elsewhere. Unfortunately, approximately two-thirds of the text is restored; only the last portion of each line is preserved. Restoration will be based upon similar documents, which tend to be formulaic. Differences do occur, however, and, as the paradigms may not refer to the same area, nor the same period, there is always the danger of a circular argument. Inscriptions that might offer fascinating insights into the way the garden was viewed frequently cannot be cited, because of the high proportion of reconstruction. An example is *SEG* 30.190 which, if correctly reconstructed, contrasts the dry earth in which a man was buried with the spacious gardens of his native Megara. As the brief inscription was found in the Kerameikos, which is not dry, it appears to be making an imaginative contrast with the garden as a watered space. This is inherently probable; however, few words of the inscription are certain. Others, such as *IG IV* 823, l. 17,
referring to gardens in Troezen that would have increased the minimal knowledge of gardens outside Attica, are so fragmentary and record such rudimentary information that they are unusable.

A second type of essential non-literary evidence is iconographic, almost entirely from vase paintings. As with literary sources, the artistic focus was on the achievements of man, not the world of nature, which was largely confined to decoration. Scarcity makes the landscape elements that do exist more valuable (Giesecke 2007: 54-57). Such are the works of the Meidias Painter, working after mid fifth century; he displays a rare interest in ‘realistic’ landscape elements. However, this does not mean that the scenes are realistic. Certainty is impossible in interpreting iconography. Any vase painting must be considered on its own merit, to try to establish a balance between realistic interpretation and imaginative construction. Vases depicting women are particularly problematic in this area (Lewis 2002: esp. pp. 35-63 and passim).

A third additional source will be from archaeological excavation, where the evidence again treats an entirely different aspect of the topic from literature and epigraphy. This hard material evidence attests aspects of concrete, practical gardens, rather than conceptual creations or legal record, albeit viewed through the filter of modern perceptions. A new and specific field, dealing with the archaeology of gardens, focuses on the recovery of evidence of changes that create landscape out of land (Miller and Gleason 1994). Unfortunately, as the only direct recognised remains for Greek gardens at present are of trees from sacred groves, archaeological reading of garden landscape can be only a tiny part of this whole study. Because excavations have traditionally been focused upon the urban world and its structures, particularly the grand buildings referenced in literature, the rural world received little attention before the 1970s.

that are likely to have been used in some garden plots. A further contribution based on archaeological evidence relates to studies of the household (Nevett 2010, 2005, 1999, Morgan 2010) – a new and interesting research field, which directs attention onto function rather than place, especially concerning the courtyard. This invites the possibility that the garden can be considered not only as a place, but as a series of functions conducted in different spaces: in particular, growing plant material need not take place on the same site as processing it. This is particularly important in urban areas. This functional aspect is especially important in naturally planted watered spaces (chapters 4 and 4).

The archaeology of rural Greece has a few well-known house sites, where a similar differentiation of growth and processing site might be applicable. The ground plans of sites such as the Vari House (Jones et al. 1973), the house near the Dema Wall (Jones et al. 1962), the farmsteads investigated by Young in the Sounion area (1956), or by Lohmann (1992), and the Pyrgouthi house (Penttinen 2005) allow insight into the spatial context of substantial rural houses. Those that can be classified as farmhouses are potentially interesting in the light of Demosthenes 47.52–61 - the sole textual reference to a garden within the confines of a suburban or rural estate. However, a garden plot has yet to be found.

Other areas of study will also be important. Linguistic analysis will be a fourth tool, given uncertainty about how the word κῆπος was applied in ancient Greece, for the earliest evidence of kepos and allied terms in Homer reveals a bewildering variety of conflicting terminology. Equally, given the paucity of literary references to real, productive gardens, questions will be asked about the context in which potential garden land is named and whether alternative terminology might be applied.

Fifthly, ethnographic studies are also relevant. Studies of traditional farming practices, (Halstead, 2014, Forbes 2007, Jones 2005, Mee and Forbes 1997) cannot directly answer problems posed by the ancient landscape. What they can do is suggest questions that might be posed, or give insight into how the landscape was used and
viewed. Gardens in ancient Greece were certainly part of the farmed landscape and cannot be considered in isolation.


1.2.1: Outline of thesis

Evaluation of the conceptualised garden landscape occupies primarily chapters 2-4, whereas analysis of the constructed garden landscape, seeking the concrete, physical changes made to the ground, is primarily in chapter 5. However, there is a constant interplay between the conceptual and the real.

Chapter 2 provides an introduction to the early source material for the κῆπος (poetic and iconographic) via a study of the Garden of the Hesperides. This demonstrates how the gardens of early sources relate to the imaginative world of myth; it reveals the two primary strands of association that surround the word, making it easily co-opted as a symbol.

Chapter 3 takes the first of these strands and traces the origins of elite associations in the earliest gardens in Greek literature - the orchard gardens of Homer’s Odyssey. It examines the continuation of such plots and elite associations into the Classical world and the consequent ambivalence of the word ‘garden’. It also examines the quality of care inherent to the garden and how this was exploited to express ideas about human nature.

Chapter 4 takes the second strand, the association of women with gardens and planted spaces. It examines, largely through iconography, how the conceptual and the real worlds were entwined and the meanings that women in planted spaces might have held for contemporaries.
Chapter 5 turns to the real gardens and planted spaces of the city of Athens. It examines their location and multiple functions and how they might have related to the conceptual links with elite status and with women evaluated in chapters 3 and 4. It also considers women’s spatial negotiation of the city.
Chapter 2: The Garden of the Hesperides

‘There are several ways to read the landscape: first, the physical features of the land; second, the residue of human activity embedded in it; and finally, the language and imagery used to describe and represent it.’

(Cole 2004: 13)

2.1.1: Introduction

This chapter develops an important theme of chapter 1 - the nature of the early evidence available to us. This demonstrates that the gardens documented in sources earlier than the fourth century are not real gardens of earth and labour. Rather they are ‘gardens of the imagination’, belonging more in the conceptual landscape than the real, and part of Cole’s third landscape category. The Garden of the Hesperides is the focus for this initial exploration, selected because it was, and is, the most familiar garden from ancient Greece. Therefore, it provides material for a preliminary examination of the nature of the garden, being well represented in surviving sources.

The Garden of the Hesperides is characteristic of all the gardens of early sources: it derives from the world of myth, from which the early poets took their inspiration. It is this that explains the conceptual nature of these early gardens; there is less potential for lyricism in a real, muddy vegetable patch than in the world of gods and heroes. However, it is possible to tease out some tantalising details of real gardens from those same sources, particularly from iconography. Artists in words and pictures operate in a zone between the conceptual and the real and ‘the garden’ is a perfect example of encounters between the two realms in this borderline area.

This initial chapter will show that the word ‘garden’ (κῆπος) carried overtones, primarily because it related to the world of gods and heroes. The luxurious life which such privileged beings were assumed to lead became part of the conceptual load of the word itself; this will then have affected the perception of gardens in the real
world. The evaluation is in three parts. Firstly, a close examination of the Garden of the Hesperides in early literature and iconography will extract significant features and associations, conceptual and real. Secondly, there will be a wider view of the myth, how it was exploited and the significance of the garden within the whole. The third section summarises the insights gained in understanding how the garden was perceived by Greeks of the Archaic and Classical periods.

The myth, one of the Labours of Herakles, tells how he has to recover apples from the Hesperides, guardians of the fruiting tree given by Ge to Hera at her marriage to Zeus; the tree is further guarded by a ferocious serpent. There are two basic versions of how the task was accomplished: either Herakles killed the serpent and recovered the apples himself, or Atlas accomplished the deed while Herakles temporarily held up the heavens (Euripides, *Her.* 395-399, Pherekydes, *Frag.* 33).

### 2.1.2: Iconographic sources

The topic is initially approached through its iconography, where a definite chronological contrast is evident. Initially, from the sixth century to approximately the mid-fifth century, the focus on extant pottery depictions of the myth is upon the daring deeds of Herakles in stealing the golden apples from the tree, or the threat of the tree’s guardian serpent, these being the protagonists on either side of the apple-stealing contest.

The representations on these early examples are dramatic. The tree on Figure 1\(^5\) is overwhelming, appearing as a fearsome hybrid that recalls Medusa. Every branch ends in a serpent’s head and his tail appears to be partially tree-root, its curve giving the impression of a walking, pursuing monster. In Figure 2, the snake stretches its open mouth perilously close to the arm of the retreating Herakles.

\(^5\) Full references are found in the Table of Figures, p. ix. Each figure number represents the entry number in that table.
The emphasis on Figure 3 is the crafty Herakles at the moment of theft; crouching, with stealthy movements, he is apparently lifting a fallen apple from behind the serpent’s back. A similar air of underhand behaviour is expressed in Figure 4 by Herakles’ semi-kneeling posture, with head poked forward and long, rapacious fingers outstretched towards the branch; however, the identification with the Hesperides myth here is uncertain.
In Figure 5, the action is divided between the Hesperides trying to halt a successful Herakles fleeing with his apples and another Hesperid placating an open-mouthed serpent with open palm gesture. Changes are apparent in this latest vase: there is already less impression of threat and three Hesperides now share the action and attention – an indication of changes to come. However, in all, the apple-bearing tree is central and there is no doubt at all of the threat of the snake or of the drama evoked.

In contrast with these early examples, fourth-century images of the myth are very different. The focus now is upon the successful Herakles. He is no longer committing a daring deed, but resting at leisure, seated in front of, or leaning against, the tree, which is now reduced to a mere prop. The Herakles of Figure 6, attended by Eros and Aphrodite and human figures, sits almost completely masking the tree; only a few branch ends can be seen. On Figure 7, the tamed snake watches Herakles, now idly leaning. The tree has lost leaves and branches; it seems to have died, acting merely as a strong, vertical prop for the Hesperid, now prominent.
The same is true of the tree on Figure 8, where Herakles and his attendants, including Eros, occupy the space; the serpent is present but in friendly mood. In Figure 9, whilst the tree is still alive and fruiting, Eros not Herakles harvests it; in this well-populated scene, Herakles is the only idle figure. In all these later vases, the dramatic impact has been lost, replaced by a quiet, contemplative mood. This fundamental change in iconographical choices is significant for an understanding of the garden and is considered below (sections 2.2.3-4).

Between these two artistic phases, soon after the mid-fifth century and associated with the Meidias Painter and his School, there was an iconographical trend of great interest, since the artistic imagination exploited the garden itself to evoke specific associations. Landscape on painted pottery scenes is rare in a society so focused upon man and his mastery of nature. Where trees, plants or rocks do occur, they are normally mere decorative elements, or indicate a scene set outdoors, or identify elements of a particular myth or location (Giesecke 2007: 54-57). It could, and has, been argued that the ‘garden’ of the Hesperides representations is nothing more than this. However, the Meidian plants are essentially different from those acting merely as decorations or signposts to myth, which tend to be stylised and artificial, giving little impression of being drawn from nature. Meidian vegetation is distinguished by frequency of appearance, detail and differentiation of species; the olive was

---

6 Osborne (1992a: 374) believes this is the case for the Meidias hydria.
particularly prominent. Some reasons why later fifth-century Athenians might have become interested in gardens are discussed below (section 2.2.4).

It is difficult to render differing vegetation, growing in a complex and multi-perspective landscape on the curved surface of a vase with restricted field, peculiar shape, limited colour-range and lack of depth. Nevertheless, artists of the Meidian School attempted it, with considerable success. Giesecke (2007: 67-69) believes that they were probably influenced by the contemporary work of Polygnotos, based on the description of his mural paintings in Pausanias (10.25-31). Pausanias describes Polygnotos as placing some elements above, below or beyond others - something that is also evident in the upper register of the Meidias London hydria (Figure 10). In both levels, the trees appear as realistic frames and boundaries for the scenes (pp. 38-39). It seems to be the work of an artist interested in experimenting with perspective in complex realistic landscapes.8

7 For examples, see the plates collection in Burn (1987).
8 Burn (1987: 5) also describes the Meidias Painter’s style as Polygnotan.
The lower register (Figure 11) seems clearly to be a garden.

![Figure 11: Athenian rf hydria, 450-400: lower register](image)

It is a good example of his style and plant interest and depicts the myth of the Garden of the Hesperides. Although the earliest extant literary references do not state that the apple-bearing tree is growing in a κῆπος, it is so described in an approximately mid-fifth-century passage of Pherekydes (Appendix 1) - slightly before the creation of the Meidias vase. This citation is recorded in Eratosthenes’ *Kataterismi* 3; although this dates only from c. 250-200, there seems no reason to doubt the validity of its transmission in view of the strong support offered by other literary evidence discussed below. Further, two early literary sources refer to the apple in the plural, as if describing an orchard, which would certainly be regarded as a garden: Hesiod speaks of δένδρα καρπόν (*Th.* 216) and Euripides of the Hesperidean shore set with apple trees - μηλόσπορον (*Hipp.* 742). Barrett (1964: 303) relates this adjective to the Pherekydes fragment, mentioning the κῆπος location. He comments that it is not merely a synonym of μηλοφόρον, but means ‘where apples were sown or planted’. The latter part of the word must derive from the verb σπείρω, meaning ‘sow’, or ‘engender’, implying the deliberate reproduction of an orchard-garden. Hesiod uses the verb μέλομαι, indicating that the trees and fruit are cared for and valued (*Th.* 215-216). Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that, if it looks like a garden and if the literary evidence suggests a garden location, then the London hydria E224 depicts a later fifth-century Athenian conception of a garden - a mixture of the conceptual and the real.
The version depicted on the hydria shows a καρπολογία (fruit-gathering) scene: Herakles sits to the right of an olive-tree. A Hesperid stands between the hero and the apple-tree; she turns to Herakles, meeting his gaze. A makeshift pocket in her robe holds apples; two other Hesperides appear to the left of the apple-tree, one picking apples into her own robe pocket. Characteristics of the fourth-century inactive style are clearly present, for Herakles is at rest, not personally involved in apple-plucking. The tree itself, albeit central, is attenuated compared with earlier examples and the guardian snake appears to be sleeping. In addition to the fruiting apple, there are two young olive-trees.

In her close study of this vase, Burn (1987: 17) comments that the garden is now more significant than the Labour. Since the garden has gained in significance, it is important to evaluate its primary characteristics before examining the reasons for its increased importance in part two of this chapter.

The prime feature is that such a garden is a sacred space, associated with female goddesses: the deities on both levels of this vase are female (Aphrodite and the Hesperides). It is also a place for heroes, for all the males are Athenian heroes. In the upper register, the scene clearly represents a shrine, with central, focal altar, on which Aphrodite sits, again in a garden sanctuary with trees. The Hesperides’ tree is positioned directly beneath this; the scene is furnished with the same attractive young olive trees, which seem to represent the boundaries of the Hesperidean garden, functioning in the same way as the trees in the top register (pp. 38-39). Both scenes represent selected aspects of different myths, portraying them in a highly idealised manner and locating them in sanctuary gardens inhabited by female divinities. Two further features are evident: the garden is a place of fruiting trees (here apple and olive) and this is not merely because apples are essential to this particular myth (see sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4). Equally, the garden is a relaxation space, protected by its boundaries. This association of female deities in a pleasant and restful, even luxurious

---

9 The upper register improbably presents the Rape of the Leukippides by the Dioskouroi in the manner of a jolly afternoon’s outing; equally, the lower register’s mood is of delightful relaxation, very different from earlier representations.
garden with fruiting trees is something that is strongly present in the literary sources and is highly significant to concepts of the word κῆπος.

2.1.3: Literary sources and the Meidian scene

Beyond the confines of the Hesperides myth, early literary sources unequivocally support the association of deities, particularly female, with the garden. The Hesperides would find their natural conceptual home there; according to the earliest witness (Hesiod, *Th.* 211-215), they were born of Night and thus divine.

The poets, working from their inherited mass of oral material, offer many examples of sacred gardens, whilst ignoring productive plots. A παρθένων κήπος (garden of the Maidens/Nymphs) is lyrically described by Ibykos in the mid-sixth century (*Frag.* 5).

Early in the fifth century, Pindar used the Doric form κάπος to describe the planting of a γυμνός κάπος (bare, or unplanted garden space) with olives, to create Zeus’ Olympian grove and an outstanding garden of Zeus (Διός ἕξοχον κάπον) near Kyrene; also a choice garden of the Graces (ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων κάπον) and a sweet garden of Aphrodite in Kyrene (γλυκὺν κάπον) (respectively *O.* 3.24, *P.* 9.53, *O.* 9.27, *P.* 5.24). Three of these early mythical gardens belong to female divinities.

The fifth-century dramatists equally referred to gardens of the gods, though more usually those of male divinities. Sophokles refers to divine gardens of Zeus and Apollo - ἐν Διός κήποις and Φοίβου τε παλαιών κήποιν (*Frags.* 320 and 956). Euripides’ *Ion* sweeps the Delphic precinct with bay from the immortal gardens (κάπων ἐξ ἀθανάτων); in the same play, Apollo’s Delian birth is described as occurring in a garden Δίοις σε κάποις (*Ion*, 116, 922). Comedy also exploited these divine gardens. Aristophanes’ *Cloud* chorus may be found in Father Ocean’s gardens, setting a sacred dance with the Nymphs (Ωκεανοῦ πατρὸς ἐν κήποις ἱερὸν χορὸν ἱστατε

---

10 Homer is an important exception; see chapter 3.
11 See pp. 34-35 for this fragment.
Νύμφαις, 271) and a garden of the Graces appears again in *Birds* (Χαρίτων τε κηπεύματα, 1100). These two citations of Aristophanes associate gardens with female deities.

More specific language could also be used to describe such sacred gardens, separating them into two different types, although any practical distinction is likely to have been less clear-cut: the ἄλσος (grove) and the λειμὼν (meadow). Although both words can refer to any grove or meadow, in early literature they normally relate to sacred gardens, particularly in the case of groves. Firstly, the grove (which the Meidias sanctuary garden partially resembles). In Homer alone, there are groves of Poseidon, the Nymphs (2), Athene (2), Apollo (2), Circe’s nymph-like handmaids and Persephone (respectively *Il.* 2.506, 20.8 and *Od.* 17.208-211, 6.291, 6.321, 9.200, 20.278, 10.350, 10.509). Of the nine references, only three are groves of male divinities. However, in the Homeric Hymns the division of the godly groves overwhelmingly favours Apollo, although there is a reference to the groves of the Nymphs (*Hom. Hymn Aph.* (5) 97). Although gendered proportion varies, female deities are always linked with such natural landscapes, more prominently by the later fifth century (see sections 4.2.11-4.2.14).

The Meidias Painter’s garden appears to be a sacred grove, as it has trees, yet it also has points of contact with the second type of sacred garden, the meadow, particularly in its fruitfulness. Of course, the artist is dealing with a garden of myth that perforce contains an apple tree and quasi-divine women, but this myth itself is part of a far wider association of women with fruit (sections 4.2.5-14). In his conception and depiction of the garden, the Meidias Painter seems to combine the grove with a specific aspect of the meadow: its association of fruitful growth in soft, luxurious surroundings with women, usually divinities.

This interesting association recurs in both literary sources and vase iconography over a very long timespan. In addition to the Meidias hydria, another scene, also classified as
representing the Hesperides myth,\textsuperscript{12} is a squat lekythos now in Malibu (Figure 12) attributed to the Circle of the Meidias Painter. In this attractive conception, three young women attend two fruiting trees, with no sign of either Herakles or snake. Three ceramic vessels, including a hydria, make an association with water.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Athenian rf squat lekythos, 420-400}
\end{figure}

Two early fragmentary lyric poems immediately recall the scenes on these two vases; as these and other poetic fragments\textsuperscript{13} long ante-date the vase imagery, the associations were both deep-rooted and pervasive. They mix aspects of both groves and meadows in one sacred garden. Obviously the vases do not illustrate these precise fragments, but they do belong to the same conceptual world of sacred gardens and it seems likely that these lyrics, and others no longer extant, would have been familiar to the painters. Firstly, Sappho’s kletic hymn to Aphrodite (\textit{Frag. 2}) provides a close aural parallel to the vase scenes, especially as the sacred garden of the upper register on the Meidias hydria included an altar to Aphrodite.

\begin{quote}
….. here to me from Krete to this holy temple
where is your graceful grove
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{12} In fact, I believe that this image depicts a sanctuary garden of Artemis, section 4.2.12. The association of women and fruiting trees are the same in either case.

\textsuperscript{13} Greek texts Appendix 1.
of apple trees and altars smoking
with frankincense.

The first significant factor is the unique inclusion of an apple grove – and in association with the most female of all goddesses. It is women who would tend this precinct as priestesses (Dillon 2002: 73). The poem continues:

And in it cold water makes a clear sound through
apple branches and with roses the whole place
is shadowed and down from radiant-shaking leaves
sleep comes dropping.

Important here are, firstly, the association with water often found in artistic descriptions of sacred gardens and illustrated by the Malibu squat lekythos, where two young women pick fruit, whilst the third bends to the hydria at the foot of the tree. Secondly, the introduction of roses calls to mind other sacred meadows where roses are found. As in this fragment, in Greece they grow best shaded by trees. Roses are among the flowers in the meadow from which Persephone was abducted (Hom. Hymn Dem. (2) 6-8 and 425-428); Pindar (Frag. 129) refers to meadows that are φοινικοφόδοις (red with roses). The fateful meadow where Paris met Hera and Aphrodite was ροδόεντ’ ἄνθε’ ύακινθινά: roses and hyacinths grew for the goddesses and, inevitably, Nymphs were present (Euripides, Iph. Aulis, 1296-1297).

Sappho’s words belong to the same conceptual world as the delicate painting on the inside of the Sotades cup (Figure 13), where a provocatively dressed girl stretches to the highest branch to pick an apple.14 A second girl, now barely visible, crouches at the foot of the tree, probably gathering apples. The girls, labelled Agro and Melissa, may well represent Nymphs.

14 Beazley and others identify this as a Hesperides scene. For details of this vase see Cohen (2006: 300-301). A further Sappho fragment (105a, Appendix 1 and below p. 186) describes such a scene.
But there is more contained within Sappho’s grove, sacred to Aphrodite:

And in it [the grove] a horse meadow has come into bloom
with spring flowers and breezes
like honey are blowing.

A grove that has a meadow within its precinct is obviously possible and other early sources make a close connection between these two types of sacred garden and with water.\(^{15}\)

The second poetic fragment, Ibykos Frag. 5, offers a further poetic reflection on a garden that appears to be an undifferentiated sacred garden of Nymphs, where quinces and vines abound:

\(^{15}\text{For example, Homer, II. 20.7-9, where Nymphs inhabit groves, rivers and meadows; Od. 6.291-292, where Athene’s grove and meadow lie together with a spring; Od. 17.208-211, where Nymphs are worshipped in a grove by a spring; Hom. Hymn Aph. (5) 97-99, where Nymphs inhabit woods, mountains, springs and grassy meadows.}\)
In the spring flourish Cydonian quince-trees, watered from flowing rivers where stands the inviolate garden of the Maidens, and vine-blossoms growing under the shady vine-branches; (trans. Campbell 1991)\(^\text{16}\)

Again this attractive poetic picture calls to mind the Malibu lekythos (Figure 12), with fruiting trees, water and nubile Nymphs in a sacred garden with features of both grove and meadow. The mood is captured in two further vase paintings. In Figure 14, an amphora contemporary with Ibykos in the second half of the sixth century, Herakles relaxes under the shade of the vine, heavy with grapes. A century later, a Meidian hydria (Figure 15) depicts Phaon and Demonassa resting under an arched bower clearly made from conjoined olive branches. Like the Meidias hydria garden, these literary and artistic fragments speak of luxury, ease, shade and relaxation.

A significant feature introduced by the fruiting trees, the female divinities and the meadowy associations, is that of specifically sexual activity that carried warnings. Sexual encounters that take place in flowery meadows (especially those initiated by determined gods) are commonplace in early literature. Zeus’ seduction of Europa is

\(^{16}\)Greek texts of these two fragments are in Appendix 1.
but one among many: ‘Zeus saw Europa, the daughter of Phoenix, in a meadow gathering flowers with her Nymphs and passionately desired her.’

Above all, the Hesperides would recall the Sirens. The enchantress Kirke, who was herself in a position to know about such things, warned Odysseus about these notorious temptresses: ἀλλὰ τε Σειρῆνες λιγυρῇ θέλουσιν ἀοιδὴ, ἣμεναι ἐν λειμῶνι (but the Sirens, seated in their meadow enchant with their clear song, Od. 12.44-45); in 158-159, the meadow is described as ἀνθεμόεντα (flowery). Their singing is described as λιγυρῇ ἀοιδῇ (song that is clear, high and sweet, 12.44); the cost to their victims is made obvious by the Sirens’ boneheaps.

When describing the Hesperides, Hesiod uses the very similar cognate λιγύφωνος (clear-voiced), used of sweet sounds like song (Th. 275, 518), and Euripides equally links these divinities with alluring song when the Chorus yearns to escape to Ἑσπερίδων δ’ ἐπὶ μηλόσπορον ἀκτᾶν ἀνύσαιμι τὰν ἀοιδῶν (the apple-bearing coast of the Hesperidean singers, Hipp. 742-743). At a later date (probably around 400), Herakleitos goes one stage further in creative imagination. He describes the Hesperides as women who kept the unfortunate Drakon as bounden servant for the rest of his life, to serve both as guardian of the apples and target of their erotic desires (Περὶ Ἀπιστῶν 20); his title seems apt.

Given that these imaginative reconstructions existed within the body of myth available to the vase painters, a Hesperides scene such as the Meidias hydria, displaying young women and fruit in an idyllic setting, is likely to have provoked a frisson and sounded a note of warning: these gardens, though alluring, were potentially dangerous places.

---

17 Bakkhylides, Frag. 12, early 5C (Appendix 1). Of many other examples, there are the horses conceived by the West Wind in a meadow (Il. 16.150-151); Kalypso’s meadows, beautiful enough for a god and the background for her coming sexual encounter with Odysseus (Od. 5.72-74); the delight of the sex-associated god Pan in meadows (Hom. Hymn Pan (19) 20-26); the abduction of Persephone (Hom. Hymn Dem. (2) 4-9, 416-439); Apollo’s birth in a meadow on Delos (Hom. Hymn Ap. (3) 115-119); Poseidon’s seduction of Keto’s daughter (Hesiod, Th. 278-279). There is no doubting the specific innuendo in Euripides’ Cyclops, 168-172 (see section 4.2.14.)
The borderline location of the garden, between the conceptual and the real has also made it an ambivalent space.

2.1.4: Horticultural practice in the real world

Because of the interactions between the conceptual and the real, it is possible to discern aspects of the real Greek garden landscape from the literature and iconography, such as enclosure and horticultural propagation technique.

The sources for the Garden of the Hesperides display a concern for the guarding and protecting of something valuable in an enclosed location. The coiling serpent is present on almost all vase depictions of the myth up to the end of the fifth century and sometimes beyond; the earlier the representation, the more threatening it appears (section 2.1.2). Wrapped around the trunk, he is shown as guarding something precious. The early literary sources make the same point. Sophokles praises Herakles for taming the fearsome guardian at the ends of the earth (τὸν τε χρυσέων δράκοντα μήλων φύλακ’ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτοις τόποις, Trakh. 1099 - 1100). Equally, Euripides describes a protective enclosure: the gold-bearing trees lie within the safety of a courtyard (ἐς αὐλὰν, Herak. 395).

Enclosure boundaries may be evident on the Meidias hydria. Burn (1987: 15) notes that the scene in the upper zone of the vase is set in a sanctuary, recognisable by the figure of Aphrodite at an altar. Foxhall (2007: 228-229) identifies the three olive trees (on both sides and in front of the central altar to Aphrodite) as probably representing the living boundary enclosure of the garden-sanctuary (Figure 16).
In the sanctuary garden of the Hesperides in the lower register there is something similar. Beyond the central apple, to the right, Herakles sits waiting, with a young olive separating him from the Hesperid within the garden. The hero seems to be waiting just outside the sacred garden, especially as the Hesperid Lipara is turning towards him, with the apples that she is about to deliver held safely within a fold of her robe. To the left, just under the handle of the vessel, is a matching young olive, outside which sits the Hesperid Khryseis, gesturing as if to welcome the heroes of Athens beyond into the garden sanctuary, the boundary of which she is guarding. Indeed, there seems to be some unity between these boundary trees. On the left hand side, the tree on the top register appears almost joined to that on the lower, making a sinuous, almost unified curve. Whilst this is not apparent on the right hand side, the trees on top and bottom registers are separated by only a small space (Figures 17 and 18). It seems almost to suggest that the two scenes share a leafy boundary.
It is, of course, impossible to state categorically that aspects of any vase scene relate to the real, as opposed to the conceptual, world and the golden apples of myth would obviously be more valued than the standard variety, thus more in need of protective enclosure. However, there is considerable evidence that garden fruit in the real world was a highly valued commodity, cared for and protected, and that enclosure was a significant feature in productive gardens also. In the earliest agriculture, there may have been little difference between fields and gardens, with the intensivity of garden production applied to cereal crops as well as any fruit or vegetables (Bogaard 2005, Jones 2005, van der Veen 2005, Halstead and Jones 1989). Such early gardens would normally have been enclosed, in order to protect crops from animals and to demarcate a special zone. There is plentiful epigraphic evidence that boundary delineation continued to be a prime consideration in Classical times, especially where sacred gardens were concerned.18 Pausanias records walls defining groves in different areas of Greece (τείχη, 7.27.3; θοιγκός, 8.31.5, 8.37.10). But he also records a boundary marked by stones (ὁροί) rather than a wall (2.27.1) and he is, of course, recording a situation considerably later than the period under review, when it is to be

18 Examples of many are: Agora 19, Lease L.4b, 8-18 from Sounion, IGC ii2 2613 and IGC i2 84, 13-14, 34-37 from Athens.
expected that boundaries would be more firmly defined; none of his examples are from Attica.

Sophokles offers a clue that less formal demarcation of groves was practised at an earlier time, for Oidipous and Antigone were able to enter unawares the Eumenides’ grove at Kolonos (OK 36-40, 124-129, 155-161). Certainly this is a dramatic situation, but one necessarily credible to a fifth-century audience familiar with such sacred gardens. The plantings here are described as bay, olives and grapes (δάφνης, ἐλαιας, ἄμπελος, 17). The olives recall the Meidias hydria scene, and the grapes the vines of the Ibykos fragment quoted above (pp. 34-35). Barnett has suggested that sacred groves might have been demarcated by plantings indicating human intervention in the natural landscape, a ‘transition from natural groups of trees to designed and managed groves’ (Barnett 2007: 258).

It seems possible, therefore, that plantings of trees demonstrating human intervention, such as the olive, might well have marked the boundaries of sacred precincts in the real world, as well as in the painted, imaginary world of the Hesperides’ garden on the Meidias hydria. Indeed, it seems improbable that these are merely decorative. The Meidias Painter and his associates display an acute artistic observation in their gentle imaginative world: richly decorated women, elaborate detail, and a persistent and highly unusual use of plants and trees. This indicates a particular attraction to the natural world and an acute observation of it. When such artists reach into their mythical and religious conceptual world to portray gardens, their sharp and interested observation will ensure that details reflect what they have seen in the real world, though slightly stylised or romanticised. Therefore, and despite the fact that they overtly describe myth rather than reality, images produced by the Meidias group of painters can offer tantalising hints of real Greek gardening practices and associations. These are likely to relate to details of practice or significant associations.
One such practice is illustrated on the Meidias hydria. Foxhall\textsuperscript{19} has pointed out that the tree at the centre of the image has been ‘top’ or ‘crown’ grafted. This practice removes the crown of the tree and inserts slips of better-fruitti ng cultivars between bark and core, around the trunk but at the same height. In the Meidias hydria, the technique has been applied to the μηλέα and the focal tree in the Malibu lekythos gives a similar impression (Figures 19 and 12).

In both cases, the three prime stems originate from the same point, rather than being spaced out on the trunk. Forbes and Foxhall recorded this same technique being applied to wild pears in Methana in the 1970s (Figure 20). Exactly the same technique is still used for citrus on Cyprus (personal observation, 2015). Ancient olives treated in this way can still be seen; an example from Rhodes, photographed by Baumann (1993: 147), probably in the 1970s, has a trunk of truly venerable age that had obviously been top grafted in the not too distant past, presumably to regenerate the tree (Figure 21).

\textsuperscript{19} Personal communication, October 2011.
It is not known when or where grafting originated, but the earliest dating given by palaeobotanists for its introduction into Europe is the later first millennium BC (Zohary and Hopf 2012: 114-115, 135-138; Sallares 2007: 29). Epigraphic evidence from late third century Mykonos records a differentiation between wild olives and grafted varieties. A century before that, grafting practices (ἐμφυτεία or ἐνοφθαλμισμός) are recorded by Theophrastos (e.g. *HP* 2.1.4, *CP* 1.6.1-10). A pictorial representation of ‘top’ or ‘crown’ grafting on the Meidias hydria is not, therefore, unexpected; it had probably been a long-standing practice by that time.

The fruit involved may not, however, have been the apple. The word μῆλον (the fruit) and μηλέα (the tree) could indeed refer to an apple, yet it could also act as a generic label for a type of fruit rather than a species-specific label; distinguishing adjectives might, or might not, be added. The word could refer to the apricot, quince, citron or peach (Littlewood 1968: 147-148), to quince, plum, peach or pomegranate (Cancik and Schneider 2002, s.v. ‘apple’). Such fruit can also be described as ἀκρόδρυα – fruit that grows on the upper branches of trees, or ‘top fruit’ (Appendix 3). It is impossible to distinguish a specific fruit on the Meidias hydria and equally unspecified in the written

---

20 Grafting will be discussed in chapter 3.

21 *ID* 366, Face b, 16-23 (Kent 1948: 288).
sources. It is, therefore, taken as an apple within this work, with the proviso that the identification is not as specific as the modern English use of the word.

Evidence of sophisticated grafting practice and protective enclosure are aspects of the care extended to the cultivation of precious garden fruit. Reference has already been made to the care characteristic of the garden (p. 28 - μὲλομαι). That care is equally expressed in a description of the sacred meadow of Artemis: Αἰδώς δὲ ποταμίαςι κηπεύει δρόσοις - the natural reverence of the place ‘gardens’ the meadow with pure river water (Hipp. 78). Euripides’ choice of the verb κηπεύω unites both the quality of care and the water that is found in such a cherished sacred garden. Chapter 3 will show care to be a primary characteristic of the earliest orchard-gardens recorded by Homer.

2.1.5: Summary of chapter 2, part 1

Grafted apples and similar fruit were a luxury food, enclosed for protection or warning, either by walls, boundary stones or plants regularly cultivated by humans, in the valuable orchard garden. Therefore, it is unsurprising that they should be painted as they were in real life gardens - the introduction of a more realistic element into the conceptual landscape of a luxurious orchard-garden and one aspect of the care extended to the garden. The primary content of the early literary and iconographic sources, however, is that gardens are perceived, firstly, as privileged, protected, shady spaces of relaxation, fit for gods and heroes and associated with fruiting trees and water. Secondly, they are linked with the alluring, though potentially threatening, presence of women, particularly divinities.

Gardens, such as that displayed on the Meidias hydria, are attractive places, with their young trees in a watered environment, with an air of rest and tranquillity. It was surely these associations that originally created a perception that they were appropriate loci for the manifestation of deities. For the gods, only the best would do and it is difficult to underestimate the luxurious qualities of cool shade in the Greek landscape and
environment. The particular presence of female divinities (and reinforcing mythical tales such as Homer’s Sirens) is likely to originate in the recurrent presence of women in real garden spaces (see chapter 4).

The poetic use of the word κῆπος to describe the sphere of the divine, the beautiful and the desirable must surely have led to a degree of association of these qualities with the word itself. Although this close association of the divine with gardens is a specific feature of early literary sources (up to the close of the fifth century and the end of the period of Attic tragedy), the repeated recitation of older poetic and tragic works in education and social life would ensure the survival of these associations. Because these older works were so enmeshed in cultural life, they would have been primary sources for mental images of ‘the garden’ to Greeks of the fourth and later centuries as they are to us and must surely have combined with more workaday impressions and experiences of gardens in the everyday world.

Therefore, existing in a borderline zone between the conceptual and the real, the garden itself would have presented both an attraction and a threat and this ambivalence would have been inherent in the word κῆπος.

2.2.1: The development and exploitation of the Hesperides myth: literature

Part 2.1.3 of this chapter explored how early poets exploited the potential of sacred gardens in general. This second section returns to the specific Hesperides garden myth, widening the scope to see how it can illuminate changing attitudes within society and contextualise the Meidias Painter’s focus on the garden element. The very fluidity of myth makes interpretation difficult; alternative aspects and versions can be used to highlight different themes according to varying perceived need. This is very

---

22 This is attested in, for example, Aristophanes, Frogs, 1030-1036; Plato, Lysis, 214a, Republic, 606e; Xenophon, Symposium, 4.6, 4.7; Plutarch, De liberis educandis (e.g. 9b, 13e); IG II² 2319-2323; the plethora of recorded poetic citations found in Athenaios and the thousands of papyrus fragments, including copied schoolboy exercises, are all evidence of wide and long-lasting cultural absorption.
much true of the Hesperides, a myth that is perhaps more prone to variation than many.\footnote{Sturgeon (1977: 102) has noted that its iconography is ‘less firmly established’ than the other labours. This is perhaps because the majority of Herakles’ exploits concern the killing of monsters of varying sorts, on which the iconography necessarily focuses. Of the three labours that do not involve death or destruction, the cleansing of the Augean stables offers less interpretive scope than the two deeds involving the recovery of something precious: the Cerynean hind and the apples of the Hesperides. Only the apples of the Hesperides was firmly set in the divine realms, leaving it open to alternative exploitation by focusing either on variants of the heroic deed or on the exotic location. Equally, the apples symbolise the immortality that Herakles had won, offering further artistic potential.}

The exotic and the luxurious are always in focus. Hesiod, establishing his cosmography around 700, focused on the goddesses existing at the end of the world, beyond even Ocean (Th. 215, 274-275, 517-518). In the early to mid-sixth century, fragments of Stesikhoros and Ibykos (S8 and S182) hint at the luxury appropriate to the divine (‘homes all of gold’ - π[αγχο]ψέα; ‘golden’ and ‘ivory’ – [χ]ψέα, ἐλεφαντ[-]. Later writers, however, emphasised other aspects.

Mythographers attempted to order some of the disparate elements of the story. In the mid fifth century, Pherekydes (Frag. 33, Appendix 1) provides the first extant developed version of the tale, although it certainly existed in oral form long before. In this, Herakles holds up the heavens, whilst Atlas recovers the apples; he is then tricked by Herakles into taking up his burden again. Pherekydes also gives the provenance of the apples – a gift from Earth to Hera on her marriage. Hera sets them in the ‘garden of the gods’, with their serpent guardian to prevent theft. Dramatic poets continued to exploit the dramatic potential within the myth: Sophokles in Trakhiniai, 1099-1011 and Euripides in Hippolytos, 742-751 (p. 36). In the late fourth century, its potential for embroidery as story is fully explored in ‘Palaiphatos’ (Περὶ Ἀπιστῶν, 18) which provides a new variant of the entire myth, exploiting the homonym μηλα to turn the apples into beautiful, luxuriously golden Milesian sheep and the Hesperides into daughters of a Milesian, Hesperos. This exemplifies the ease with which aspects of myth can be used to raise the profile of a specific town or area (see Kyrene, pp. 60-61).

In the first half of the third century, Apollonios Rhodios (Argonautica, 4.1396-1409)
provides a suitably epic picture for his brave heroes, focusing on the writhing, stricken and horrific serpent.

From the early to mid-fifth century, the geographers and historians of newly developing genres are more firmly focused on the real world and the Hesperides’ home acts as a remote coastal location. In the early to mid fifth century Hekataios (Frag. 333) and Herodotos (4.171, 204) cite a home on the coast of Libya, the town named Euhesperides in modern Benghazi. In the later fourth century, Pseudo-Skylax (Periplus, 108.5, 109.1, 111.9) and Theophrastos (HP 6.3.3, 8.6.6) also reference this geographical location. In the first half of the third century, Eratosthenes (Katasterismi, 1.3) adds a new ‘scientific’ aspect to the myth: the apples’ guardian is now no mere serpent, but a part of the heavens, lying across the constellation of Ursa Major and Minor; with the eye of faith, it can still be seen, named appropriately as Drakon. In these cases, the myth has been projected onto the physical environment.

The dominant themes, however, always include one or more of the following: a location perceived as borderline and exotic, an element of luxury, the presence of female divinities and a threat. All these authors are exploiting the single myth in different ways and variation is also found in artistic media, which necessarily work in a different way from the literary sources. Lacking words to express ideas, they have to encapsulate certain moments within the myth, which restricts their choice to a considerable degree; thus Herakles is portrayed as frozen at certain moments of his life.

2.2.2: The development and exploitation of the Hesperides myth: sculpture

Sculpted reliefs demonstrate how specific aspects of the Hesperides myth were selected and how these changed over time. They are all located in very public and prominent places. The earliest is a metope from the temple of Zeus at Olympia, created around 460. It is a stiff, formal relief of three figures, encapsulating the

24 Even if, like ‘Palaiphatos’, they deny these elements to produce a more prosaic version.
moment when Atlas, having retrieved the apples, is about to hand them over to Herakles, himself supporting the burden of the Earth, whilst Athene offers some help (Figure 22).

![Figure 22: Herakles, Atlas and Athene; metope, Olympia](image)

The location of this relief is important; one in a series of Heraklean Labours, it occupies a central position on the east façade of the building, right above the entrance (Pausanias, 5.10.9, Barringer 2005: 214-215) – a site of prime importance and one that sets a pattern. The focus is on heroic effort; presumably it is this effort that makes Herakles worthy of appearing between two gods, indicating that he is approaching their status. The tree is absent, the garden and the apples ignored, but they are no longer relevant. In the moment encapsulated by the sculpture, they are part of the past, whereas the story here is moving forward towards fulfilment of the Labour.

In the second half of the fifth century, further relief figures depicting aspects of the myth were created in similarly prominent sites. The metopes along the eastern façade of the Hephaisteion in Athens represent the Labours of Herakles, ending with the Garden of the Hesperides; Herakles holds two apples and is taking a third from a Hesperid (Thompson 1949: 245; Figure 23).
Again, the position is above the entrance. As well as underlining the subject’s importance, the location suggests the Hesperides’ borderline zone – here between temple and outside world. Equally, the viewer would be looking towards the west, where the garden was traditionally believed to lie. Thompson further identified one akroterion as depicting two Hesperides (Thompson 1949: 247-248). He also finds a third, and more significant, expression of the myth in the sculptural group on the focal, central eastern pediment. He credibly believes (Thompson 1949: 245-246) that this represents the apotheosis of Herakles before Zeus, with the hero’s extended hand holding out before Zeus the apples that were his passport to immortality (Figure 24). Thus this scene of apotheosis would logically follow, and be the climax of, the eastern metopes.
By analogy with contemporary vase iconography and explaining cutting marks in the pediment, Thompson restores the snake and apple tree between the hero and the chariot in which he has arrived (Thompson 1949: 246-247). The message of the iconography has changed, with no hint now of the Olympian heroic effort, but emphasis on the reward of apotheosis, with the Hesperid metope and the tree (if correctly restored) there as a reminder of how he achieved his newly divine status.

This places aspects of the Hesperides myth in the heart of the Athenian public arena, both within the city and in the specific siting on the temple. A Herakles in the Garden of the Hesperides was also prominently displayed as one of the Three-Figure Relief sculptures on a monument in the heart of the city during the last quarter of the fifth century, which confirms his popularity at this date. Already, this few decades later, the aspect of the myth has shifted again, as the Herakles of the Three-Figure Relief matches very closely the Herakles figures already noted on painted pottery during the later fifth and fourth centuries (section 2.1.2).

The original appearance of the relief panels has been re-created from later Roman copies, and discussed by Thompson (1952), Harrison (1964) and Ridgway (1981) following earlier research by Götze. It seems that those who commissioned and executed the scene decided to portray precisely the same aspect as the later vase painters, but different from those of Olympia and the Hephaisteion. The man of action has gone, replaced by the seated figure of a youthful hero, at rest after his final Labour, very quiet and still; a Hesperid stands to either side, with the one on the left holding apples within the folds of her robe (Figure 25).

25 Believed by Thompson to be the Altar of Pity in the agora and by Langlotz to be a funerary monument, possibly of a tragedian.
26 The Hesperides recreation was influenced by the Roman Villa Albani example (Thompson 1952: 63, pl. 17c, Sturgeon 1977: 113-114).
The presence of the tree is not certain; it is not in the restoration sketch, but it does appear prominently in the Roman Villa Albani Hesperides copy on which the restoration is based, and which greatly resembles the later scenes on painted vases. The relief is dated to the last three decades of the fifth century, and was therefore created at the same time as the Meidias hydria, sharing the same iconographic conceptions. Its reconstruction is, however, based on a Roman copy, subject to different influences; thus its original appearance is uncertain.

2.2.3: Interpreting the Hesperides myth

The interpretation that is to be placed on the change illustrates the difficulty of reconstructing ancient intentions. Thompson (1952), following Götze, interpreted this as a romanticising of the myth, with the relief showing the Hesperides’ emotions of love and loss because Herakles is about to leave them, emotions appropriate to the Altar of Pity and potentially linked with late fifth-century tragedy (Ridgway 1981: 206-210). Harrison (1964), however, described the scene as reflecting the hero’s immortality, which is now the widely accepted interpretation of the resting Herakles with Hesperides scenes in all artistic media. Depictions of the myth have changed from Olympian exertion, through apotheosis on the Hephaisteion, to Herakles’ final rest in Elysion. This argues for a shift in interest away from the heroic and towards the eschatological.
Before examining the significance of this for the garden scene in the Meidias hydria and its place within the myth, there is a unique private cemetery monument, believed to be the base for a funerary vase, from Kallithea (south-west of Athens), evaluated by Kosmopoulou (1998), where a man and woman stand facing each other. Like the seated Herakles vase painting scenes and the Three-Figure Relief, this funerary base is dated to approximately the 420s (Kosmopoulou: 535-536). The man picks fruit (which, with the leaves, would have been painted on) from the tree that rises between them and there are clear similarities with the Hesperides’ tree scenes; again, the woman holds apples within the folds of her robe (Figure 26).

Kosmopoulou believes that this relief probably represents a married couple, one commemorating the other, but with clear Hesperidean echoes (Kosmopoulou: 538-540). She also believes that this apple-picking, or καρπολογία, scene is related to the changing beliefs about life after death that Harrison (964: 78-80) also finds in the Three-Figure Relief, painted pottery, this Kallithea base and the Meidias hydria. In the case of Kallithea, there are two additional figures, identified as Hermes Psykhopompos (representing the transition from the world of the living to that of the dead and introduced into funerary art from the fifth century) and secondly, a priest to perform the funerary ritual (Kosmopoulou: 541).
There must certainly have been a reason for the marked similarity in the iconographical selections and conventions used to depict Herakles in the last quarter of the fifth century and continuing into the fourth, both in painted pottery and carved figure reliefs. In this period Herakles appears in a completely different manner from the earlier heroic representations. It is impossible to know which works of art were produced first, especially as the Three-Figure Relief has been re-created from later copies, potentially introducing alternative artistic variation. The Meidias hydria was certainly early and may well be the earliest extant example of those changes including the seated Herakles, as Burn believes (Burn 1987: 21).

Apart from the Meidias Painter, later vase painters were less interested in depicting the garden setting, merely using the tree with the hero resting against it as an evocative symbol. It is as if the Meidias Painter had provided a new iconographic interpretation, which they could then invoke in shortened form – known as Ἡρακλῆς ἀναπαυόμενος (Keuls 1974: 163). This resting Herakles is the key to the altered fifth-century conception, for seated leisure is hardly a heroic characteristic. The mood is tranquil, devoid of the activity and violence associated with a Heraklean Labour. Herakles sits with limbs relaxed, his expression calm and distant. The tree now seems a mere prop to support his weight and the serpent, if present, is comatose; the mood is of static existence. The vases in Figures 6-9 exemplify these qualities and many of the features are already present on the Meidias hydria.

2.2.4: The symbolic associations of ‘the garden’

Whereas in these later fifth and fourth century art-works the tree functions as an evocative symbol of the garden, the Meidias Painter alone chose to focus on it, which is in accordance with his interest in the landscape (p. 27). Several modern scholars (Harrison 1964: 78-80, Burn 1987: 17-22, Kosmopoulou 1998: 536-545 and others) interpret the scene as metaphorically expressing Herakles’ post-apotheosis life in the Elysian Fields where heroes dwell with gods. There are many aspects of the depiction that support such an interpretation, particularly the leisured posture of the hero; it is
this utter absence of activity that militates against reading these scenes as depicting
the Labour itself. The youthful, beardless face of Herakles is another indication,
expressing his rejuvenation in an afterlife. Equally, using the Hesperides garden as the
prelude to immortality fits logically within the pattern of events: it was this
penultimate labour, the gaining of the apples, which guaranteed Herakles his
apotheosis and quasi-divinity. Thus the garden is the entrance to the Elysian Fields. All
that remains is for him to conquer Kerberos, representing Death.

Because of the combination of funerary and apple-gathering elements, Kosmopoulou
(1998: 545) interprets the Kallithea relief within the context of either a mystery
religion or a philosophical group who taught and sought personal salvation in an
afterlife of bliss; the Hesperidean scene formulates this hope. Orphism is the best-
attested of these mystery religions, becoming increasingly popular in the later fifth
and fourth centuries.

In this connection, Sourvinou-Inwood (1995: especially 173-216) traced a growing
interest in the possibilities of a blissful afterlife in the later fifth and fourth centuries.
She established a correlation between the greeting formula χαίρε/χαίρετε in private
epitaphs and a more personal and positive view of death, with the Homeric vision of
an afterlife for heroes extending first to the publicly celebrated and heroicised war
dead by the later fifth century, then to ordinary individuals by the mid fourth century,
with a corresponding variation in funerary expressions.

This would correlate with the fourth-century portraits of the relaxing Herakles vase
paintings, with the hero acting as a paradigm for the gradual democratisation of
paradise expectation. Equally, it accords with the historical experience of Athens by
the end of the fifth century. Thucydides’ account of Perikles’ funeral oration (2.34-46)
is immediately followed by his description of the plague (2.47-54): the years of
triumphalism and immortalised heroic citizens swiftly followed by death on a terrifying
scale and, by 415, military failure and factionalism. Orphic beliefs in particular,
exploring the nature of man, his relationship with the divine and his fate, would perhaps have offered consolation.

Equally, there are some interesting changes in drama at the very end of the century, particularly in the work of Euripides, which may reflect disillusionment with the social and religious status quo. Trojan Women (415) expresses disenchantment with the Greek actions. Iphigenia Among the Taurians (c. 413) and Helen (412) offer romantic escapism rather than tragedy. Iphigenia at Aulis (after 406), although more serious, avoids the heroine’s death; perhaps real life had provided sufficient tragedy. Two plays, Euripides’ Bakkhai (after 406) and Aristophanes’ Frogs (405) deal in different ways with the rites of mystic cults. The arrival of Middle and New Comedy in the early fourth century marks a distinct change between serious satirical comedy and a far more frivolous comedy of social manners, which could be interpreted as escapist. It is possible that all these changes reflect nothing more than poetic artistic development and it is equally possible to read almost anything into Greek drama; however, in total they remain interesting as potential indications of changes in views about the afterlife.  

The exploration of ideas about an afterlife is certainly present in different literary genres. At the philosophical level, Plato in the Myth of Er (Republic, 10.614-621), describes the underworld as a place of individual judgement, where those deemed worthy proceed to the light. In Gorgias (524a) he describes the destination as the Isles of the Blessed and he devotes Phaedo to the theme of the soul’s immortality. At a less elevated level, Aristophanes’ Birds expresses a desire for an escapist Utopian world; whatever may or may not have been the political significance of the play and the unattainability of such a world, it is notable that it was written in 414, just after the humiliation of the Sicilian Expedition. Equally there was awareness of mystic cults like Orphism - perhaps the most extreme compared with the publicly approved Eleusinian Mysteries. Herodotos (2.81.2) compares Egyptian burial prohibitions with those of Orphic and Bacchic rites, Euripides (Hipp. 952-957) has Theseus (inaccurately) accuse

27 See also reference to Agathon, below p. 64.
his son of following Orphic ecstatic rituals, and Aristophanes has ‘Aiskhylos’ praising Orpheus for teaching humanity his rites (Frogs, 1032).

The concept of an afterlife world, originally available just for heroes, was hazy, but there are clear links with the garden. Even in the gloomy Underworld there was a meadow (λειμών) of asphodel (Od. 11.539, 573, 24.13). More influentially, and existing in an uncertain relationship, for heroes like Menelaos there were the Elysian Fields (lit. ‘plain’, Ἡλύσιον πεδίον, Od. 4.563), or Isles of the Blessed. In these νῆσοι dwell heroes who are ὄλβιοι (happy or blessed, Hesiod, WD 171-172). The Elysian Fields were, according to Homer, situated at ‘the limits of the earth’, ‘where there is made the easiest life for mortals’, with no unpleasant weather but, for refreshment, ‘always the stream of the Ocean sends up breezes of the West Wind’ (Od. 4.565-568).

Hesiod gives specific reasons why the Garden of the Hesperides might be selected as a symbol of the Isles of the Blessed: like the Elysian Fields, the Hesperides’ original home was sited at the far bounds of earth (ἐς πείρατα γαίης, WD 168), beside the deep-eddying Ocean (παρ’ ὦκεανὸν βαθύδινην, WD 171; cp Th. 215, 275), thus bordering the gods’ domains. As the Hesperides’ name indicates, this home was located in the far west, place of the dying sun and for that reason linked with death and the Elysian Fields. Additionally, there is the garden-like fruitfulness of the Isles of the Blessed, which produced honey-sweet fruit (μελιηδέα καρπόν) thrice annually (WD 172) – an ideal place for a blissful immortality.

It is possible that the concept of immortality was even bound up with the first knowledge of the Hesperides myth. The Near Eastern Garden of Eden shares the elements of fruiting Tree of Life, snake and theft of something forbidden (Genesis, 2-3). Eating the fruit of the tree secured eternal life (Genesis, 3.22). Here too there was a woman, representing both lure and temptation and such an association of females

---

28 The ‘Orphic’ Tablets are referred to below, pp. 57-60.
with Greek sacred gardens has already been noted (pp. 35-37). Equally, it may ultimately have links with Near Eastern ideas which appear from very early in the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh. In tablet 9 the hero, seeking immortality, encounters a wonderful garden with a precious fruit-bearing tree with leaves of lapis lazuli and gem stones growing like weeds. In tablet 11 he is helped to find the plant that restores youth and secures immortality, only to have it stolen by a crafty serpent. Tablet 12 is very defective, but is believed to involve Gilgamesh’s journey to the Underworld. Reinforcement of the association between the garden and ideas of blissful living derived from Persia occurred during the fifth century (pp. 60, 65, 119-120).

The meadow is equally a part of envisaged post-mortem blissful existences within mystery religions, providing a clear link attested in both literature and archaeology. Firstly, from literature, the Platonic sources (p. 54) make specific references to the existence of a meadow in their envisaged underworld (Republic, 10.614e and 616b; Gorgias, 524a). Greater detail comes from Aristophanes’ Frogs, which has a Chorus of initiates into a mystery religion normally interpreted as Eleusinian but which, by the fifth century, had absorbed Orphic and Dionysiac elements; the Mysteries in Frogs resonate with all three cults (Bowie 1993: 228-234).

These initiates have already attained their posthumous bliss and summon the myrtle-wreathed Iacchos to the meadow, also described as flowery, full of roses, where they will sing and dance (326-327, 449-450, Appendix 1). The πολυρρόδους λειμώνας ἀνθημώδεις resonate with the λειμών’ ἀνθημόεντα of Odyssey 12.159, the shady roses of Sappho (Frag. 2) and the φοινικορόδοις of Pindar Frag. 129 and other texts (p. 33).

A major element in Frogs, connected with the chorus, is the fearsome wandering journey through the Underworld in the katabasis of Dionysos, where there is a specific link to Herakles. He is Dionysos’ guide to these realms because he has himself
journeyed there in his pursuit of Kerberos. This gives a further concrete reason for the selection of Herakles as the most appropriate heroic figure to stand as a symbol of a life of bliss in the Hesperidean garden, or Isles of the Blessed, on the Meidias hydria. As Herakles himself witnessed the Underworld initiations, he is linked specifically with mystic rites – again appropriate for adoption as a symbol for any follower of such cults.

A further passage of *Frogs* describes these Underworld mystic rituals taking place in myrtle groves as Herakles arrives at the place of bliss:

> ἑὔτεύθεν αὐλῶν τίς σε περίεισιν πνοή, ὄψει τε φῶς καλλίστον ὡσπερ ἐνθάδε, καὶ μυρρινῶνας καὶ θιάσους εὐδαιμόνας ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν καὶ κρότων χειρῶν πολύν. (154-157)

Then a blowing of pipes is around you, you will see a wonderful light, just as [you do] here and myrtle groves and joyful choruses of men and women and a great clapping of hands.

Such festive singing and dancing equally took place in the sacred groves and meadows of the upper world – Sappho (*Frag.* 94, Appendix 1) has an early fleeting reference to this association. It was natural that this enjoyment should be transferred to perceptions of the Underworld. The Meidias garden scene is an equally light, bright and joyful setting.

The Orphic mysteries were believed to have originated with someone who himself descended to the underworld in search of Eurydike, making Orphism a highly significant mystery cult and one that preached the soul’s immortality for those who followed its practices. Since the late nineteenth century, numerous gold tablets have been discovered in funerary contexts in various sites, especially Southern Italy, Crete, Thessaly, Pella, Lesbos and Olbia on the Black Sea; they date from c. 400 (Torjussen 2005: 289, 294-295) though possibly based on earlier material (Guthrie 1993: 171-

---

30 A further reference to this can be found, for example, in ‘Plato’, *Axiokhos*, 371e: ‘And the story is that Herakles and Dionysos, in their descent to Hades’ realm, were first initiated here and obtained courage for the journey there from the Eleusinian goddess.’ (Hershbell 1981: 48-49 and f/n 77).
They contain verse that instructs the adherents of a mystery cult on the progression through, and the ritual words to use in, the Underworld - very reminiscent of the *katabasis* of Dionysos in *Frogs*. Because the sentiments and vocabulary fit well with the fundamental myth of Orphism the tablets were quickly identified as Orphic. Since that time, this identification has been challenged and opposing camps of ‘maximalist’ and ‘minimalist’ positions on the Orphic nature of the tablets still exist; alternative candidates are a Dionysiac cult or a school of Southern Italian Pythagoreans, both of which had considerable overlap with Orphism. The bone tablets from Olbia attest a close connection between the *Orphikoi* and Dionysos (Torjussen 2005: 295, 298, 300) and an afterlife expectation similar to that of *Frogs*. Given the coincidence of practice and beliefs across mystery cults, and the fact that so many of the tablets have been recovered from Southern Italy (which was a known focus of Orphic writings and mystery cults in general), ‘Orphism’ remains the safest term to describe the tablets, on the understanding that no clear distinctions between groups, nor certain identification is possible.

The ritual texts of the tablets link with the meadow and with the water that has been shown to be closely associated with the meadow, via the person of Persephone. This deity is associated with the meadow at every level. It was from a flowery meadow that she was abducted (p. 36, f/n 17), and one of her most important attributes was the meadow poppy. She ruled in the underworld with Hades, to which there is also a passing reference in *Frogs* (670-671), where the joyful underworld meadow and groves have presumably evolved from the gloomier asphodel meadow of Homer’s day. These meadows and groves are cited by the tablets as ‘the sacred meadows and groves of Persephone’ (λειμῶνας θεῖεις ἄλσεα, Tablet A4, Appendix 1).

Two inscriptions from Pelinna (Thessaly), dating from the last quarter of the fourth century, echo the mystic world of *Frogs*. They specify that the dead soul is ‘to tell Persephone that Bacchios (sic) himself has released you’ (Tsantsanoglou and

---

31 These are known from the *Rhapsodies* of the early AD years; the recently translated Derveni Papyrus provides evidence of a fully-developed Orphic theogony (Torjussen 2005: 297-298); Torjussen’s work gives a summary overview of current Orphic scholarship.
Parássoglou 1987); like the lacchos of Frogs, the name is an epithet for Dionysos. They are inscribed on gold ivy leaves and this specific shape may well refer to the associations of both Bacchios and Persephone with the natural world (Figure 27). They show Persephone as the dominant deity.

![Image removed for copyright reasons](image)

**Figure 27: Gold leaf A, Pelinna**

No such tablets have been discovered from Attica and the distribution is clearly peripheral to the Greek centre, as if provincial areas were exploiting the cults in a new way. However, there are clear links with Platonic thought on the Underworld; the association of meadows and groves in both areas is particularly interesting. Other tablets demonstrate the importance of water; for example, B3 (Appendix 1).

Tablet B11 describes the underworld water (in this tablet it is flowing from a lake) as ψυχο – cold, the word that is used by Pausanias (for example, 8.42.12, 9.24.4) to describe the refreshing cold of the springs within sacred groves that almost certainly partially inspired their sacred character. It is not surprising that the beauty of the meadow and the refreshing coolness of water in a frequently hot and arid climate became a symbol for visions of a joyful and relaxed afterlife of bliss. As a tablet from
Thurii proclaims: ‘Happy and blessed (ὀλβιε καὶ μακαριστέ) you will be a god instead of a mortal’.  

This association of watered groves and meadows with joyful relaxation is likely to have been reinforced by the gardening practices of Persia. Despite official rhetoric, aspects of elite Persian life had long held attraction for members of privileged Greek society who visited the Persian empire, including the lands of the Ionian Greeks. After the Persian Wars and the rise of the de facto Athenian empire, aspects of Persian material culture were adopted in Athenian pottery, clothing and displays of luxurious lifestyle, including an interest in the Persian paradisoi gardens (Miller 1997: 40, 252-258, Raaflaub 2009: 90-112).

That so many of the gold tablets come from Southern Italy is interesting in view of the fact that the Meidias hydria was discovered in an Etruscan tomb. The vast quantities of Greek archaeological artefacts recovered there, especially from tombs, attests considerable Etruscan contact with this area. The people of Apulia seem to have been particularly interested in the Orphic Mysteries, the majority of the tablets having been found there. At a site in Cumae, a mid-fifth century inscription restricts burial to those who have been βεβαχχευμένον and probably refers to Orphic initiates (Parker 1995: 485). Vase paintings with Orphic themes and with depictions of Dionysos in funerary contexts are frequently found there (Carpenter 2010: 340-345).

Kyrene provides a further example of provincial appropriation when, as Diez de Velasco argues, it adopts the Hesperides myth as a badge of identity (Diez de Velasco 2000). Like Apulia, Kyrene demonstrates an interaction of interests between an Attic production centre and more peripheral regions of the Greek world, as many of the Attic vases recovered from its territory depict aspects of the fourth-century Ἡρακλῆς

---

32Magna Graecia, 5 (Thurii 3) in the best collection of the tablets, being grouped geographically (Graf and Johnston 2007). There are similar references elsewhere in the corpus of tablets to the (usually white) cypress by a spring: Magna Graecia 1 and 2 (Hipponion and Petelia); Sicily 8 (Entella); Thessaly 25 (Pharsalos); the bakkhoi: Magna Graecia 1 (Hipponion, text 1); the holy meadow: Thessaly 27 (Pherai, text 1) and to Persephone: Macedonia 31 (Pella/Dion, texts 1, 37); she also appears as Chthonic Kore in Magna Graecia 4 (Thurii, text 2) and Chthonic Queen in Sicily 8 (Entella).

33This Persian connection is discussed further in pp. 119-120.
ἀναπαυόμενος scene, selected because of its local relevance.\textsuperscript{34} It was appropriately situated near Euhesperides, the city that had become an alternative location for the garden of the Hesperides (p. 46). The tree was their selected iconographic shorthand; it first appears on the reverse of a silver tetradrachm of about 500\textsuperscript{35} (Figure 28) - central, clearly fruiting, and snake-entwined, with a Hesperid and Herakles on either side.

![Figure 28: Tetradrachm, Cyrene](image)

The silphium on the obverse of the coin and the Hesperid watering the tree on the reverse indicate that the garden aspect of the myth and the city’s name itself was selected because of the area’s claim to fame – the production of the prized silphium plant that grew along the fertile coastal plain (for example, Theophrastos, HP 6.3.3) and the region’s overall garden-like productivity, first noted by Hesiod (WD 172). Pseudo-Skylax describes the landscape of the local ‘garden of the Hesperides’:

This is shaded with trees woven in one another as densely as possible. The trees are lotus (and) fruit-trees of all kinds: pomegranate-trees, pear-trees, arbutus fruits, mulberries, vines, myrtles, bay-trees, ivy, olive-trees, wild olive-trees, almond-trees, and nut-trees.

(Shipley, 2011, 108.4, acknowledgements to Foxhall)

\textsuperscript{34} Especially red-figure vessels, Figures 6, 7, 29 of this work and Beazley on-line 230397, cited in Diez de Velasco 2000: 200-203.

\textsuperscript{35} Robinson 1927: pl.2.19, xxii-iii (10a), xxxiv. The coin was manufactured in Attica, presumably with this provincial market in mind. The city was founded in the early sixth century (Diez de Velasco 2000: 199).
Kyrene exploits the Hesperidean garden in a slightly different way from the Meidias hydria, focusing upon its rich fertility, rather than envisaging it as a perfect paradise, although the two are related. Both the Kyrenean coin and the Meidias hydria are, however, working in the same way: using the garden as a symbol for something more complex.

The association of women with sacred gardens examined in part one is present in many of the ‘immortality’ sources examined above. Orphic tablet A4 specifically refers to Persephone’s meadow – one of the many sites of sexual activity with gods and recalling the Sirens in their flowery meadow (p. 36). Some of the vases found in Kyrene have obvious sexual symbols in addition to the presence of the Hesperides. For example, Figure 6 shows Eros and Aphrodite; one of the fourth century pelikes (Figure 29) depicts two Erotes surrounding Herakles and Pan. The other side has a further Eros encouraging the satyr, who is pursuing a nymph or maenad in determined fashion. Both vessels characteristically show the Ἑρακλῆς ἀναπαυόμενος leaning against the Hesperidean tree.

This specific linking of women with fruit and sexual activity is found on many of the Attic Ἑρακλῆς ἀναπαυόμενος vases apart from those cited for Kyrene. The erotic potential of the garden is exemplified on a vessel attributed to another of the Meidian School, the Painter of the Athens Wedding, and dating from c. 400. In this
well-populated scene all eyes are focused on the central tree, which is being shaken by an Eros; a second Eros flies to the tree (Figure 30). Wreathed young men and ornately-dressed young women give a festive air, whilst the youth and young woman holding each other’s arms and the Erotes introduce an erotic element.

Figure 30: Athenian rf bell krater, c. 400

This scene has been suggested as a further representation of Herakles in the Garden of the Hesperides (Herrmann 1984: 30). There are many further examples of fourth-century date, such as the Athenian red-figure krater (Figure 9) where again Eros is picking fruit, in the company of Pan, a satyr and several young women, one at least of which is a Hesperid. The upper level divinity (tentatively identified as an Eleusinian goddess because of her torches36) may indicate that this garden setting is other-worldly and thus be a further confirmation of the association between the garden and a blissful afterlife. These καρπολογία scenes, with fruiting trees, women and erotic potential are a close and recurrent association which will be further examined in section 4.2.14.

36 CVA, France 15: 25, top right of Figure 9.
2.3.1: Summary of chapter 2, part 2: κῆπος - the conceptual and the real

What can be concluded from both parts 1 and 2 of this chapter is the enormous conceptual load of the word κῆπος in the sources available both to us and to Greeks of the Archaic and Classical periods. The ‘resonances’ of luxury and pleasure began with the earliest records and endured for centuries through the repetition of older poetic works. Consequently, the κῆπος existed in a borderline zone between the real and the imaginative, with a constant interplay between the two. This conceptual load made ‘the garden’ an easy and natural vehicle for symbolic, transferred use. It functioned as a tangible expression of ideas about a relaxed, privileged immortality and a hint of sexual potential. This aptitude for symbolic transfer will prove to be a recurrent pattern.

Burn (1987: 14) makes an association between the Meidias Painter’s stylistic world and that of the tragedian Agathon and this is a valid point, for aesthetic considerations were clearly involved in the gardens of the conceptual landscape. Lacking Agathon’s works, we can only judge from those who knew him. The satire of Aristophanes, although no doubt in exaggerated fashion, gives a flavour of Agathon’s artificially clever, elegant, over-mannered style (Thesmo. 101-129). The response to Agathon’s song in the play is ὡς ἡ δὺτο μέλος (130). Henderson’s translation (Henderson 1996: 130) ‘What a pretty song!’ expresses exactly the sort of objection Beazley (below) finds in the Meidias Painter’s style. Equally, Plato (Symp. 195a-196b) has Agathon describe the deified Love as that which is most beautiful and best; young and delicate, he touches and walks on things that are soft; he is supple and graceful and lives among flowers. This sounds, indeed, like the Meidian Garden of the Hesperides, existing in an unreal, delicate, safe and protected world.

The fact that this painter chose to emphasise the garden aspect of the myth means that it was felt appropriate for expressing things about life in the blessed hereafter. It seems reasonable to assume that he has picked up on old poetic notions of cherished and protected space, association with the divine realms, with water, fruitfulness, the
meadow, with women, softness and sexual activity. The garden has become a focus for, and expression of, an easy life that was distant from the harshness of much everyday experience in the later fifth century. The use of this garden shorthand symbol by the growing mystery cults in the later fifth and fourth centuries would have reinforced the existing associations between gardens and ease rather than toil. Furthermore, it was during the fifth century that knowledge of, and influence from, the Persian paradeisos garden became more general. Although paradeisoi were not adopted directly into Greek garden practice (however, see chapters 3 and 5), they would have reinforced yet again many of the existing notions of ‘the garden’, being redolent of ease, luxury and power, plentiful flowing water and fruiting trees. The Meidias Painter’s leisured Ἡρακλῆς ἀναπαυόμενος seems to have acted as a symbol for all these intangible associations and these, in turn, are likely to have increased the extent to which gardens were associated with private luxury, privilege, ease and leisure, with concomitant effects upon the attitudes of less affluent, hard-working Greeks living in a more democratic age towards the real gardens in their environment, their owners, the crops it was appropriate to grow in them, even to the possession of a garden, and towards the specific designation as a κῆπος. The word itself cannot have been free of all these associations.

Some of those resonances are still perceptible. Beazley was no lover of the rich Meidian style:

Here also there is beauty; the gleam of gold, loves and ladies with soft limbs, in soft raiment, and all that is shining, easeful and luxurious: perfume, honey and roses, till the heart longs for what is fresh, pungent and hard.37

This description brings to mind Sappho’s and Ibykos’ lyrical descriptions of the groves of Aphrodite and the Maidens, the associations with luxury detected in Stesikhoros and Ibykos, and the sweet Siren voices of Hesiod’s Hesperides (pp. 35-37). Hesiod (WD 109-201) further relates how humans have fallen from their original state of grace

37 Beazley (1918), cited in (Burn 1987: 2).
when, in the Age of Gold, they lived like gods (ὡς θεοὶ), without distress or labour, and food was freely produced of the earth itself (112-120). Perhaps the Meidias Painter was attempting to recreate a picture of that easy existence. Therefore, what seems to have happened is that, in the same way that the Garden of the Hesperides was used as a mark of identity for Kyrene (pp. 60-61), in the hands of the Meidias Painter it became an artistic paradigm for the Isles of the Blessed and a foretaste of paradise – a true paradise garden.

2.3.2: Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that gardens in early, myth-based Greek sources related to gardens of the conceptual landscape, yet these cannot have failed to influence perceptions of garden plots in the real world. When a fifth-century Greek saw women gathering fruit or flowers in a fold of their robe, the κόλπος, it would be part of their everyday experience of women’s garden-related tasks (see chapter 4). But it would also recall the mythological associations of the gesture portrayed in art and literature - for example, the Hesperid on the Meidias hydria, picking apples, or Euripides’ account of Creusa being surprised by Apollo whilst gathering flowers (Ion, 887-890), for both women were using their kolpos to hold their garnerings. Equally, real gardens must earlier have been perceived as productive and pleasant places, fit for the conceptual world of the divine. When Aristophanes described the delightful meadows of the afterlife in Frogs, he probably envisaged the suburban area of Athens called The Gardens (Kepoi), along the delightful Ilissos banks described by Plato (Phaidros, 230b-c, 6.3.1 and passim).

Gardens that were appropriate for the gods, or for the blessed heroes, were not, however, appropriate for man. Everything that we can learn from the corpus of Greek literature about the qualities felt desirable for Greek, especially Athenian, democratic citizens indicates that Beazley’s sentiments might, at least officially, echo their own. Therefore, it seems that the concept of ‘the garden’ was open to suspicions: firstly, of Persian-style luxury and ease and secondly, of softness, and sexual activity. It was,
therefore, a word describing a privileged and cherished space, but one with uneasy associations - a borderline and ambivalent area.

Homer is the only early author who describes more realistic, productive gardens and chapter 3 examines these spaces. In Homer’s gardens, the feminine strand of soft luxury and sexual allure is not emphasised strongly, being confined to the meadows of the Sirens and the tales of divine abduction of maidens from meadows. However, the second strand of elite status, fruit and luxury with eastern provenance is part of the underlying narrative.
Chapter 3: The Gardens of Homer

‘Nowhere in Homer is there an unmotivated landscape, natural scenery for its own sake.’

(Giesecke 2007: 35)

3.1.1: Introduction

Three gardens are described in Homer’s Odyssey, written perhaps c. 700: those of King Alkinoös (7.112-132), Laërtes (24.220-257) and the boy Odysseus (24.336-344). These are the earliest garden descriptions in Greek literature and the only ones until the late Classical period. These gardens exemplify the above quotation from Giesecke: all parts of their descriptions are targeted to express societal ideas. Although the imaginative world is clearly involved in this epic literature, the fact that the gardens described are of a definite type, with clear ownership and productive capacity, means that they are more likely to relate to the real garden landscape than the gardens of chapter 2. All the gardens are orchards and vineyards, with no suggestion of decorative planting; the emphasis is all on productivity.

These Odyssean gardens are very important spaces, because of the role they play in the underlying narrative. How they were perceived by Homer’s audience down the centuries will have been equally important. Because Homer was the basis for education, his values, associations and models were constantly reinforced with each generation and can, therefore, illuminate attitudes to the landscape and to human behaviour far beyond Homer’s own day. They are our earliest clues to evaluating how the Greeks viewed that especially privileged space.

This chapter examines, firstly, the vocabulary of the Odyssey’s garden plots and Homer’s overall garden terminology, focusing on the metaphorical load of the vocabulary and its significance within the text. Second, the relevance of the textual associations to the real gardens of Archaic Greece is investigated in the light of
historical, archaeological and iconographic records. Third, the legacy of these early garden attitudes, practices and experiences on Classical and later Greece is outlined.

3.1.2: The three gardens of the Odyssey

There are three terms used by Homer in describing garden plots:

- κῆπος - a garden, orchard, or plantation;
- ὄρχατος - an orchard or row of trees;
- ἀλωή - a vineyard, orchard or garden; a threshing floor.

His use of these is, however, not consistent. The main focus in this work is the κῆπος, because that word alone has the specific, root meaning of ‘garden’, although ὄρχατος and ἀλωή can be used in this sense. The differing resonances of these words add to our understanding of the garden as perceived by those who experienced them.

The first and fullest description is the garden plot of Alkinoös on Scheria - a place and king not quite of this world. Alkinoös is descended from Poseidon; he, his wife and his kingdom are cherished by the gods (Od. 7.56-72, 49, 132, 200-206). Thus his garden is also semi-divine and acts as a paradigm for others. The garden is located next to the palace; several different terms are used in its description:

On the outside of the courtyard and next the doors is his orchard (ὄρχατος),

(112)

a great one, four land measures, with a fence driven all around it,

and there is the place where his fruit trees (δένδρα μακρὰ τηλεθάοντα)

are grown tall and flourishing,

pear trees (ὀγχαι) and pomegranate trees (ῥοαί) and apple trees (μηλέαι)

with their shining (115)

38 The φυταλία (generalised planting space) is also referred to, pp. 79, f’n 46, 86.
39 Greek texts of the 3 Odyssean gardens are in Appendix 1.
fruit (ἀγλαόκαρποι), and the sweet fig trees (συκέαι γλυκεραι) and the flourishing olive (ἐλαιαι τηλεθόωντα).

Never is the fruit spoiled on these, never does it give out, neither in winter time nor summer, but always the West Wind blowing on the fruits brings some to ripeness while he starts others.

Pear (ὄγχη) matures on pear in that place, apple (μῆλον) upon apple, (120) grape cluster (σταφυλή) on grape cluster, fig (σῦκον) upon fig. There also he has a vineyard (ἀλωή) planted that gives abundant produce (πολύκαρπος), some of it a warm area on level ground where the grapes are left to dry in the sun, but elsewhere they are gathering others and trampling out yet others, and in front of these are unripe (125) grapes (ὄμφακές) that have cast off their bloom while others are darkening. And there at the bottom strip of the field are growing orderly (κοσμηταί) rows of greens (πρασιαί), all kinds, and these are lush (ἐπηετανὸν γανώσαι) through the seasons; and there two springs distribute water, one through all the garden (κῆπον) space, and one on the other side jets out by the courtyard (130) door, and the lofty house, where townspeople come for their water. Such are the glorious gifts of the gods at the house of Alkinoös.

(7.112-132; trans. Lattimore, 1999)

The terminology seems clear-cut: the ὀρχατος (112) is the orchard plot with fruit trees, the ἀλωή (122) is the vineyard and the πρασιαί or vegetable beds (12840) – all make up the entire plot of the garden or κῆπος (129). The reality, however, is far less simple and this passage acts as a treacherous introduction to the minefield of Greek garden terminology.

40 128 in Lattimore; 127 in Greek text.
The second garden description is that of Laërtes, Odysseus’ father, the retired king. His plot appears to be remarkably similar:

But Odysseus (220)
went closer to the abundant orchard (ἀλῳῆς), searching. He did not find either Dolios, as he came into the great orchard (เถχατον), nor any of his thralls, nor his sons for all these had gone off to gather stones and make the into a wall retaining the orchard (ἀλῳῆς), and the old man had guided them on their errand; (225) but he did find his father alone in the well-worked orchard (ἀλῳη) spading out a plant and he had a squalid tunic upon him patched together and ugly, and on his legs he had oxtide gaiters fastened and patched together, to prevent scratching, and gloves on his hands because of the bushes (βάτων), and he was wearing (230)
a cap of goatskin on his head, to increase his misery.
Now when much-enduring Odysseus observed him, with great misery in his heart, and oppressed by old age, he stood underneath a towering pear tree (艅χνην) and shed tears for him (234)

With this in mind, noble Odysseus came straight up to him. (241)
He was digging around a plant (φυτὸν) with his head held downward, And now his glorious son stood near, and spoke to him, saying: ‘Old sir, there is in you no lack of expertness in tending your orchard (เถχατον); everything is well cared for, and there is never (245)
a plant (φυτὸν), neither fig tree (συκῆ) nor yet grapevine (ἄμπελος) nor olive (ἐλαιή)

41 ‘Brambles’ would be a better translation.
42 This operation could be weeding. Alternatively, it could describe the scooping out of a hollow around the stem to increase water capture. A third possibility is root pruning to spur the plant into production; a parallel example of this, for a fig, is given in Luke 13.8 - σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν.
nor pear tree (ὀγχυνή) nor leek bed (πρασιή) uncared for in your garden (κῆπον)..... (247) ........................

But come now, tell me this and give me an accurate answer. (256)

What man’s thrall are you? Whose orchard (ὀρχατος) are you laboring?’ (24.220-234, 241-247, 256-257; trans. Lattimore, 1999)

All the crops mentioned are also grown in Alkinoös’ plot. Although pomegranates and apples are not mentioned in Laërtes’ garden, it undoubtedly represents the same type of mixed orchard-garden, including vineyard and vegetable beds. The φυτὸν (242) normally is a ‘fruit tree’ rather than Lattimore’s ‘plant’ and the πρασιή (247) a vegetable bed. Lattimore has followed Homer and retained ‘garden’ in the final line of description (247) and it is possible to understand κῆπος as again referring only to the entire plot. However, the use of ἀλωνι and ὀρχατος shows a strange inconsistency, masked by Lattimore’s consistent translation into ‘orchard’, which avoids bewildering the reader.

It would initially be possible to understand ἀλωνι as a separate vineyard adjacent to an orchard - ὀρχατος (220-225): on this view, Odysseus approached a vineyard, but did not find his father there, nor in the orchard alongside, and the workers had gone to gather stones for a vineyard wall.43 That interpretation is rendered impossible, however, by 226-247, because Odysseus would then have discovered his father working in a vineyard (226), yet one full of fruit trees (234, 245-247, 257).

The third garden, the orchard Laërtes gave to the child Odysseus, seems equally confusing:

Or come then, let me tell you of the trees in the well-worked (336) orchard (ἀλωνιν) which you gave me once. I asked of you each one, when I was a child, following you through the garden (κῆπον). We went

43 In any event, the vines would have been planted in a separate, regularly planted block.
among the trees, and you named them all and told me what each one was, and you gave me thirteen pear trees (ὀγχνας), and ten apple trees (μηλέας), (340)
and forty fig trees (συκέας); and so also you named the fifty vines (ὀρχους) you would give. Each of them bore regularly, for there were grapes (σταφυλαι) at every stage upon them, whenever the seasons of Zeus came down from the sky upon them, to make them heavy.
(24.336-344; trans. Lattimore, 1999)

This plot is clearly a mixed orchard/vineyard like the previous examples. ὀρχος (342) is more precisely a row, usually of vines. There is no mention of vegetables and the use of κῆπος as descriptive of an entire mixed plot is not even possible here: Odysseus was walking through this garden, looking at the orchard trees (338-339). All three of these descriptions emphasise the garden as a place of fruit production; whilst πρασιαί exist in two of the three, they play a very insignificant part.

The immediate and most probable explanation for the confusion of terminology (which cannot have been a problem for the original audience or it would not exist for us to puzzle over) is that it responds to the demands of the metre. The three key words, of differing syllabic length, obviously all scan differently:

--- v --- v --- v --- v ---
κῆπος ὀρχατος ἀλωή

With one exception, where ὀρχατος or ἀλωή are used, the metre would not easily permit the substitution of κῆπος. The exception is 24.336:

--- v --- v --- l --- v --- v --- v --- l --- v --- v --- l ---
eί δ' ἀγε τοι καὶ δένδρε' ἐύκτιμην κατ' ἀλωήν

---Note---
44 342 in Lattimore; 341 in Greek text.
Without the elision at κατ’, the line could have read:

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllll}
    \text{v} & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} & | & \text{v} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
ei\ d’\ \acute{a}γε\ τοι\ καὶ\ δὲνδρε’\ \acute{e}υκτιμένη\ κατά\ κῆπον
\]

This option was probably not taken because the phrase κατά κῆπον (already in 338) would then be repetitive, although pleasingly alliterative.

If metrical considerations and euphony were Homer’s prime considerations, however, it seems unlikely that they were solely responsible for the vocabulary variation. If κῆπος was perceived as the only appropriate word, then other vocabulary adjustments could have been made elsewhere within the lines to permit this. The versatility of garden/orchard vocabulary opens up possibilities, however, for no word has exactly the same shade of meaning and application. Therefore, it seems that the vocabulary choices within these passages are bringing different resonances to the narrative, which will be evaluated below. A full reference list to all three words in Homer is in Appendix 2.

3.1.3: Garden terminology in the Iliad and the Odyssey

κῆπος

Although the associations of the word seem the same in both Homeric works, the way in which the word is used differs. Within the three passages cited above, κῆπος is used in conjunction with the prepositions ἀνά and κατά plus the accusative, which give a meaning of up, down, across, along or throughout a space, particularly with a sense of motion. This agrees with the initial interpretation of κῆπος as the entire garden area (p. 70). In 7.129-130 ἀνὰ κῆπον reinforces σκίδναται (disperses); it increases the impression of water moving throughout the garden space, highlighting the importance of irrigation. Equally, κατὰ κῆπον in 24.338 reinforces the ἐπισπώμενος (following): the child Odysseus trails in his father’s footsteps around
the whole garden area. κατὰ κῆπον, reinforced by πάμπαν (24.247, 245),
emphasises that the care is total.

This quality of care is the prime association of the κῆπος. The word κομιδή is notably
used three times in six lines in Laërtes’ garden (24.245, 247, 249). It means care
bestowed, with associations of something that is due and right. It is significant that it
accompanies the κῆπος, seen in these passages as places where hard work and
irrigation make them privileged spaces. The garden as the tangible expression of care
is also seen in Alkinoös’ garden, where even the humble vegetables are κοσμηταί -
well-ordered (7.127). By this order, the most complete mastery of nature is achieved,
as a result of intense cultivation. Precious water is supplied throughout in Alkinoös’
plot; Laërtes’ garden was a model of intense, constant attention; and Odysseus’
childhood garden was more than a land grant: it was a princely endowment. Here he
received training in the skilled care of the fruit trees that were a valuable economic
asset of his house. This physical training also expressed more intangible qualities
(sections 3.1.5-6). The sole Odyssey reference to κῆπος outside the three cited
passages (Od. 4.735-737) links it with the faithful, hard-working Dolios.

The prepositional use of the word κῆπος is absent in the Iliad. The only two uses of
the word are in similes: the gardens of 8.306-308 and 21.257-262 compare the falling
of the fragile, inconsequential poppy bud with the falling head of another blameless
warrior, and the rush of life-giving irrigation with the vengeful force of the river fouled
by death. These come in passages of intense fighting, recalling the normal, natural
world of productivity, against which the distortions and slaughter of war stand in
starker contrast. Because the garden is a closely focused and meaningful space, it can
swiftly be related to the simile’s point of contact, so that its literal and metaphorical
force is easily perceptible.

45 Although water is not mentioned in Laërtes’ and Odysseus’ gardens, the brambles of 24.230 in Greece
imply moist ground.
Across the two works, therefore, the κῆπος can be seen as a place of concentrated care - of water and good husbandry. It is the most intensely controlled and privileged part of the landscape, but also an easily-adopted metaphorical tool.

όρχατος

όρχατος is rarely used in Homer: apart from its appearance in the gardens of Alkinoös and Laërtes (though not that of Odysseus) it appears only once more in the Odyssey, merely as a locational reference to Laërtes’ orchard-garden (24.358). Its single occurrence in the Iliad (14.123) is interesting. It describes the land holdings of Diomedes’ grandfather and represents a specific land type (‘planted orchard’), the others being ‘good arable’ and ‘sheep pasture’. This links with the enduring three categories of land exploitation in Archaic and Classical Greece. The earliest land distinction is that between ploughed or planted land in mid-seventh-century Sparta - Μεσσήνην ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀροῦν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν (Tyrtaios, Frag. 5). In fourth-century Athens, the key division was between ploughed land (γῆς ψιλῆς) and land planted with fruit trees (γῆς πεφυτευμένης; Aristotle, Pol. 1258b, 1259a, Demosthenes, 20.115, 55.13).

The fruiting gardens of the Odyssey certainly belong in the planted category. Because of the timespan involved in reaching full productivity from initial planting of young stock (compared with a return on arable the same year), οὔρχατος is likely to have carried associations of long-term investment in the plot - as exemplified by the inter-generational horticultural practices of Laërtes’ house.

It seems that οὔρχατος carried an emphasis on the plot as a specific, differentiated part of the landed estates of its owner. These constituted the wealth and foundation of the household, reflected in the word βίοτος - the substance or means of living, used to describe Diomedes’ land. This word is emphasised constantly in the Odyssey, especially in the multiple references to the substance of Odysseus’ household being destroyed by the suitors (e.g. Od. 1.160, 377, 2.49, 123, 126, 142, etc.). Because the
word is related to ὀρχος (a row of vines or fruit trees) and to ὀρχηδόν (in a row) the plantings were probably made in formal rows. Unlike the κῆπος, there are no resonances of especial care surrounding this word.

ἀλῳή

The word ἀλῳή is used far more frequently than either κῆπος or ὀρχατος: thirteen times in the Iliad, eight times in the Odyssey. It is probable that the word was attractive because of its poetic resonance: with three vowels, two of them long, it sounds attractive and mellow. That cannot, however, be the entire explanation, as the word is associated with specific contexts.

In the Odyssey, apart from the references in the three gardens already cited, the word is used to indicate locations and refers either to a vineyard or an orchard. Nausikaa directs Odysseus towards Alkinoös’ flowering or flourishing orchard-garden - τεθαλυῖα τ’ ἀλῳή (6.293). Twice ἀλῳή is used with ἄνα and κατά, like κῆπος (pp. 74-75) but this time the crop is clearly a vineyard - ἄνα/κατά γουνὸν ἀλῳῆς οἴνοπέδοιο (1.193, 11.193). It is probably part of the same garden of Laërtes that contained vines (24.246). Thus all the ἀλῳή references in the Odyssey are tied to the gardens of Alkinoös and Laërtes and share the associations of the κῆπος.

The γουνός (high ground, 1.193, 11.193) is an interesting word choice. It may describe an upland plateau. In the Iliad, however, Lattimore’s translation as ‘pride’ of the orchard (Il. 18.54-57, 435-438, 9.533-534, 538-542 ) presumably means that he discerned its use here as a metaphorical rather than a physical description: the ἀλῳή is a place that displays status. The repetition of this translation in Thetis’ lament is particularly appropriate, reflecting the pride a mother takes in her son and pride in the ἀλῳή as a status possession. A further repetition, associating a proud Artemis with rights in prized orchard fruit, makes it more probable that Lattimore perceived the status afforded by the orchard/vineyard.
In the *Iliad*, three of the references concern the primary use of the word as ‘threshing floor’. This usage is very similar (reminding of normal life amidst fierce fighting), but is not examined, because the focus in this work is on its meaning of intensively used ground. The word is used in very specific contexts: either similes (4), references to religious duties (4) or in the *ekphrasis* of the Shield (2). The ἀλῳη similes interrupt heavy fighting, or describe its consequences: the destruction of carefully tended crops as ‘collateral damage’ of war within the *aristeia* of Diomedes; Thetis’ poignant lament for her lost son; the reference to an ἀλῳη at fruit harvesting time amidst Akhilles’ raging fury, as if recalling the hearer to the good, normal way of life (5.89-92; 18.54-57, 436-438; 21.346-348).

The two *ekphrasis* references (18.561-568) work in exactly the same way. The tended, flourishing vineyard, where young people work happily, is an iconographic parallel to the ἀλῳη simile of 5.89-92, where the work of the young and vigorous is destroyed. The vineyard is, of course, part of the city at peace, contrasted with the city at war.

The religiously associated ἀλῳη references concern failure to fulfil obligations. The boar that destroyed Oineus’ fruit trees was sent by Artemis, furious that her first-fruits (θαλύσια γουνψ ἀλῳης) had not been rendered (9.533-535). The similar reference (21.34-39, 21.74-79) shows Akhilles ignoring three divinely-imposed sanctions: to honour Lykaon’s supplicant status, their ἕνωσ relationship and the dues owed to a father, for Lykaon was abducted from his father’s orchard - ἐκ πατρὸς ἀλῳης (21.36, 75, 76, also 77-78).

Therefore, in the *Iliad*, ἀλῳη in similes is used like κῆπος as a simile (p. 75). In scenes of deep, destructive fighting, the wastage of war is expressed through the loss of fruitful harvest. The *ekphrasis* also recalls the normal agricultural world, where the young work productively instead of dying, whilst the religious references show that, in slaughtering Lykaon, Akhilles ruptures norms of his society, from which no good can come.
3.1.4: Summary of vocabulary

In emphasising some of the differences in the use of the three garden words, it must be remembered that, in the *Odyssey*, all three words can describe the same plots.\(^{46}\) The assumption must be that, as well as responding to the demands of the metre, the use of differentiated vocabulary created different mental associations in contemporary audiences that were appropriate for the contextual emphasis of each reference.

Ἀλωή seems to have been a general word for land growing fruit or vines and one that easily evoked a relationship with good order, right living, productivity and harvest, with overtones of sacred responsibility. In the *Iliad*, the more vicious and intense the fighting becomes, the more the word ἀλωή appears, seeming particularly to cluster around the figure of the wayward arch-fighter Akhilles, which indicates its function to contrast the best and worst of society.

κῆπος, the prime interest of this study, is less common. It seems to carry moral resonances similar to ἀλωή, where care and precious water are emphasised, where greater focus and detail is possible. The κῆπος seems to be a specific, separate area, because of the regular use of the word in the *Odyssey* with ἀνά and κατά, giving a sense of motion or inclusion of that whole area. This is given some support by the enclosing walls or hedges referred to in two of the three garden plots (Alkinoös’ and Laërtes’); such a privileged, intensely worked space would, in any event, be carefully defined and protected. It seems possible that κῆπος was a more specific term, used to describe an ἀλωή that was more planned, demarcated and developed.

\(^{46}\) And there are further confusions. In the *Odyssey*, both κῆπον πολυδένδρον (4.737) and ἀγρὸν πολυδένδρον (23.139 and 359) almost certainly refer to Laërtes’ garden, which was also an ὄρχατος. The adjective means full of deliberately-planted trees, in contrast with naturally-wooded areas like Zakynthos, which are always ὑλῆς (Od. 9.24, 16.123, 19.131). The word φυταλία, literally a planted place, is also used in *Iliad*, 6.195, 12.314 and 20.185 in the sense of orchard or vineyard, to distinguish that land from ploughland, like the later γῆς πεφυτευμένης.
Ὄρχατος is a rare word, descriptive of a class of land that is permanently planted with productive fruit trees in formal rows, contrasting with arable. Because fruit was a valued resource in the ancient world and full cropping took years, ownership of an Ὄρχατος implied wealth, status and stability. Unlike the other two words, there is no evidence that it had any moral or metaphorical extension.

It may be helpful to try and assimilate the different words to English equivalents to express some of the differences insofar as they are recoverable; this is necessarily a crude exercise, influenced by contemporary and personal perceptions. Ὄρχατος perhaps carried something of the fairly neutral overtones of our word ‘plantation’, indicating only that it is tree-planted land; further, plantations are normally owned by wealthy landowners. Ἀλωή is a more difficult term to render in a modern, industrial society. It has the feeling of an old, atavistic word for ‘fruit-producing and harvestable plot’. For κῆπος, perhaps, ‘nursery-garden’ expresses the quality of nurturing care involved – a place for the rearing, nurturing and protecting of plants like human children. Equally Tuan’s felicitous phrase ‘field of care’ (Tuan 1974: 241) expresses what κῆπος seems to have meant to those who created, cared for and experienced it from within their own society.

3.1.5: Significance of the garden vocabulary in the narrative constructions of the Odyssey

The clusters of associations relating to the responsibilities of mankind in society that had developed around words describing garden spaces encouraged their symbolic use to transmit attitudes about society and behaviour.

In the Odyssey, the descriptions are used implicitly as extended metaphors for a well-ordered world, for behaviour that results in good government and productive landscape, the two being inextricably combined. De Jong (2001: 176-177, 577-579) notes that Homer’s landscape depictions are never simple descriptions, but are structured through the focused viewpoints of specific characters. The gardens are all
seen through the eyes of Odysseus and are linked to him; they relate metaphorically to the leadership qualities of his house, expressing in physical terms the qualities of controlled care, good order and productivity expected of a good king.

The major polarity of life on Ithaka is between the waste/care of the kingdom’s natural economic resources. The references to the suitors, who waste the life-giving substance (βίοτος, p. 76) of the kingdom are legion. Contrasted with waste is care, a characteristic of the Odyssey’s good characters - a kind, consistent care of something valued and cherished. It is frequently displayed by characters who act humbly, even though they may be well-born. The nurse Eurykleia is a paradigm: a servant, but of a good family, who had been bought for a considerable price (1.428-433). She is always described as (κούρο)τρόφος - a nurse, nurturer, or rearer, especially of the young (e.g. Od. 2.361, 4.742, 9.27 etc.). Eumaios, Odysseus’ faithful, lowly pig-farmer, hard working and pious, was a king’s son and described as noble (14.3, 15.412-414). Laërtes, the ex-king, labours personally on his land (24.226-231, 244-250) and it is through his meticulous and exhausting care of his garden plants and trees that his character as a just man and good ruler is articulated.

In Greek there seems a particularly close link between imagery which describes the growth and rearing of plants and of humans (Aubriot 2001). This encourages metaphorical application of plant and garden terminology, particularly in association with care. Ithaka is a land that is a good rearer of its people (κούροτρόφος, 9.27). More specifically, one of the Iliad’s great similes compares a falling in death with the uprooting by a storm of a young and lovingly tended olive (II. 17.53-58). There was no better way to express the loss of a child, protected and reared to the full flourishing vigour of manhood than to compare it with a fruiting tree, over which a man has laboured.

There is, therefore, every reason to believe that characters who care for their trees will care for the humans in their charge and this is something that comes increasingly into focus towards the end of Odysseus’ journey. Throughout his travels, Odysseus has
visited numerous strange societies, none of which gain their life’s substance, their \( \betaιοτος \), through agriculture. The Cyclops, for example, had a land that was ideal for agriculture, with watered meadows, land for arable and vines, with rich soil that would yield a full harvest throughout the seasons (9.132-135); but they did not farm.\(^{47}\) Only when he arrives in Phaiakia does Odysseus find the ideal society, which is expressed through the perfection of Alkinoös’ regulated landscape, particularly his orchard-garden. Giesecke sees the perfection of that garden and the well-run orchard-garden of Laërtes as expressing the containment of Nature (Giesecke 2007: 27). This is, of course, an important theme, but the care afforded to these places of privilege and the consequent fertility seems to be the underlying metaphorical load; Nature is controlled through that care.

In the case of Phaiakia, the care is divine, for its kings have godly favour. The wonderful, watered fertility of Alkinoös’ garden articulates that favour (7.117-132), with the garden as a microcosm of the land. From there, Odysseus travels straight back to Ithaka, where there is a desperate need to re-establish good rule and order because of the suitors’ depreciation of the kingdom’s \( \betaιοτος \).

However, there is a further passage which directly expresses the relationship between good rule and agricultural productivity. In a simile which ruptures normal gender roles (Foley 2009), the good, faithful Penelope is praised by her returned but unrecognised husband:

Lady, no mortal man on the endless earth could have cause to find fault with you; your fame goes up into the wide heaven, as of some king who, as a blameless man (\( \alpha\μυ\μονος \)) and god-fearing (\( \thetaεου\δης \)), and ruling as lord over many powerful people, upholds the way of good government, and the black earth yields him

---

\(^{47}\) For a general summary of the variations of ‘uncivilised’ behaviour Odysseus encounters see, for example Rutherford 2013: 86.
barley and wheat, his trees are heavy with fruit, his sheepflocks continue to bear young, the sea gives him fish, because of his good leadership (ἐξ εὐηγεσίης), and his people prosper (ἀφετώσι) under him.

(19.107-114; trans. Lattimore, 1999)

There is no clearer statement of the relationship between good government and agricultural productivity and prosperity. It is an image that expresses the complete political, religious and agricultural interdependence of a civilised community: εὐνομία is founded on well-ordered landscape. Hesiod (WD 213-237) makes clear and remarkably similar links between rulers who act justly and fertile productivity; here again the imagery connects plant and human. For a just ruler, the ‘city blooms and the people in it flower’ (τεθήλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ’ ἀνθέουσιν, 227); they enjoy ‘the fruits of the labors they care for’ (μεμηλότα ἔργα, 231); ‘they bloom with good things’ (θάλλουσιν δ’ ἁγαθοῖς, 236) and ‘the grain-giving field bears them crops’ (καρπὸν δὲ φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα, 237). The use of the word καρπὸν brings an orchard to mind and μεμηλότα echoes Homer’s emphasis on care.48

3.1.6: Summary of part 1

The vocabulary examination showed that the orchard-gardens of Homer were spaces carrying a complex symbolic load, which was easily metaphorically extendable to express human qualities in society’s rulers.

Laërtes in his orchard-garden functions as a metaphor to demonstrate that good government in practical form, in the same way that Alkinoös’ garden reflects his good governance (Giesecke 2007: 27). The fact that he works hard and faithfully towards his crops expresses his nobility of character and fitness to have ruled. It cannot be coincidental that the description of Laërtes working in his orchard-garden (24.220-257)

48 Translations, Most, 2006.
is closely followed by Odysseus’ reference to the trees which he himself had been given as a child (24.336-344). This landed endowment is part of the same extended metaphor: the child’s own orchard-garden articulates his correct upbringing, inherited right to its land and attachment to it. Further, this garden is one of the two means of identification used: the boar’s scar is a jointly recalled accident and the garden a shared experience (24.330-346). A further recognition sign, Odysseus’ marriage bed, constructed upon a living olive (23.183-204), equally associates a fruiting tree with identity and the right to rule. Therefore, the garden and its fruiting trees clearly associate the past and the present ruler in shared attitudes of care towards people and things that were in their charge: both were ‘good’ rulers.

Care and privilege are inherent in the word Κῆπος, but it is significant that these Homeric orchard-gardens were plots belonging to the elite of society. This is unsurprising in view of the investment of resources and labour. Part two of this chapter will focus on the close structural association of these plots with wealth and power, which has already been hinted at by the kingly owners of these orchard-gardens and in the word γουνός (p. 77).

3.2.1: Homeric orchard-gardens within the ‘real’ horticultural world: introduction

This section seeks to trace the origins of this type of literary garden in the ‘real’ world. Venturing from Homer into the historical world is, of course, treacherous. No part of the Homeric epics can be precisely dated and Odyssey 24 has been suspected of being an altered and potentially later ending (Rutherford 2013: 97-102). From the garden aspect, Book 24 certainly fulfils the paradigm of the orchard-garden of Alkinoös in Book 7 and the encomium to Penelope in Book 19. Equally it works with the construction of hard working, good and ‘noble’ characters. This consistency of theme, and garden terminology argues for authenticity of at least the garden sections of the book.
It is notoriously difficult to establish a date for any Homeric detail, which is obviously important when considering the chronology of socio-economic conditions. Similes and metaphors, however, must necessarily relate to the experienced world of the audience in order to be effective (Sherratt 1996: 153). Minchin specifies that similes act as mental processors for listeners or readers; to do that, the simile must recall memory and experience by creating a mental image (Minchin 2001: 135-137). As the garden plots of the Odyssey act in this way, garden descriptions had to relate to the lived experience of the audience around the time of its codification into text (perhaps c. 700) in order to have had their metaphorical impact. Direct evidence of any type of garden has not survived; therefore, arguments can only be made from probability, the text itself, archaeological evidence of status exchange in durable materials, historical and literary records and palaeobotanical research.

3.2.2: Evidence from the text and archaeological evidence of status exchange

Hanson (1995: 47-50, 86-89) sees Laërtes as representing a new class of entrepreneurial middling farmers, exploiting the land in a new and intensive way. This, however, ignores the fact that Laërtes and Odysseus represent the past and future Ithakan ruling household, whatever the nature of their ‘kingly’ authority might have been. Donlan comments that Laërtes’ orchard-garden is a large-scale enterprise, with supplementary buildings, employing the elderly slave couple and their sons (24.220-225; Donlan 1997: 655). Other holders of similar landholdings in Homer are all clearly members of the elite, which is unsurprising since land, in the three distinct categories of arable, pasture and orchard, was the basis of wealth (p. 76). Other holders of orchard land in Homer all belonged to the honoured elite. The hero Bellerophontes (Il. 6.191-195) was granted a royal princess and a parcel of the finest land, arable and orchard (καλὸν φυταλῆς καὶ ἀροῦρης) as a kingly prerogative (τιμῆς βασιλείδος). Sarpedon and Glaukos were equally honoured (τετιμήμεσθα) with their grant of fine orchard and wheatland (καλὸν φαυταλῆς καὶ ἀροῦρης πυροφόρωι, Il. 12.310-314). Akhilles sneeringly wonders whether Aeneas has been promised the same καλὸν φυταλῆς καὶ ἀροῦρης as an inducement (20.184-186).
Clearly it is all high quality land and a high-status reward - hardly the exploitation of the *eskhatia* by hard-working middling farmers (Hanson 1995: 40, 79-85). In any event, fruit trees (olives apart) would generally not tolerate marginal lands. Unlike the orchard-gardens of Alkinoös, Laërtes and Odysseus, the word ὄρχατος is not used to describe these new grants of land; instead φυταλιά (planted place) is substituted (6.195, 12.314, 20.185). The word also means permanently planted land, distinguished from ploughland, but perhaps any difference lies in the fact that it has not (yet) been permanently planted in formal rows.

Socio-economic conditions within the Greek world in the early Archaic period are notoriously difficult to establish. The economic changes that took place by the crucial eighth century, when the Homeric epics were crystallising into written form, are endlessly disputed, as are the social consequences. What seems reasonably certain is that, by the end of this century, a long period of fragmented, independent local practices had cohered into more identifiable regional clusters, that productivity and population were moving upwards and that conditions were more settled. By the eighth century (and increasingly into the tenth and ninth) material remains indicate a broader elite class whose lifestyle proclaimed conspicuous consumption (Dickinson 2006: 193-194, 249-250). In a few places, elites had been doing this for centuries; indeed, elite competition has been seen as an economic driving force of the period (van Wees 2013).

Conspicuous consumption took many forms, with the type and proportions varying with time and area. Recovered grave goods evidence weapons, use and choice of metals, pottery styles and decoration, dress and jewellery; religious dedications and grandiose burial practices are among the most obvious. The formalisation of sanctuary sites like Olympia and Isthmia seems to have stimulated competition, by acting as meeting places for different communities, where elite families could exchange ideas and gifts. Equally, they were sites for the display of status-proclaiming and

---

49 Also p. 79, f/n 46.
competition-inducing dedications (de Polignac 2013: 439-443). The sanctuaries provide some of the best evidence of this increasing prosperity and display, particularly in bronze figurines, notably horses (Osborne 1998: 24-29); horses are, of course, a status item.

Because all these endure in the archaeological record, they provide evidence for the lifestyle of elite families that is lacking for the general population. Perishable goods would also have played a part in display behaviour, particularly within sanctuary contexts. Food items were vital, although rarely leaving tangible traces; inferences from vessels are sometimes possible. Well-documented ritualised feasting (Dickinson 2006: 251) offered an excellent opportunity for elite self-promotion (de Polignac 2013: 440). Garnsey (1999: 2-7, 113) underlines the importance of food as a significant means of displaying wealth, status and power in ancient societies, who knew at first hand the value of food to survival; it must have been important to EIA elites. Excess produce would be traded. Amphorae recovered from Aegean sites (such as Euboean examples recovered from Tyre and elsewhere) are logically seen as evidence for the trading of food and liquid commodities - the most probable form of surplus wealth available to wealthier members of Archaic Greek communities to exchange for luxury goods and materials (Dickinson 2006: 209, 252).

High quality fruit was a seasonal luxury in the ancient world, the sole source of sweetness apart from honey and therefore prized. Cereals and pulses account for almost all the limited palaeobotanical evidence of food consumption currently available. It seems probable that flourishing large orchard/vineyard/gardens, like those of the Odyssey, represent a further example of an IA status item. Donlan (1997: 655) comments that such plots ‘were as much for display as for utility, a highly visible marker of wealth, high rank and distinctive lifestyle’.

Whilst everyday gardens containing a few native Mediterranean species (olive, grape and fig) undoubtedly existed, continuing uninterrupted since Neolithic times, apples

---

51 See reference to Ward’s research on the Uluburun shipwreck, p. 97.
and pears (other than wild species) indicate something different. Logic dictates that only those with a considerable surplus to invest in future productivity could have afforded the land resources, labour and time required by complex Odyssean orchards, where the emphasis is all upon the fruit, and vegetables play a very insignificant role. It would take anything from ten to twenty years for the plot to reach its full potential, during which time it would require the application of skilled horticultural techniques, irrigation and care, whilst returning little in the way of crops.

The type of developed fruit cultivars described in the Homeric orchards are most plausibly seen as one more aspect of the ‘orientalising’ phenomenon - a major component of elite competition. Near Eastern more sophisticated economies and communities had already been the origin of many, perhaps most, status commodities, ideas and objects exchanged by elites from some areas for centuries, perhaps unbroken since the LBA. The spectacular site of Lefkandi on Euboea demonstrates this for the very early IA, apparently operating as a key site for goods exchange between Greece and the Levant.

Attica is another area demonstrating early Near Eastern contacts, most dramatically in the mid ninth-century burial of the rich lady of the Areopagos. Her oriental style gold earrings demonstrate a salient feature of most Near Eastern ‘imports’: they were adoptions of materials and techniques, not merely provincial copies. Imported raw material and ideas were appropriated, altered and developed to suit local requirements (Dickinson 2006: 118, Osborne 1998: 48-49, Smithson 1968: 78, 111-112).

‘Orientalising’, therefore, does not mean provincial copying, but an eclectic selection by those social groups who had the widest knowledge and experience of the technological advances offered by more easterly lands – necessarily, the more

---

52 *Od.* 7.127-128, 24.247. The term in both cases is πρασιά, probably related to πρασόν, a leek; it may refer to leeks, or generic green vegetables. There is some palaeobotanical evidence indicating an underdeveloped vegetable cultivation (Kučan 2000: 102-104).
privileged. Osborne\textsuperscript{53} has recently argued that the diversity of the Archaic period is evidence of extensive communication networks across the eastern Mediterranean, enabling a plethora of choices. Given the significance of these networks operating across political zones (Vlassopoulos 2007, Vlassopoulos 2009, Malkin 2011) and the durable evidence for the appropriation of status items from the Levant, it is improbable that prized fruit cultivars would not have been acquired. Evidence is given below that Assyria was producing enormous quantities of fruit saplings at the relevant period which, once spread to the Near East, would have been in easy reach of Greek acquiritors.

3.2.3: Evidence from the Assyrian historical record in relation to the gardens of the Odyssey

At the time of the Greek EIA, royal Assyrian orchard-gardens had a long history and fruiting trees had enormous value and prestige. Around 1100, Tiglath-Pileser I began a long Assyrian tradition of importing exotic trees from conquered lands, taking ‘rare orchard fruit which is not found in my land’ for his own gardens (Grayson 1991: 27, vii 17-27).

In the earlier ninth century, Ashurnasirpal II created the first known fully-irrigated Assyrian garden at Nimrud, filled with species from captured terrain. The majority were fruiting: almond, date, olive, pomegranate, pear, quince, fig, grapevine (Grayson 1976: 173-174). At the end of the eighth century, Sargon II created a magnificent new garden at Khorsabad, near Nineveh.

This was not a traditional orchard, but a landscaped park-like area, deliberately imitating the Syrian Amanus Mountains, underlining his power over that area, but it certainly included fruit trees from conquered territories (Luckenbill 1927: no. 83). Fruiting trees are depicted in a relief from the Palace (Figure 31).

In emulation, his son, Sennacherib, created a more grandiose and extensively irrigated garden at Nineveh (Dalley 2013: esp. pp. 49-52, 88-96):

A great park, like unto Mount Amanus, wherein were set out all kinds of herbs and fruit trees, - trees such as grow in the mountains and in Chaldea, I planted by its (the palace’s) side.
(Luckenbill 1927: no. 368)

It is clear that removing exotic specimens from conquered terrain was not only for personal luxury, but acted also as a symbol of dominance. The recreated foreign landscape emphasised control over their most desirable plants and over domestic water resources. The prominently displayed palace reliefs reinforced the inscriptions, underlining the status of the owner of a cool, shaded, irrigated, fragrant and fruiting garden - a luxury affordable only to very few. Other scenes are equally status-boosting: martial prowess, besieged cities, lion hunts, king as high priest, etc.

In the Sennacherib relief, created about the time that the Homeric corpus was being committed to writing, is a potential image of a formal orchard (Figure 32). Dalley (2013: 51, 155-156) notes that within this terraced, landscaped garden, there is an enclosed, protected rectangular area containing regular rows of smallish trees, possibly saplings, separated from the rest (boxed area, lower centre-right).

54 The Near Eastern garden as a statement of political power is examined in Stronach 1990.
She suggests that the rectangular lines surrounding and crossing the plot might be irrigation channels. Although certainty is impossible, this plot appears like a formal orchard or nursery, especially as it is situated on the lower land bordering the lake where fruit trees would flourish. Such formalised planting is archaeologically evidenced from Sennacherib’s temple of Ashur where recovered tree pits have enabled the reconstruction of a formal layout with irrigation channels (Figure 33). Again, the grove was planted on low land, close to the river (Dalley 1993: 6, Carroll 2003: 64-65).
The area of Ionia was ideally placed to receive early knowledge and exchange of specimens from the famous Assyrian royal gardens, albeit indirectly, although evidence does not survive. The long coastline of the eastern Greek settlements, extending from Anatolia down through the Levantine cities, was a huge interface of mingled cultural influences and incessant movement. It was from this fertile intermediate zone that status items had long been appropriated and adapted and would long continue to be, in waves of intermingling influence over the centuries.\(^{55}\)

Assyrian officials moved throughout the zone, spreading their political control throughout the region in the ninth and eighth centuries. It was not only eastern influences and practices moving westward, however, but also Greeks travelling eastward who experienced for themselves the luxuries of other cultures. Ionians (‘Yauna’; see Gadatas Letter, Appendix 1) are referred to in Neo-Assyrian sources from c. 730, as raiders, traders, craftsmen and mercenaries (Rollinger 2009: 32-47). They would not have missed any opportunity to seize both knowledge and examples of the type of prestige goods which would suit their own environment and that of Greeks in Europe. Cyprus seems to have acted as a primary site for onward transmission of goods and artistic ideas. Given that the Homeric poems are believed to have come from Ionia, ‘Homer’ was located in the best possible region for learning of eastern exotica and practices.

It is interesting that large quantities of pomegranate seeds were found from seventh-century deposits at the Heraion on Samos in this intermediate zone (Kučan, 2000: 101). Kučan notes that seeds from many varieties of the fruit were recovered and comments that different fruits would have been brought in as offerings from the Orient. Model pomegranate votives have also been recovered from this site (Kyrieleis 1993: 138-139; Figure 34).

\(^{55}\) Also pp. 60, 65, 119-120.
From the same site, a far wider variety of fruit than has yet been found in Greece was recovered: grapes, figs, olives, blackberries, peaches, water melons, sweet melons and almonds. Yet even here, apples and pears were absent, which Kučan (2000: 100) attributes to their infrequent consumption at the period; this tends to confirm their rarity value. Apples were, however, known by at least the later seventh century in Ionia, as they are mentioned by Sappho\textsuperscript{56} (pp. 33, 186). Sweet, cultivated and harvested apples were, therefore, known on Lesbos in another goddess’ sanctuary.

On the basis of this very limited combination of palaeobotanical and literary evidence, the status of fruit as an elite item is maintained. The pomegranate is widely associated with Hera in art and the apple with Aphrodite. Pomegranate seeds have also been found in deposits from Archaic Miletos in this same intermediary zone (Stika 1997: 160-163), along with olive, fig and grape remains, but again no apples, which so far appear only in literature at this period. The palaeobotanical findings from Samos are also interesting in that they show vegetables to be only semi-domesticated, playing a very minor role, as in the gardens of the \textit{Odyssey}, around the same time that ‘Homer’ was writing (Kučan, 2000: 102).

\textsuperscript{56} With the \textit{caveat} about nomenclature, pp. 42-43.
Cook (2004) has closely examined the strong hints of eastern connections in the *Odyssey*, citing the most probable scenario for the transmission of such knowledge around the time when the Levant became an Assyrian province under Tiglath-Pileser III in 738. In this time and place, all the mechanisms were there for the transmission of everything from trade goods to myths and reports of exotic palaces and gardens (Cook 2004: 45-47, 66-67).

Cook’s main premise is that the description of Alkinoös’ palace (Od. 7.81-102) demonstrates a Greek familiarity with circulating tales of eastern wonders, including specifically Assyrian palace architecture (and accompanying gardens) of the two centuries 900-700, together with the perception of high status (Cook 2004: 51, 71). Common features of Neo-Assyrian and Odyssean gardens are proximity to the royal palace (Od. 7.112), the combination of utility and pleasure in the gardens, and the garden as an expression of power and authority (Cook 2004: 62-65). None of these potential eastern appropriations were copying from the source cultures, but rather selecting items from the many reports of eastern wonders which carried the luxurious, paradisiacal associations the poet was seeking.

Within the Homeric text, the figure of Laërtes also links with the Near Eastern world. Although the ex-king working in his own orchard (24.220-257) is unparalleled in Greek literature (Stanford 1959: 420), it has clear eastern resonances. Laërtes’ orchard garden as a metaphor for his fitness to rule (section 3.1.5) is similar to the constructions of Biblical Israel and Mesopotamia: the king at the centre of the community is responsible for agricultural prosperity (Launderville 2003, chapter 3). Such ideas are found in Assyrian records and art. Ashurbanipal, for example recorded in 636 that on his assumption of the throne, rain fell, grain grew and:

\[
\text{....... heavy crops and plenteous yield made the field(s) continuously luxuriant, the orchards yielded a rich harvest, the cattle successfully brought forth their young - in my reign there was fulness to overflowing, in my years there was plenteous abundance.} \\
\text{(Luckenbill 1927: no. 769; also nos. 402-403)}
\]
This is notably close to the philosophy of the good king expressed by Odysseus (pp. 82-83): the good king’s yields of grain, fish and sheep are heavy and ‘his trees are heavy with fruit’ (Od.19.112).

Furthermore, for Assyrian royalty as for Laërtes, manual as well as organisational labour was part of their proclaimed role (Dalley 2013: 100-102). Although countless labouring masses carried out his works, Sennacherib is particularly recorded as being involved in practical engineering, irrigation and the importation of new species (Luckenbill 1927: for example, nos. 333, 393-401, 403, 414). The extent of his physical contribution is unrecoverable and unimportant. The propaganda value was certain and it is the propaganda value of hard labour that Homer exploited with Laërtes.

The idea of the labouring eastern monarch was lauded centuries later by Xenophon. He related that Kyros, displaying his paradeisos at Sardis, told the wondering Lysander that the plantings were his personal handiwork, claiming that such agricultural labours were part of his regular regime (Oik. 4.4-25). No doubt much of this is constructed: Xenophon had an interest in making his Persian hosts acceptable and the idea of a ‘working’ monarch would been more acceptable in Greek eyes. Again, it is the narrative function not the truth that is important.

Greek appropriation of outside ideas characteristically adapted them in an altered form and the distinctly uneastern humility of Laërtes has little to do with Sennacherib’s. But the constructed idea of a working ruler is common to both, as is the Odyssean ‘good king’ who shares the task of being an agricultural benefactor with grander rulers; the ideas are more likely to have arrived in Homer from eastern garnered tales than from elsewhere.

Further, Assyria seems not only to have been the likely source of the orchard-garden (directly or indirectly) as an expression of status and power, but also of some of the specific fruits of the Odyssean gardens. The prominence of clearly advanced forms of fruit cultivars in the Homeric orchards, particularly Alkinoös’ with its constantly fruiting
trees, is most likely to derive ultimately from real luxurious elite orchards, for which Assyria is the nearest known model.

3.2.4: Evidence of fruit species

The fruits of the Odyssean orchards are a mixture in terms of climatic and geographical zones. Grapes, olives and figs were native to the Mediterranean littoral and had been cultivated for centuries across the Orient and Near East, forming a native fruit triad in Greece. Being vegetatively propagated, they are easily improved by cultivation. Pomegranates, appearing only in the garden of Akinoös, seem to have been extremely rare in Greece during the EIA; only two pomegranate seeds are known, from LBA Tiryns (Kroll 1982: 477, 481-482). However, it was a fruit that was domesticated early in the Near East, from the EBA. Apples and pears in their wild forms have a distribution that includes the non-littoral areas of Greece, extending to the southern Black Sea coast and northern tip of Assyria (Zohary, Hopf and Weiss 2012: 135-140). Apple and pear cultivation is tied to the introduction of the technique of grafting, for which a potential time and place is given below (pp. 99-100).

In Homer, these fruits are clearly desirable. Apart from the three orchard-gardens already discussed, in the Tantalos myth (Od. 11.582-592), the most delicious and luxurious fruits have been chosen to maximise the disparity between the unattainable and the desirable: pear, pomegranate, apple, sweet figs and ripened olives - clearly cultivated, sweet forms. The apple and pear particularly have to be cultivated: wild apples and pears are too sour and hard to be palatable. Palaeobotanical evidence for Greece is too sparse to allow conclusions to be drawn: pits or seeds of olives, grapes and figs are found; pear seeds are very rare and apples absent.

This absence, especially from Samos where plentiful other fruits were evidenced (p. 93) suggests that cultivated forms of apples and pears were new, luxury items in the EIA; there is no evidence of the domesticated apple before the first millennium BC (p.

57 Again, the caveat about nomenclature applies.
Food innovation is a prerogative of wealth (Garnsey 1999: 127) and the rare early references to the apple in Greek literature were all status-associated. Of the Homeric and Hesiodic references, apples only occur in elite orchard-gardens: of Alkinoös, Odysseus and the hero Meleagros (Od. 7.120, 24.340, Il. 9.542), or within the divine realms - the Underworld of Tantalos (Od. 11.588-590), the apples of the Hesperides and the myth of Atalanta (Hesiod, Th. 215, 335, Frag. 76). Sappho, writing in the same Greek coastal area in the early sixth century mentions apples twice (Frag. 2 and Frag. 105a, Appendix 1). The first context is Aphrodite’s grove, thus again of a divinity; the second context is uncertain, but the apples are specifically described as sweet. In Greek literature, pears (under the rare word ὀγχη) are seldom found but, like apples, are found only in gardens associated with elite status or the otherworld example of Tantalos.

Ward has examined the associations of the pomegranate with luxury during the LBA in the eastern Mediterranean area. She notes the close association between pomegranates on decorative motifs and elite housing (Ward 2003: 530-535). The plant remains (also often found in elite housing and markedly present in the Uluburun shipwreck with a wide range of elite goods) led Ward to conclude that the pomegranate was probably a luxury food (Ward 2003: 529-530, 538). Pomegranates were a Near Eastern motif on the earrings of the rich lady of the Areopagos (p. 88) so clearly elite-associated. In the Near East, Assurnasirpal’s Banqueting Stele connects his pleasure garden with the fruit, endorsing the connotations of luxury (Grayson 1976: 174; Appendix 1).

Pomegranates are mentioned once in a series of surviving eighth-century inscriptions between an Assyrian monarch (almost certainly Sargon) and his governors (Postgate 1987: 128), which attest an enormous royal demand for young fruit trees. Dalley describes this as evidence of a ‘nursery trade’ (Dalley 1993: 4). The texts, however,

58 Of course, epic is dealing with an elite. However, there are no passing mentions of apples or other fruit in the course of the narrative, such as a descriptive like ‘apple-bearing’, or ‘X where the apples grow’. 
indicate not a trade, but a levy, destined for the new royal garden at Khorsabad.\textsuperscript{59} These saplings were clearly highly desirable items, therefore of some status. The quantities are staggering and the fruits required significant.

Assyrian royal archive document SAA 01 227 refers to someone who ‘is stealing saplings of pomegranate trees’ which implies value, although this is the sole reference. Equally, there are single references to saplings of peach or plum (SAA 05 027), almond, quince and plum saplings and medlar (SAA 01 226).\textsuperscript{60} Of these, numbers are given only in the case of the medlars - 450 bundles.

It is not only an emphasis on luxury fruit as a desirable royal status item that is striking about the Assyrian archives. The most surprising feature is the emphasis on the apple. The sheer quantity of apple trees and saplings required is remarkable - far more than for any other fruit tree. Whilst in some documents no numbers are specified (SAA 05 027 and SAA 01 227), in the same document that recorded the 450 bundles of medlars are 2,350 bundles of apple trees and, from a different people, 1,000 bundles of apple saplings; in SAA 01 222 the requirement is 1,000 apple saplings. This evidence of a sudden upsurge of interest in young apples requires more than a new royal garden to explain it. Even if trade were the reason, the focus on one fruit is inexplicable; Dalley (2013: 165) suggests additional roadside plantings, but again this does not explain the emphasis on the apple.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{59} Two texts (SAA 01 226 and SAA 05 105) specifically mention their destination as Dûr Šarrukîn (Khorsablad) and those commissioned to obtain them are clearly subordinates: e.g. ‘since the order was given to me’ (SAA 05 027).

\textsuperscript{60} For detailed consideration of fruit terminology, see (Postgate 1987).

\textsuperscript{61} The identification of the Akkadian word hašḥur as apple has been occasionally been challenged, but detailed evaluations (Postgate 1987: 116-120, Powell 1987) confirm the apple as almost certainly correct. The general word for apple, hašḥur covers fruits that we would consider different varieties, usually designated by suffixes; the translation of almost all of these is uncertain. Postgate (1987: 129-132) translates hašḥur-kur-ra as pear, although it may also be quince, which can be a similar shape.
Different peoples in northern Assyria were being specifically required to provide these enormous quantities of young apple trees - and the word *ziqpu* means sapling,\(^6\) rather than Dalley’s ‘cuttings’ which are entirely different. Apart from the fact that they are described as being ‘pulled up’, SAA 05 105 explains that the saplings have not been despatched because of icy weather. Cuttings are not taken in winter, so the word clearly refers to over-wintered young stock, growing in a northern upland area with the cooler temperatures that apples favour.

The documents evidence cultivation on an impressive scale in irrigated valley areas, appropriate for flourishing nurseries and ease of transport. Each area seems to have target crops, presumably appropriate to their climatic zone and/or fixed according to a centrally organised horticultural programme. In two cases, those responsible for sapling acquisition are known: both were governors of the relevant provinces during Sargon’s reign (Parpola, Radner and Whiting 1998: 142, Parpola, Baker and Whiting 1988: 1084). Such an organised, high level effort indicates the importance of this levy and the intense focus on the apple indicates that something important had occurred. It seems probable that it was due to the introduction of the grafting technique, or its adoption and widespread application by a ruler who perceived its potential.

Grafting is vital for the cultivation of apples and pears; without it, seed-grown fruit reverts to smaller, wilder forms of the crab apple or wild pear (Zohary, Hopf and Weiss 2012: 115). Whilst crab apples had long been gathered (examples have been found in Ur from the fifth millennium, threaded on strings to dry), there seems no reason for a palace orchard to grow thousands of sour crabs. They are beautiful in flower, but the prime emphasis of these royal gardens was productivity (section 3.2.3; Luckenbill 1927: 402, 403, 416).

Grafting removes the fruiting branches from rooted wild stock, replacing them with scions from larger, sweeter fruit, which can then be further improved and propagated

---

as the domestic species evolves through selection. This makes an essential contrast with the first group of fruits to be domesticated in the eastern Mediterranean (also found in Assyrian records) - date, fig, grape, pomegranate and olive. With these fruits, better species from wild varieties were gradually improved by vegetative propagation – cuttings, suckers or basal nodes. The grafting technique enabled a second group of fruits to come into cultivation: apple, pear, plum, sweet cherry (Zohary, Hopf and Weiss 2012: 114-115).

The date at which grafting was introduced into the Near East and Mediterranean area is unknown, but is believed to be somewhere in this first millennium BC and from further east because the domesticated apple derived primarily from the wild central Asian apple *M. sieversii*. Theophrastos (*HP* 2.1.4, 2.2.4-5, 2.5.3) is the earliest reliable witness. However, the Assyrian evidence indicates that the technique was being extensively employed in eighth-century Assyria.

From Assyria, these status products would have spread to the Levantine coast and through Anatolia, into other royal and elite orchard-gardens, by gift-exchange and trading, then extending further. Given the status association of these orchards, it seems very possible that it was newly-improved orchards of grafted fruit that Homer co-opted into his imagery, as a visible form of status display for the very few. Homer’s Ionia was ideally placed (p. 92). This proposition is, of course, speculative, but the accumulation of circumstantial evidence indicates that it may well be the case.

Some evidence of the type of process involved may be found in a Roman copy (early second century AD, found near Magnesia) of a letter from Dareios to Gadatas (Appendix 1), probably the Persian satrap in Ionia, originally dated around 500. In the letter, Gadatas is praised by Dareios for planting into the territory ‘below Asia’ fruit trees from ‘beyond the Euphrates’. The precise territory is unclear: it could be anywhere between Magnesia, near the Ionian coast, or further south into the Levant. All those areas were well within the orbit of Ionic Greeks and especially those on
Cyprus. The genuineness of the letter is disputed\textsuperscript{63}, but such plantings are in accordance with later Persian practice: for example, Xenophon records that Kyros ensured the lands he controlled were well-planted, especially the \textit{paradeisoi} \textit{(Oik. 4.8, 13, 16)}. Again there is no proof. What the Gadatas Letter does demonstrate, however, is a potential additional mechanism for the spread of knowledge about intensive royal orchard-gardens to the Ionian area and the letter is accepted by more scholars than reject it.

A second small piece of potential evidence is a later painting on Clazomenian Sarcophagus F.13 (Figure 35), which includes three fruiting trees (Cook 1981: 103 and pl. 33). Unfortunately, the scene is unclear, but it is possible to discern some details of these unusual images (where trees are shown on these sixth-century Ionian sarcophagi, they are normally palms). The fruits look like apples: they are large and spherical; peaches fit the shape, but are not probable.\textsuperscript{64} Given the size, these are clearly cultivated and grafted apples, providing evidence of sophisticated cultivation techniques being used in the Greek Ionian coast by the later sixth to earlier fifth century. Cook describes the right hand tree as an ‘espalier’, presumably because of the limited number of branches and their spread layout. Whilst not a correct espalier in modern terms, it certainly looks like an early attempt at the shape, which restricts the grafted fruiting branches in order to obtain fewer, but better, fruits. The second tree, more difficult to see because of the deer behind it, looks like a standard tree, with lower branches removed and a cluster of fruiting branches at the top. The third example seems to be an unshaped fruiting tree. Two of these trees are, therefore, early examples of advanced horticultural techniques, part of the secondary stage in horticultural cultivation.

\textsuperscript{63} Briant, originally \textit{pro}, is now \textit{contra} (Briant 2002: 491, Briant 2003; see also: Tuplin 2009, who is narrowly \textit{pro}, Lane Fox 2006, who is \textit{pro}). Tuplin (2009: 157) comments that the practices recorded, including the royal use of agriculture, agree with known imperial practice.

\textsuperscript{64} Peaches were later in cultivation than the apple (Zohary, Hopf, Weiss 2012: 144). One fragment was found in seventh-century Samian deposits - the only one yet recovered from the Greek area (Kučan 2000: 101).
Like the planted orchards of Gadatas, these fruit trees were part of status display. Only the fairly wealthy would be able to afford these painted sarcophagi, and the other images relate to the elite world (scenes of cavalry, fighting warriors and symposia, Cook 1981).

Some support for a late introduction of grafted, cultivated apples into Greece is offered by the fact that the only identified fruit-related words in Mycenaean Greek are the same Mediterranean trio: ἐλαία, σῦκον and ὀἶνος plus καρπός for fruit (Chadwick and Baumbach 1963; Ventris and Chadwick 1973). Pears are mentioned, but are almost certainly wild, being confined to two minor sites. Valuable cultivated fruit would have been under palace direction and likely to be recorded, as is the case for the Mediterranean trio. Palaeobotanical research has added crops that have no palace record, particularly legumes, but not orchard fruit. Hansen’s summary of the Aegean evidence for cereals, legumes and fruit shows only olive, fig and grape (Hansen 1999: 19-20). Although future discoveries and research may change this picture, the current state of knowledge indicates a lack of apple cultivation at this period.

By the time the earliest Greek vases displayed apples, they are certainly horticulturally advanced, grafted species, with large fruit, such as one would expect from the

---

65 Ventris and Chadwick (1973: 129-130) comment that apples, pears and pomegranates ‘were presumably cultivated’, but without evidence.
66 Plus a single LBA pear seed (Hansen 1999: 20), almost certainly wild. Hansen does not mention the two pomegranate seeds from Tiryns (p. 96).
epigraphic and literary evidence of the Classical period (sections 3.3.1-6). The fruit size often appears exaggerated, as if emphasising that it is large, sweet, cultivated fruit and thus a prized item. Carefully shaped, cultivated trees are depicted in an early cluster of Athenian vases dated 525-475. The oenochoe in Figure 36 is particularly interesting, as it associates the eastern motif of two animals on either side of a cultivated fruit tree.

All these early scenes show trees that are shaped in some way, mostly by branch restriction recalling the ‘espalier’, although more curved; the branches appear to have been top-grafted onto a bare stem (Figures 37 and 38).

---

67 E.g. Beazley on-line 23646, 44890, 331719 (skyphoi); and Figures 37-39.
Some trees clearly show grafting, because trunks are far thicker than branches, indicating the introduction of young grafts into a well-established stock (Figures 37 and 39). Figures 37-39 are all by the Haimon Painter (as is Figure 99, p. 170), which suggests that he had a particular interest in, or experience of, cultivated fruit trees.

There is an inconsistency between the Homeric orchard-gardens where pears regularly appear alongside apples (or, in Laërtes’ garden, instead of apples) and the other literary sources, both Greek and Assyrian, where pears are rare or absent. It is probable that pears are obscured in the Assyrian records by their difficult classification systems (p. 98, f/n 61). Although pears appear in general Assyrian plant lists, they do not feature in the sapling lists, unless they are subsumed under hašhur. It is interesting that the Greek category μηλον is equally generic and remained so for centuries; it can refer to apples or to any other tree fruit or ἀκρόδρυα (pp. 42-43). It is possible that this broad categorisation was introduced along with the fruit.

Therefore, in Greece also, because of the generic nature of the category, ‘apples’ (μηλα) in texts may occasionally obscure pears or even quinces. Homer is rare in making the distinction, as if he were using classification more forensically to indicate

---

68 Although in Figure 39, rogue stock shoots are also present.
an improved type of fruit. Although it may be merely poetic, the adjective βλωθρός (tall; Od. 24.234) might possibly indicate a pear that has grown better than scrubby wild species. Some support is given by the fact that Theophrastos uses the term ὄγχνη only for cultivated pears; the wild ones are ἄπιος (HP 2.5.6). Although pears occur in the palaeobotanical record, these are almost certainly the wild pears gathered since palaeolithic times (Hansen 1999: 20, Dalby 1995: 39) - probably the type of spiky pear (ἄχερος) of Odyssey, 14.10, where Eumaios has made the type of animal-proof hedge that is still in use today.

3.2.5: Summary of part 2

An examination of historical, archaeological and iconographic records from Greece and Assyria suggests that the latter may well be the original source of the grafted, cultivated apples and pears of the Homeric orchards, transmitted via the intermediate zone of the Levantine and Ionian coastal areas; these crops would have been specially desirable status items. This proposition rests upon evidence that is circumstantial but, in view of the ultimate eastern provenance of most Greek status items, techniques and materials at this period, it currently seems the most probable interpretation.

Such high-maintenance, long-term investment orchard-gardens are likely to have been appropriated as a status item by the Archaic period and their existence is a necessary part of audience comprehension of the Odyssey’s conceptual world and narrative constructions. The associations of the word κῆπος would have been absorbed and promulgated down the decades with every repetition. In consequence, ‘the garden’ of Homeric poetry would have meant an intensively worked, cherished and privileged part of the landscape, planted with productive fruit trees, receiving maximum labour and irrigation and necessarily owned by the wealthy. From the viewpoint of those who were less well endowed, who owned no garden or nothing more than a humble vegetable plot, the κῆπος is likely to have been perceived as an ambivalent space, associated with luxury, and there is evidence that this attitude endured into, and after, the more democratic Classical period.
3.3.1: The elite orchard in the classical period: introduction

Having examined Homer’s gardens and garden vocabulary, and their relationship with real elite gardens in the Archaic period, the final part of this chapter considers ‘the garden’ and attitudes to it in later centuries, including the survival of the elite orchard. It is clear that different source types, with their different purposes, reveal very different pictures, but the orchard-garden certainly flourished on both owned and leased land. There are indications that the κῆπος continued to be perceived as an ambivalent space.

3.3.2: Epigraphic evidence

This key source reveals real, practical gardens from the end of the fifth century, when the epigraphic habit begins, becoming well-established by the fourth. There are many types of inscription recording different types of plot, for different purposes.

There are horos inscriptions recording the presence of a house and garden. Some record gardens, plural, which may indicate that the gardens were not necessarily connected with houses, even outside the city (such as the nine plots near Peiraieus, pp. 224-225). Other fifth- and fourth-century inscriptions attest a market in the purchase or rental of gardens. Unfortunately, the information provided by these inscriptions is minimal, relating mostly to legal status, but insights can be gained from the inscriptive record of other types of gardens – those leased to provide a permanent income for the sanctuaries that owned them. These are normally more detailed and prescriptive than the leases of secular properties and the epigraphic record gives evidence of three important aspects.

Firstly, their food productivity was governed by intense and regulated care; the Laërtes-like attention to each task in its season is familiar. An equal level of care may

---

69 Attic examples are: IG II² 2675; ‘AD’ 17 in Finley 1985, 12A; SEG 33.175; IG II² 2724; horos 92A in Finley 1985 included a garden in Phaleron with a house and (probably) a wineshop, suggesting the produce may have been sold (Harris 2002: 69).

70 E.g., IG I³ 430, frag. a, 17, which includes house and garden in Myrrhinous; IG II² 1596, b, I - garden in Pallene; IG II² 1579, 35-36 - house and garden in Oion.
be assumed for privately owned or leased land; it is only the invaluable temple records that record this clearly. Leases were increasingly epigraphically recorded by sanctuaries determined to get the best return on their land.\(^{71}\) One cannot, of course, know how far their conditions were met. A stele from Rhamnous, IG II\(^2\) 2494 (Appendix 1), dated 339/338\(^{72}\) demonstrates this careful regulation within Attica. Although late, the lease employs the type of formulaic provisions that were probably long employed but unrecorded and which are paralleled elsewhere. Unfortunately, it has required considerable reconstruction, so there are uncertainties, although it is stoichedon, which is some advantage. It relates to the leasing - probably of two properties, one or both being in Rhamnous, or possibly to one property on different dates (Jameson 1982: 70).

The garden was dedicated to fruit trees: ἀκρόδρυα – ‘top fruits’\(^{73}\), probably apples or pears, and the reconstruction adds olives and figs (l. 12). There is sufficient text to be fairly sure of a requirement to propagate and of restrictions on what the tenant may not do to the cultivated trees (ll. 12-16). Fairly secure too is that, on expiry of the lease, half the garden was to be planted with trees and cabbages or other vegetables, whilst half remained fallow (ll. 16-19). The attention to careful cultivation is echoed in the second part of the lease - IG II\(^2\) 2493, which deals with ordinary agricultural land. There is similar regulation about how the tenant should plough and sow, with barley, wheat and pulses (ll. 7-10). Figs (probably, ll. 17 and 27) and other crop fruits (l. 18) were to be grown and carefully tended (ll. 15-19). The timing of agricultural operations is specified and the end of lease term conditions, including manuring (ll. 14-31). The term of the lease is ten years (ll. 10-11) and, as the garden section of the document is related to this one, the garden lease would also have run for that term. Given that this part of the document is far better preserved, it supports the restorations in the garden lease.

\(^{71}\) For example, from Thasos - IG XII, Suppl. 353 and IG XII.8 265. For Delos, pp. 109, 112, 123, f/n 79.
\(^{72}\) IG II\(^2\) 2494, plus 2493 and fragments, are now under the umbrella of DR II.180 and examined by Jameson (1982) and (Petrakhos 1999). 2494 contains the garden evidence and line references are to this version.
\(^{73}\) See appendix 3 for this rare word, the reading of which is fairly secure, as only two letters are reconstructed: ἀκρόδρυα.
The careful tending of the garden was obviously extended to the arable, but the separation of arable and garden leases shows that a clear distinction was made between land described as κῆπος and as χωρίον. This categorisation of garden plots as playing a distinct economic role is the second important feature of these documents; the same distinction is found in secular leases.74 The χωρίον grew cereals and pulses, which apparently define the category. However, the Rhamnous arable also grew cultivated fruits, which seem not essentially different to the garden-grown fruit trees. The difference is only that the garden fruits are described as ἀκρόδρυα. These seem conceptually different and are, therefore, very important. It seems probable that the ἀκρόδρυα designated the more specialised apples and pears and other grafted species of the Homeric plots. The growing of ἀκρόδρυα may well define the κῆπος as a designation (see Appendix 3). As in Homer, vegetables seem insignificant, perhaps because of their short-term value compared investment in fruit-trees. This contrasts with the more workaday gardens of Theophrastos’ literary evidence (section 3.3.4). A further difference is that the garden had a water supply, whereas the farmed land, despite a house being on the plot, had none; water again, is shown as essential to the garden, making it a place of privilege in the Greek climate (Krasilnikoff 2010: 108-110). Its use is carefully regulated (ll. 9-11).

A different verb reinforces the difference between χωρίον and κῆπος: the tenant of the arable (or rather his workers) will farm - γεωργήσε (IG II2 2493, ll. 7-8), but when working the garden, the tenant will garden - κηπουρήσει (IG II2 2494, l. 8). The distinction can only lie in the requirement for more careful and regular tending and watering, as the garden specifically grows fruit, or that most of the land is tree-planted, rather than being shared with annual food crops. In literature, Demosthenes (20.115) differentiates between categories of annually-sown and tree-planted land - γῆς πεφυτευμένης or ψιλῆς (the same division is found in Aristotle, Pol. 1258b, 1259a; p. 76 above), thus has a partial correspondence with the Rhamnous’ χωρίον/κῆπος division.

---

74 E.g., IG I3 430, IG II2 1241, SEG 33.175.
It seems likely that the χωρίον/κήπος distinction was variable with place and period. Rhamnous’ differentiation seems slightly different from the lands of Apollo in Delos, Rheneia and Mykonos, where leases for some estates probably began in the sixth century (Kent 1948: 247). Kent sees the difference here as between κήποι producing vines, fruit and grain and χωρία which had pasture in addition to arable (Kent 1948: 318, f/n 240). Hellman, working with the same evidence, characterises the garden as an enclosed site, producing fruit and vegetables, sometimes with buildings, and χωρία which included other, less-productive types of land (Hellman 1992: 209-210). However, most of the Delian evidence is considerably later.

The third significant aspect of these leases is the confirmation of value. In cases where prosopography allows deduction, the leases are normally associated with wealthy, prominent individuals, keen to maximise their returns. It is the case at Rhamnous and elsewhere (Jameson 1982: 71-74). It has been particularly noted in the case of the lands of Delian Apollo. Epigraphic analysis and prosopography demonstrate that these estates were largely worked by slave labour, leased by wealthy individuals as a capital investment (Kent 1948: 280). Given the large scale of these estates, it is unsurprising that they should have been leased by the elite, Delian and Athenian. Thus they continue the elite associations of the orchard, although now being commercially exploited on a large scale. It seems likely that the lessees of temple plots were trying to secure maximum profits and valuable fruit could achieve better returns. Temple rents were high, so the profit obtainable from the land must have been higher.

Therefore, the epigraphic evidence indicates that the orchard-garden remained a place of intense care and regulation, a place distinguished from the surrounding χωρίον and with considerable elite associations.

3.3.3: Archaeological evidence

Archaeology, unfortunately, offers very little firm evidence. Within Attica, material remains have been found only of temple gardens: the tiny fourth-century grove
surrounding the Altar of Pity and the third-century Hephaisteion plantings. Both were linked with the irrigation systems that are a constant garden association from Homeric times and with divine high status.

The excavations at Crimean Chersonesos do, however, give some insights; although distant, the rocky, thin-soiled land resembles the Attic landscape. There is evidence of intensive cultivation by relatively modest Greek settlers, in two phases from around 400. Each rectangular kleros is separated into small blocks of vines, fruit and grain fields and shows a careful positioning of each crop to gain maximum benefit, recalling the precepts of Theophrastos and complementing his evidence. This is a vine-producing area, so vines usually occupy the greatest percentage of land. But fruit is prominent as a field crop, occupying an average of 14.37% of the few plots where figures are available (Dufkova, Pečírka 1970: 152-167; Figure 40). It appears, therefore, to be more widely grown than in Homeric times and field-grown, as in Theophrastos’ works. No gardens are attested, but we do not know how the individual sections of the plots were categorised.
Enormous care, recalling the labours of Laërtes and Theophrastos’ advice, was taken to secure the best yield, with soil improvement practices, including the laborious carving into the rock of soil-filled planting pits for vines. This bears witness to the amount of effort that their owners were prepared to put into maximising productivity (Figure 41).

Archaeological evidence, therefore, confirms the quality of care in connection with fruit crops and indicates that fruit was quite extensively field grown by the later Classical period, almost certainly as a valuable market crop. There are no known elite associations with these plots and they are evidence not of elite orchards, but of a later, wider spread of fruit and vine cultivation, as a specific part of agriculture and one that always required more intensive care. The increasing growth of city markets would have acted as a stimulus to such a development, which is also attested by Theophrastos.

3.3.4: Literary evidence

By the time of Theophrastos, the earliest post-Homeric author to write of garden matters, the nature of the written material was very different, being now involved with the real, practical world of plants and their classification, far removed from the elite world of heroic epic. Theophrastos was writing soon after the second land reorganisation at Chersonesos and he also writes of fruit as a normal field crop (H.P
2.5.7; CP 3.6.6-8); it is frequently referenced in sections that also concern grain growing (CP 1.18.1-2, 2.1.2-4, 3.9.1-3). In CP 3.2.1-2, fruiting trees are clearly considered a branch of agriculture - ἥ γεωργία (3.2.1). Fruit seems to have been more widely cultivated, not only enclosed in protected gardens, but also field grown, no doubt because of increasing demand from the city’s markets. The same intensive care was still dedicated to its cultivation. The careful laying out of vineyards and orchards is found in HP 2.5.7; 4.14.13 and CP 3.11.5-12.3, including the effect of cold and frost around the Black Sea. When Aristophanes’ citizens gladly returned to their peaceful plots of figs, olives and vines (Peace, 571-581), these would have been field, not garden, plots; only the humbler myrtle and violets are likely to have been garden plants, along with vegetables. Theophrastos’ fourth-century literary evidence records these humbler gardens for the first time, reflecting the absence of early written sources for more ordinary gardens, which only now emerge into the historical record, although they must always have existed. Such plots could either be privately owned, or commercial market gardens, often leased, worked by hired or slave labour. They would still have been a prestigious type of land; how far down the social scale they extended is unknown.

Theophrastos’ gardens appear as simple vegetable-growing spaces, far removed from the Homeric precedent. When Theophrastos mentions the garden or gardeners, it is always in a vegetable context (e.g. HP 7.2.5, 7.4.5, 7.5.2). The ‘things reared in gardens’ (τὰ κηπευομένα) are always vegetables (HP 7.1.1, 7.2.2, 7.5.6; CP 4.6.7). The investment seems not to be of long-term tree-planting, but of annual care. Most gardens would, however, have contained the odd fruit tree; for example, Theophrastos (Char. 10.8) records a garden fig tree. The primarily vegetable nature of Theophrastan gardens stands in stark contrast with the evidence from leased temple plots revealed by epigraphy, such as that from Rhamnous and Delos, where fruit and vines were the major crop (section 3.3.2) and the estates were high-status and wealth-producing. The difference is essentially between privately owned or leased ‘secular’ gardens, with a greater or lesser share for domestic/market consumption, and large leased temple estates geared primarily to the market; and equally between ordinary
owners/lessees and wealthy investor-lessees. Both types of plot seem to have carried the name κῆπος, but the common factor is not the crops that they grew but the intensive care with which the crop was grown and the consequent fertility and value it carried.

Other literary references show gardeners in a humble light, but by inference giving evidence of the wealthy landowners who employed them. Gardeners were lowly people, frequently of metic status (pp. 158, 238). The first gardener known by name, Hegesias, appears in a list of metics on whom citizenship was conferred just before 400, probably rewarding political services during the tyranny (IG II² 10, b, col. 1). Comic poets around 400 list gardeners with diggers, donkey drivers and women who cut greens, or with a coal-merchant, sieve-maker or barber (Arkhippos, Frag. 44, Philyllios, Poleis, Frag. 14, Appendix 1). Aristophanes refers to gardeners as ‘stooping and straightening in the manner of a gardener’s well-beam’ (Aristophanes, Frag. 697, Appendix 1). This was the κήλων, a water-lifting device, also found in epigraphy, they were still being used in Methana in the 1980s (Forbes 2007: 241-244; Figure 42). As shadufs, they are still widely used today across parts of the Near East and North Africa.

42: κήλων, Methana, 1980s

75 IG I² 422, col.2, 190 from the 414 confiscation records (Pritchett 1961: 27); IG II² 1632, b, 200 from later fourth century Attica; IG XI² 154, a, 8 from early third-century Delphi.
Irrigation was normally hard and heavy physical labour. In the later fourth century, the philosopher Kleanthes, being both poor and industrious, earned the money to study philosophy by day through drawing water for garden irrigation at night (Diogenes Laertios, 7.168-170). Really wealthy individuals had obviously developed complex, branching and channelled irrigation systems: Aristotle describes them when making an analogy with human veins and arteries (Parts Animals, 3.5.668a; also Plato, Timaios, 77c). Theophrastos mentions irrigation from channels as well as harnessed rain-water (HP 7.5.2, CP 3.8.3). The garden, with its intensive cultivation, was completely dependent on water. Demosthenes (50.61) records a situation where, when the well dried, no vegetables grew.

The fact that the literary evidence deals more with the gardens of more ordinary people than the elite no doubt relates to the political context of the polis. It does not mean that the earlier privileged orchard-gardens no longer existed, nor their high-status owners. While gardens per se appear to have lost their elite status, fruit does not, as iconographic evidence also demonstrates.

3.3.5: Iconographic evidence

In the second half of the fifth century fruit is pictured in high-status contexts. Firstly, it appears as food proffered to heroes or divinities. Examples are shown in Figure 43, where Aphrodite in an idealised setting (section 4.2.13) is brought a plate of fruit by one of her handmaids; also in Figure 43, where Phaon is offered a basket of fruit, including pomegranates.

43: Athenian rf squat lekythos, 450-500
Secondly, single fruits appear as offerings on altars, shown, for example, in Figures 45 and 46.
Thirdly, a single fruit is shown being carefully held by a symposiast in red-figure cups like Figure 47.

This evidence of fruit in high-status contexts is an indication that, although later literary sources do not demonstrate the elite associations of the orchard-garden, such associations still existed and can be teased out. This is made clear from certain texts where the earlier symbolic load of the word is κῆπος is exploited.

3.3.6: The rhetorical load of ‘the garden’

Because of the early literary associations of the κῆπος with wealth, privilege and luxury, it is highly probable that the word carried connotations that were uncomfortable to many in a democracy. Classical Greek literature frequently reinforces the advice of the Delphic Oracle: μηδέν’ ἀγάν. The doctrine of τὸ μέτριον is most fully expounded in Aristotle’s Nikomachean Ethics (1117b, 25-1119b, 15), but frequently occurs elsewhere,76 the ideal being to avoid excess in any form. Solon’s dictum ‘Excess breeds insolence’ (Frag. 6, Gerber 1999: 123) became proverbial; excess breeds ὑβρίς, which is offensive to the gods and encourages civic disharmony.

76 For example, Plato, Laws, 3.691c, 5.728e-729a; Aristotle, Politics, 7.1327b.
The land seemed especially prone to carrying moral and political rhetoric. The ideal of the sturdy Greek citizen-farmer was reinforced by images such as that offered by Herodotus, who concludes his history of the Graeco-Persian conflict with the alleged maxim of Kyros: ἐκ τῶν μαλακῶν χώρων μακακοὺς γίγνεσθαι (9.121) - soft lands breed soft men. μαλακός is the word regularly used to describe soft Greek meadows, haunted by nymphs and scenes of sexual encounter (pp. 35-37). Euripides uses a similar maxim: in the same way that dry, stony ground may grow better produce, so may bastards be better than legitimate sons (Androm. 636-638). The land is being used as an explanation for, and metaphorical expression of, human qualities.

The garden - the most concentrated form of land use, long associated with privilege - and its products are ideal vehicles to convey ideas about luxury or excess. The associations with luxury were never far below the surface and the garden remained an important rhetorical tool. This was particularly so because there was reinforcement of these ideas during the fifth century (pp. 119-20).

The elite orchard endured and remained a high-status possession throughout antiquity. There are two similar reports of aristocratic statesmen (Peisistratos in the sixth century and Kimon in the fifth) opening their orchards for free public consumption. Although extant only in later texts, Athenaios (12.532f-533a) says they derive from the fourth-century historian Theopompos (Frags. 135 and 89, Plutarch, Kimon, 10.1) which makes it less probable that they were part of Roman rhetoric, although the similarity of the second report makes a copy of a first edifying tale possible. Their motive, according to Athenaios, was to demonstrate a preference for moderation over luxury and this may indeed be doubted; it is not part of the citations from Theopompos. A more probable motive is to demonstrate political credit with an act of generosity: anyone could take produce from the lands or gardens (χώροι, κήποι). Fruit is specifically mentioned in 12.533a (καρποί) although in context this probably includes other produce too. Not only did these wealthy individuals own large orchard-gardens, but in making available to the many what was normally the preserve
of the few, they demonstrated their relatively ‘democratic’ credentials. Fruit was still highly desirable.

Even the lowly vegetable could carry luxurious associations. Vegetables were part of the ὀψον element in diet - the tasty relishes for bread (Davidson 1998: 20-26) and several literary references attest a tension between ideologically desirable simple fare and the natural human wish to maximise taste and variety, which could be seen as luxurious. Both Plato and Xenophon’s Socrates express concern for an overindulgence in opsa at the expense of plainer fare (Republic, 2.372a-e; Memorabilia, 3.14.2-6). ‘Socrates’ employs subtle satire, which Aristophanes makes overt in a fragment from Seasons (Frag. 581, Appendix 1). The Athenian vegetable growers have overturned the seasons by sowing and rearing summer crops equally in winter, to satisfy public demand for ‘luxurious’ foodstuffs. In consequence, Athens has been turned into Egypt - another ‘soft’ and eastern land.

These references help explain Theophrastos’ ‘Man of Bad Taste’ - ἀηδία (a feeling of unpleasantness or disgust). This rhetorically constructed stereotype has a garden full of vegetables that are soft and tender (λάχανα ἀπαλά). Like μαλακός, the adjective was frequently used to describe the delicate, such as a woman (Sappho, Frag. 82a). The tenderness was due to his cistern of cool water - ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ ἐστὶ παρ’ αὐτῷ λακκαῖον (Char. 20.9). Because of the intense care of the garden and the precious water, its produce is abundant and fresh. The vegetables in Alkinoös’ garden were described as ἐπηετανὸν γανόωσαι (growing abundantly and freshly, Od. 7.128). These qualities of abundance and freshness, having plenty of what is scarce, could easily be seen as negative - like Athens into Egypt. For many, vegetables would have been wild variants or transported, tired market products.

The garden is used rhetorically to express selfishness in Isaios (5.11). Instead of protecting his wards’ interests, a guardian demolished their property to turn it into a garden alongside his own house in the city. A garden adjoining a residence was pure luxury in Athens; none have ever been found archaeologically; the only other example
attested in literature is the house and garden donated by Demon (section 5.4.2). A few probable examples are epigraphically recorded for Attica, almost all outside the city.

The association of the garden and its produce with luxury was undoubtedly increased by a growing awareness of luxurious Persian gardens, the παράδεισοι, which reinforced earlier waves of eastern garden influence. Scholarly investigations of the reality behind the official anti-Persian rhetoric have produced a more nuanced view of Graeco-Persian relations than is given by the constructed polarisation.

Miller uses iconographical evidence of Persian dress, pottery, etc. to argue for their adoption as aspirational status symbols, despite growing anti-Persian rhetoric, plus the adoption of Persian architectural elements (Miller 1997). Raafaub (2009) has demonstrated the adoption of Persian ‘instruments of empire’ by the Athenians with their growing imperial ambitions (see section 5.2.1). One potential means of demonstrating power and status was the paradeisoi that were seen and admired by travelling Greeks (Raafaub 2009: 112, Xenophon, Ana. 1.4.10, 2.4.14). Xenophon describes his own estate near Olympia, which has many of the features of a paradeisos (Ana. 5.3.7-13) and ‘Socrates’ describes Lysander’s personal tour of the paradeisos of Kyros at Sardis (Oik. 4.20-25). Despite Plutarch’s biographical focusing of his material, it seems probable that his story of Tissaphernes naming his most beautiful paradeisos ‘Alkibiades’ (Alk. 24.5) is not mere invention, as it is completely consistent with Alkibiades’ Persian exploits and undemocratic lifestyle - well-documented in Thucydides (particularly from 8.45).

A tension between admiration for gardens and suspicion of their luxury, and one that was variable with social status and political orientation, almost certainly existed in Classical Athens. The fact that no oriental-style garden can be cited for anywhere within the Greek areas outside the zones ruled by tyrants is probably due to this tension. It does not mean that appropriations and adaptations of the style did not exist.
The nearest equivalent appears to be Xenophon’s estate at Skillous in Elis (Ana. 5.3.7-13, Appendix 1), bought with Persian rewards after his exile from Athens because of his Persian service. This is, in fact, a composite plot, reflecting Xenophon’s varied experience, with elements of the *paradeisos* in its trees, varied landscape, animals for hunting, water and space for enjoyment and feasting. Equally, however, it is a food-productive estate in Greek tradition, supplying meat, fish, wine, bread and fruit for the estate’s household and neighbours. Perhaps more importantly, it was a sacred plot, dedicated to Ephesian Artemis to whom an annual tithe was paid. Artemis’ temple was the heart of the estate; the payment of her tithe and the requirement to maintain her temple were inscribed alongside.

Xenophon’s estate does demonstrate that it is necessary to look obliquely and at different terminology for the continuance of the Homeric elite orchard at a time when the more basic vegetable gardens occupy the literary sources (section 3.3.4). Xenophon’s estate was described by the neutral word χωρίον (Ana. 5.3.7). Around Artemis’ temple was an ἄλσος (5.3.12), which sounds like a sacred grove; this was undoubtedly one of its functions. The temple and grove, lay by the irrigating river, as at Ephesos (5.3.8). However, the trees in the grove were ἡμέρων δένδρων - cultivated trees producing seasonable fruits - τρωκτὰ ὡραῖα (5.3.12); the unusual word τρωκτά means here dessert fruits for eating raw. This grove was clearly as much an elite orchard as it was a sacred grove. The siting of the estate on the main road from Sparta to Olympia is significant (5.3.11); such a prestigious possession was meant to be seen and admired. Elsewhere, Xenophon writes of olives always being planted by the roadside (παρὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς μάλιστα ὀρύττεται, Oik. 19.13). They would give shade to passers-by, but in doing so, would emphasise the wealth and status of the estate’s owner. Demosthenes also records trees that were part of a long-established plantation being right on the roadside (55.14-15, 22).

Foxhall (2007: 222-225) has highlighted the significance of the large, ornamental elite orchard, such as that of Demosthenes 53.15-16 (Appendix 1), which had carefully regular plantings and provided an integrated productive and ornamental space. In this
plot, an enemy had destroyed the grafted stock of choice fruit trees (φυτὰ ἀκροδρύων γενναίων ἐμβεβλημένα) and the vines trained on trees (ἀναδενδράς). Training vines was obviously a long-standing practice, unsurprising in view of their climbing habit. Sappho records the word ἀμαμάξυδος (Frag. 173), meaning a vine growing up trees or poles. Theophrastos uses the word ἀναδενδράς to describe a climbing vine (CP 1.10.4, 3.10.8, 5.5.4). A black-figure lekythos (Figure 83, p.154) shows either a tree-growing vine or a double-stemmed specimen.

In the grand orchard described by Demosthenes were also nursery beds of young olives planted in rows around either the beds or the plot (φυτευτήρια ἐλαῶν περιστοίχων); even a rose bed was included (Dem. 53.15-16). This plot is a sophisticated development of the Odyssean orchard, where aesthetic considerations were significant as well as fruit-production and which was clearly a status possession. The fact that such a creation would depend on incessant care by trained gardeners is unmentioned. This plot’s resemblance to the carefully regular plantings, fruitfulness and pleasure-giving of the paradeisos is clear. Yet the word παράδεισος or κῆπος is avoided, being again replaced by the very anodyne word χωρίον, as in Xenophon’s estate. Todd describes this word as characteristic of a smaller, less valuable area than ἄγρος, in a context designed to emphasise that one litigant is less wealthy than another (Todd 2007: 515). Thus the owner of a χωρίον is attempting to make himself sound less privileged in terms of land ownership, whilst privately rejoicing in his possession; selective vocabulary indeed.

In Xenophon’s Oikonomikos, ‘Socrates’ explores the tension between the pride of such a landowner and a more ethically, rather than materially, focused life. ‘Socrates’ demonstrates that Iskhomakhos is, in fact, living according to Persian, rather than Athenian, values (Krohenberg 2009: 20-23, 39-66); real life models for his paradigm must have existed. Xenophon’s ‘Socrates’ clearly recognised the eastern elements in the landed estates of the elite and their management of their resources, which is

---

78 The context is Lysias 7 and Isaios 11.41-44.
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unsurprising in view of Xenophon’s Persian experience. In the real landed estates of Xenophon and Demosthenes 53.15-16 and in the literary estate of Oikonomikos, lie elements of Pliny’s pride in his carefully constructed Etruscan villa landscape (p. 2). Yet, in the forensic questioning of ‘Socrates’, it is still possible to see the surviving values of a Laërtes, focused on hard work and right behaviour, versus the self-interest of the Ithakan suitors, Iskhomakhos and Kritoboulos.

The impression gained from Demosthenes 53 is that χωρίον was used deliberately because of this tension between the suspicion of many and a personal admiration for the large and flourishing orchard-garden. In a city where democratic ideals were far from extinguished, any form of κῆπος still resonated with status and luxury - enduring because it was such an established and easy to comprehend symbol. Later sources, mostly citations from Athenaios, provide several examples, which are used in constructions of luxury (τρυφή). Whilst their strict application to earlier individuals or circumstances cannot be guaranteed, they are proof of the long duration of elite associations, which were particularly useful in constructing oppositions. Equally, it is inherently more probable that later authors carefully selected existing references to demonstrate a theme, rather than invented them; they certainly accord with the resonances of luxury cited throughout this work.

Diodoros Sikulus (14.80.2) described Tissaphernes’ gardens (which were places of luxury and enjoyment), distinguishing between the kepoi and paradeisoi, as if marking the difference between their productive and luxurious aspects. Athenaios links the garden to a luxury agenda several times. He records the late fourth-century philosopher Klearkhos (12.515e) commenting on Lydian luxury (τρυφή) in making paradeisoi to avoid the strong sun. The word covers a range of meanings: softness, delicacy, luxuriousness and wantonness – alien to officially sanctioned characteristics. The Klearkhos citation again differentiates between παράδεισοι and κῆποι, as if trying to contrast oriental and Greek practice. Tyrannical rulers in the Greek world seemed prone to adopting oriental practices to demonstrate their power. Hieron held audience in a magnificent garden called Μύθος, according to a citation from Silenos
of Kalakte (12.542a). The name surely indicates the legendary nature of the garden. A similar enjoyment of luxury amidst wooded groves by Kotys of Thrace is cited from Theopompos (12.531e-f). In his discussion of Hieron of Sicily, Athenaios (5.207d-e) describes the tyrant’s luxury ship-board garden with plants (ornamental and fruitful) that were υπερβάλλοντες - exceeding normal bounds, or excessive. Careful irrigation was also supplied. Aristoxenos, a hedonistic philosopher in Tarentum in the later fourth century, from overwhelming luxury (ἀνυπερβλήτου τρυφῆς), watered his garden lettuces with wine and honey (1.7c). There are almost certainly elements of exaggeration in these late citations (texts Appendix 1), but the constant factor is the use of the garden as an easily coopted symbol for extravagant behaviour that recalled eastern luxury – a quality inherent in the garden since the earliest records.

Because the continuing existence of the elite orchard garden was not made overt in literary sources, the evidence for such plots is difficult to find and it would be easy to conclude that few existed. Yet Foxhall has estimated that over a third of agriculturally usable land was owned or controlled by 9% of the population (Foxhall 1992; 157-158, 2002: 211; also Osborne 1992: 24). These people were the same wealthy elite who had always enjoyed the luxury and status of such gardens. The fact that Theophrastos refers to fruit trees within the context of field agriculture probably means that many orchard-plots attained considerable size.79 They must have been a familiar sight and perhaps it was these specific estates that provoked the sole reference to the word in Thucydides.

In 2.62.3 he records his version of Perikles’ speech, aimed at rallying the Athenians early in the Peloponnesian War, in the face of invasion, plague, devastation of their land and consequent anger (2.59-65). In trying to persuade them that the losses of their homes, land and crops were no great suffering, he suggested that they weigh these losses against the greater gain in power for their state. As their strength lay in the latter, they should continue to fight on and regard their land losses as nothing

79 Some of the estates, many rented by Athenians in and around Delos (p. 109) were very large. In the late third century, Thaleon on Mykonos contained 1140 vines, 143 figs, 147 cultivated olives, 87 grafted wild olives, 200 wild olives and 101 apples (ID 366b, 8-23; Kent 1948: 288).
more than a garden or an ornament (or decoration) of wealth - μᾶλλον ἢ οὐ κηπίον καὶ ἐγκαλλώπισμα πλούτου. Warner's translation (1972: 160, Appendix 1) of 'gardens and other elegances that go with wealth' expresses well the overtones of the phrase. The use of the diminutive κηπίον is pejorative and dismissive, intended to reduce further the perceived value of their lands. Whether the phrase was coined by Perikles or Thucydides, it is a testimony to enduring perceptions of the garden as a place of wealth and privilege in the mid fifth century.

3.4.1: Conclusion

Part 1 of this chapter examined the 'resonances' of the different words used to describe Homeric orchard-gardens and found that they carried associations of permanently tree-planted, inherited and investment land (ὀρχατος) and of good, well-ordered and responsible agriculture (ἀλωή). The word κῆπος itself, however, emphasises another aspect noted in chapter 2: the intensive care of labour and irrigation that this most privileged and fertile landscape space enjoyed. The garden was more about the care it received than the crops it grew. These qualities, linked as they were with human characteristics, actions and responsibilities, exercised in a defined and easily perceptible space, made the garden an ideal vehicle for symbolic transfer, as it is used in the narrative constructions of the Odyssey.

Part 2 of this chapter examined the potential eastern origins of these orchard-gardens as an elite status symbol to be added to those which have survived in more durable form. Their origins, ultimately appropriated from the east and transmitted via the Ionian area, would have increased associations with elite status. The apples of the Odyssean orchards seem to represent newly developed cultivars, dependent on the grafting technique, adding to the associations with luxury.

Part 3 of this chapter traced the survival of such elite orchard-gardens into democratic times, when this type of specialised plot and the name it carried is likely to have been ambivalent and uncomfortable, at least officially. It is this that probably explains the
fact that those elite orchard-gardens that can be traced in literature are not described as κῆποι. The authors (and most of the subjects) of the meagre literary sources were of the privileged class, who would themselves have possessed large estates, owning or leasing flourishing orchards themselves; land and its products was the basis of wealth. The estates of Xenophon and of Demosthenes 53.15-16 show that the elite associations of the orchard-garden in Homer were maintained, albeit obscured by terminological sleight of hand. The citation from Thucydides shows that this might be necessary. The orchard-garden certainly remained a ἐγκαλώπισμα πλούτου, but one perhaps best enjoyed in private.

Perikles (or Thucydides) reversed this terminological shift, describing the lands of more ordinary citizens as κῆποι, when they would, in fact, more typically have been called χωρία or κλῆροι. It was a clever rhetorical manoeuvre, which reduced these essential citizen lands to an aristocratic attribute unworthy of the citizens of so great a city, purely because of the swirl of associations surrounding the word κῆπος.

The fact that the earliest gardens of Greek literature were luxury orchards, which had a continuing afterlife, explains the presence of fruit trees and the high status contexts of the poetic sources examined in chapter 2. Chapter 4 will evaluate the second strand of associations linked with the κῆπος in chapter 2: the alluring presence of attractive women.
Chapter Four: Women and the Garden

‘To the Greek imagination, the landscape was infused with gender.’

(Cole 2004: 22)

4.1.1: Introduction: the problems of the sources

The focus of this chapter is the association of women with watered, planted and green spaces, which illustrates Cole’s ‘gendered landscape’. This topic is particularly difficult because of the notorious problems of female representation (see below). The major source is iconographic. Scenes on vases show women closely associated with trees: picking fruit, dancing between trees, fetching water in plant- and fruit-festooned fountain-houses - all clearly in outdoor settings. Other scenes show women involved with wreaths and other forms of decorative plant material.

Early myth-based poetic references (from Arkhilokhos in the early seventh century to the tragedians and comedians of the fifth century - chapter 2) make the same outdoor, women-gardens-fruit associations. However, in the newer philosophical and forensic genres of the Classical period, apparently describing real women’s lives, women are secluded, bound by the oikos, certainly not frolicking in orchards and fountain-houses. A preoccupation with status and behaviour appropriate for citizen women is evident (Lewis 2002: 7-8). Texts like Demosthenes, 57.30-36, 44-45, Aristotle, Politics 1300a and Xenophon, Oik. 7.35-36 are rhetorically motivated in showing that, if citizen women were visible and working outdoors, it was because of shameful necessity. It was certainly not acceptable for the city’s better classes, being something associated with barbarian customs (Scheidel 1996: 5-8).

There is, therefore, a dichotomy between the later literary invisibility of women and their visibility outdoors in the iconography of vase painting and in early myth-based poetry. Of course, both literature and iconography are largely produced by men, for men. The only ‘female’ viewpoints come from the early poetic fragments of Sappho
and Erinna. The problem lies in knowing how far Classical rhetoric reflected or formed reality. Archaeology has, so far, played only a limited role in resolving the contradictions. Evaluations of excavated Attic housing in the light of women’s movement, especially in Athens, Olynthos and Halieis (Nevett 2010: 16-21, 1999: 68-74, Morgan 2010: 117-142), show that living arrangements were more complex than the neatly gendered segregation of Lysias 1.9, with the women safely confined to the gynaikonitis. Therefore, the textual rhetoric cannot be taken as representing lived reality for the majority of Athenian citizen women.

As all source types have different purposes and emphases, it is impossible to try and form any coherent, overall picture from the component parts and, given the contradictions, probability and inference must play a role (Scheidel 1996: 8, Scheidel 1995: 202). Scheidel examines the issue of women working in agriculture, but his conclusions apply equally to any scenes where women are shown actively outside the home. Therefore, a fourth source - exemplars from the sociological and anthropological disciplines - is relevant. They cannot provide answers to the questions the sources pose; there are no certainties about any ancient and poorly documented society (Scheidel 1995: 203-204). However, such studies can help to guide the inferences that the source incompatibility requires and indicate angles of approach.

The iconographic evidence alone is complex and difficult to interpret (Lewis 2002: esp. Ch.1; Osborne 2011: 61-65). Even without contradictions from literature, the readings of female scenes would be problematic. There is considerable imbalance in what is portrayed. Although women are shown in the earliest painted scenes (earlier sixth century), their depiction increases greatly during the later fifth century, but the nature of the scenes changes, with domestic work coming into greater prominence towards the end of the period. Certain types of scene recur, whilst other aspects of women’s lives are ignored; the status important in literature is difficult to determine in iconography. It is often impossible to know whether mythical or real women are portrayed; there may sometimes be differences between scenes with a domestic

---

80 For example, on pyxis (Beazley on-line 209971) a realistic fountain scene is accompanied by the Hesperides’ apple tree and three named mythological figures.
provenance and those exported, or between vases intended for male or female usage. Above all, the relationship between realistic portrayal and artistic imagination is unknowable and variable.81

4.1.2: Reflections on the source problem

As noted in section 1.1.2, garden spaces were ambivalent, situated on the blurred boundaries between the built and the farmed landscape. Boundary zones are risky areas (Cole 2004: 8). This ambivalence matches Greek male attitudes to women, as a sort of suspicious sub-type, where boundaries between civilised, rational human and ‘the other’ were equally blurred. The misogyny of Hesiod (Th. 590-612) and of Semonides (Frag. 7, pp. 159-160) are extreme examples of a more generalised attitude.

It is probably this double ambiguity of women plus boundary areas interacting that accounts for the source discrepancy when it comes to women’s ‘visibility’ in planted spaces, which are mostly public areas. Authorial unease means that what we can learn from one source is negated by the other; neither side gives a full picture, but is slanted towards its own target audience and their susceptibilities.

Poetic tales of maidens encountered in flowery meadows (pp. 35-37) and iconographic depictions of women in such surroundings seem best explained as mythical assimilations of an everyday feature of daily life: the close working association between women and water. Because plants are equally found with water, there is then a close link between the women-water-plant triad. Therefore, whereas the first strand of association noted in chapters 2 and 3 (the elite resonances of ‘the garden’) derives from the literary exploitation of an imported status item, the second strand derives from the everyday fundamentals of women’s lives from time immemorial. Consequently, sources that show women out of doors are inherently more likely to be closer to reality than literary sources that are based on a perceived need to show

81 For an overview of the problems, see Lewis (2002: esp. chapter 1).
citizen wives and daughters closeted indoors, guarded from taint or suspicion. Although slaves took over some of the traditional female tasks during the fifth century, life for most citizen women would have changed little. Therefore, the position taken in this chapter will be that most women were not as secluded as the rhetoric claims and that watered, planted spaces were part of their daily experience.

It is likely that the women portrayed were ‘good’ citizens, going about their prescribed domestic and religious tasks; water was involved in almost all these, thus plants were naturally present. When women who are not ‘good’ are portrayed, as in the explicit symposion scenes, there are no such associations. Equally, women were major users of many of the vessels showing women and it seems less probable that lowly slaves would be portrayed. The plant-filled areas may not be formal gardens. In fact, few were designated as κῆποι as far as we know, but they are fulfilling one important garden function: providing a cool and shaded space for rest. Therefore, this chapter will consider gardens and naturally plant-filled spaces together.

Because Greek imagination perceived the landscape in gendered terms (Cole 2004: 21-29), places where plants and flowers grew, in a soft, moist environment, were particularly ‘female spaces’. It seems likely that the medical characterisation of female bodies as wet and cold, contrasted with the male hot and dry, was connected with their use of, and frequent proximity to, water (Hipp. Corpus, Reg. 1.27, 1.34; Aristotle, Prob. 4.25; Parker 2012). Equally, male plants (especially trees) were seen as dry, hard and unpliable compared with female counterparts (Foxhall 1998a: 63-68). Greater softness and pliability in natural materials normally means higher water content.

In order to extricate salient features and examine the scenes in their different contexts, the iconography will be examined through the different spaces displaying women with trees or plants, described as ‘Female Spaces’. The vase scenes have been grouped into categories which seem indicated by the nature of the scenes, although there is considerable interplay and such categories are obviously filtered by modern perceptions. In reality, these categories turn out to be far from discrete. The spaces
are: the courtyard, the cemetery, fountain-houses, the orchard, and sanctuaries in
general, with further sections on the cults of Artemis, Aphrodite and the Adonia
ritual.\footnote{The cult of Aphrodite ἐν Κήπωις is examined in chapter 5.}

4.2.1: The courtyard: decorative and ritual plant material

The earliest scenes showing women with plant material date from the first stages of
vase painting. In Figure 48 for example, three of the women in this domestic scene
carry unidentifiable ‘generic’ branches.

\begin{center}
Figure 48: Athenian bf neck amphora, 550-500
\end{center}

Given the cramped conditions of Greek houses, the courtyard necessarily provided a
work and leisure space for women as well as allowing general access. Many of
women’s tasks would have been conducted here, including those occupations
involving plant material; this was essential for religious garland-making, food storage,
preparation and cooking. Plants may also have helped to screen their activities. Small
flower pots appropriate for herbs, seeds, cuttings and small shrubs certainly existed
and the distribution suggests a connection with female working areas (section 5.6).
Cahill, evaluating artefactual scatters from Olynthos, found that the majority of
grindstones, most louters and many loom-weights were discovered in the courtyards
and semi-open adjoining areas such as postas (Cahill 2002: 151-179).
The courtyard would have housed any domestic altar - focal point of domestic ritual, which again was normally a female task. The tragedians attest food offerings at domestic altars – of foodstuff (δειπνα) or all kinds of fruits (πάγκαρπα; Aiskhylos, Eum. 108, Sophokles, Elek. 635). Theophrastos does have the Superstitious Man buying myrtle to garland his domestic herms (Charac. 16.10), but superstition was perceived as a feminine characteristic, so Theophrastos was probably indicating that this was not really man’s work.

Women were major players in funerary ritual and commemoration, so it is unsurprising that trees and plants appear in funerary iconography. They are referenced in literature; for example, Euripides’ Elektra cannot rest until her father’s tomb receives libations and myrtle sprigs; his Alkestis garlands her domestic altars with myrtle before her own death and Hermione garlands Klytaimnester’s tomb with wreaths. In the real world, such funerary wreaths would have been prepared in the courtyard. Most funerary vase scenes are considered in 4.2.3 below, but prothesis scenes such as the plaque (Figure 49) with draped tree, probably often took place in the domestic courtyard where the family’s women could tend the body. Other fragments, such as the loutrophoros (Figure 50) show wailing women at another prothesis, with multiple suspended wreaths.

**Figure 49: Athenian bf plaque, 575-525**

---

83 Elek. 324, 511-512; Alk. 170-172; Orest. 1321-1322.
Weddings also required ritual and decorative plant preparations. Sappho particularly emphasises the role of violets for the bride (Frags. 30, 103, Appendix 1). Not only were wreaths made, but large pottery containers were used as plant holders. This is well-illustrated in two vessels of the second half of the fifth century, firstly a pyxis (Figure 51), showing wedding preparations indoors. Two lebetes gamikoi are planted with young sprigs of plants, probably the myrtle used in wedding ritual.

The best illustration of large vessels used as plant containers is on an epinetron (Figure 52), showing an elaborate scene of wedding preparations. Again, two lebetes gamikoi
are planted with young sprigs, as is a loutrophoros, again resembling myrtle. Wreaths hang on the wall. It is possible that these vessels were not planted, but that the vases were used as water-filled containers for carefully arranged foliage and flowers.  

Most of these vases have the idealised atmosphere of a mixed real and mythical world with richly decorative women, characteristic of the later fifth century; this makes interpretation more difficult. However, as the vases depicted were used in wedding ritual, it is improbable that details of these planted vessels do not relate to the lived experience of Athens’ women, especially as large planted containers are found in other ritual contexts (section 4.2.15). One possible site for the placement of large vessels in Eretria is mentioned below (pp. 251-252). Wedding wreaths were also important. In an alabastron (Figure 53) a bride sits holding the wreath that depicts her status; it looks as if she is inspecting her finished work (also below, p. 201).

---

84 Oakley and Sinos (1993: 17) state that one lebes gamikos (Beazley on-line 20338) shows sprigs protruding from the mouth of a loutrophoros, perhaps used for ritual sprinking (on these vessels: Sabetai 2014a: 52-55).
A close association of women and flowers, particularly wreaths, is clear also in Sappho, whose voice is invaluable in representing ancient Greek women. The contexts highlight women’s allure, wreath-making, or ritual celebration (Frags. 94, 122, 125, 81, texts Appendix 1). Plants appear as an accoutrement of femininity, along with items such as mirrors and jewellery.

It seems safe to assume that vase painters increasingly associated women with plant material because their responsibilities included the making of decorative ritual wreaths and arrangements; this would have taken place in the domestic courtyard, since plant material and planting up large containers is messy. The same space would have accommodated women’s personal and domestic washing and endless food processing. Thus much of women’s working lives would have been spent in this domestic space, with plants and their care one of the pleasanter responsibilities. Whilst higher-status women would have supervised rather than worked, the working slaves would equally have been mostly female.
4.2.2: The courtyard and water

The courtyard, as attested by archaeological excavations, was also where a domestic well or cistern was often found. It is possible that the column on a scene of women bathing, in Figure 54 indicates a domestic courtyard.

![Figure 54: Athenian rf stamnos, 475-425](image)

This is an additional reason for seeing at least parts of this open area as ‘female space’, perhaps during ‘female time’; water-gathering was a prime female task in Greece, as in most traditional societies. The contradictions of female seclusion and the courtyard’s access function are examined by Nevett and Morgan (Nevett 1999: 68-74, Morgan 2010: Chapter 5; see section 5.6). Morgan (2010: 121) mentions the potential screening role of foliage and textiles. The suggested large plant container holes in the House of Mosaics in Eretria are interesting in this light (pp. 251-252). Recycled water from domestic supplies would supply any plants, normally pot-grown, several having been recovered from domestic contexts in Olynthos (section 5.6). As yet no definite evidence exists for courtyard-planted trees.

A scene on a cup (Figure 55) depicts the interesting combination of woman, well and fruiting tree; it appears to be a courtyard (although a sanctuary is possible). Whilst sufficient space for trees is less likely within the cramped city of Athens, in more rural areas this is inherently more probable. The woman draws water from her well/cistern,
the well-head formed from a pithos; the tree stands behind her, plus a wall indicating a building.\textsuperscript{85}

As ever, the degree of reality and idealisation in the scene is unrecoverable. Nevertheless, this vase raises the possibility that some of the series of women harvesting fruit vases discussed in section 4.2.7-8 could be set within a rural courtyard; the context might equally relate to women’s ritual life within sanctuaries, particularly of Artemis (Sections 4.2.11-12).

The courtyard was also an ambivalent, borderline area, because of access from the outside world with the risk of entry by non-family males. These characteristics, as well as the water and plant association are certainly found in other places where women are depicted.

4.2.3: The cemetery: trees and plant material

Apart from women’s role in preparing funerary wreaths and branches, their presence is well-attested in literature within the public cemetery area of the Kerameikos, sanctioned by law and custom. It is unsurprising, therefore, that women are also

\textsuperscript{85} A very similar cup of the same date and painter (Beazley on-line 204007) shows the same scene, but without the tree.
shown with trees, wreaths and other plant material in cemetery iconography. The
cemetery was, perhaps only at certain times and on certain occasions, also a ‘female
space’. An early example is a loutrophoros c. 500 (Figure 56), showing trees with
‘generic’ branches as the background to an interment scene.

Figure 56: Athenian bf loutrophoros, 525-475

Many of the white-ground lekythoi (second half of the fifth century) used in funerary
ritual depict a tree beside women standing or sitting at tombs,\textsuperscript{86} recalling the ritual
that Elektra was longing to fulfil (p. 131). Figure 57, for example, shows the tomb
beside the tree hung with fillets - the same practice displayed on the considerably
earlier black-figure plaque (Figure 49, p. 131). Again, the artist places women and
greenery in the same conceptual world, reflecting lived experience.

\textsuperscript{86} For example, Beazley on-line: 10662, 217787, 217668.
Wreaths are shown on many of the white-ground lekythoi; sometimes there is both wreath and tree.\(^87\) The women who carry baskets of wreaths\(^88\) represent the many whose ritual responsibilities included the manufacture of wreaths and funerary branches in the courtyard of their homes. In one lekythos (Figure 58) a woman sits beside a tree, contemplating the wreath she has made. Although Theophrastos refers to the plants used by commercial garland makers (*HP* 6.8.1-3), most would have been manufactured by women domestically.

\(^{87}\) For example, Beazley on-line: 212340, 2753, 216356, 9028544.

\(^{88}\) For example, Beazley on-line 9026663, 209299.
Some cemetery lekythoi indicate a connection with scenes of women harvesting fruit vases and ritual activity (p. 164); for example, the lekythos (Beazley on-line 217601) shows women carrying a tray of fruit to tombs. Others show women and youths proffering individual fruits, such as the woman on a lekythos (Beazley on-line 9026662). In the Berlin lekythos (Figure 59 below) the woman offers Kharon a tray of pomegranates.

The iconography of cemetery space, therefore, shows a clear association of women with trees, wreaths and plant material, again showing them to be female attributes. Additionally, in the same way that water was part of the ‘female space’ of the courtyard, there is a corresponding linking of water with women and plants in the Kerameikos.

4.2.4: The cemetery: watery ground

The fact that trees are shown on many funerary scenes is due not only to associations with women’s world, but to perceptions about the Underworld and to the natural terrain. The Kerameikos area had been used for burials since c. 1200 (Camp 2001: 263), becoming increasingly formalised. The area is marshy, alongside the little river Eridanos, which seems a surprising choice: there were other areas outside the walls that were drier, without the unpredictability of this shifting river, although these would have been harder to dig. The site may well have been chosen because it fitted well with Greek myths about the afterlife, the journey to which began with the River Styx, as illustrated on the lekythoi in Figures 59 and 60. In these scenes, Kharon stands in his boat to receive the dead; flourishing reeds grow on the riverbank. Before the formalisation and partial canalisation of the Eridanos, it probably seemed ideally suited to the myth. Certainly because of its location, trees and other plants grew naturally. Greenery, including reeds, follows its course today (Figure 61).
Apart from sharing the watery and plant-associated pattern of the courtyard, the Kerameikos was equally an area of multiple use. Whilst ‘good’ women clearly had legitimate business there because of their long-sanctioned funerary duties, the area was heavily used by men and by prostitutes (section 5.8.2). The area was, therefore, an ambivalent border zone: between genders, between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ women, between land and water, between risk and safety, city and suburbs. Many of these resonances are very much present in the fountain houses.
4.2.5: The fountain-house: examples from the vases

Like the Kerameikos, the fountain-houses were public places with which women were firmly linked in vase paintings. Most of the well-known burst of fountain scenes\(^89\) (in black-figure iconography, lasting approximately a century, c. 575-475) associate women, trees and plant material. With few exceptions,\(^90\) the overwhelming majority divide into two themes. The first, mostly on amphorae, later on lekythoi, is an ambush vignette from the Trojan War, where Troilos approaches Polyxena filling her hydria, unaware of Akhilles lurking. An almost identical scene on a Clazomenian sarcophagus (Izmir 3619, Cook 1981: 114, G7) of around the same date may indicate that the vignette derived from the east Greek world. The association of water with trees in these scenes is unsurprising given the moisture. More significantly, when fountains first appear in iconography, the subject demonstrates the potential threat of violence, reflecting the ambivalent nature of this zone (section 4.2.12). One of the earliest is the amphora (Figure 62) showing Akhilles lying in wait behind the fountain.

![Image removed for copyright reasons](image.png)

**Figure 62: Athenian bf neck amphora, 575-525**

This first theme is overtaken by the well-known ‘women at the fountain-house’ hydriai of c. 550-500; they continue until about 475, but on a wider variety of smaller vessels

---

\(^89\) Analysed in detail by Tölle-Kastenbein 1994, who makes no reference to plant material; the analysis focuses tightly on ‘realistic’ architectural development.

\(^90\) For example, Beazley on-line: 302864 (capture of Silenos); 300598, 301799, 11963 (deeds of Herakles).
with less unity of scene. The fountains illustrated are organised, urban structures, mostly with lion-head or other animal spouts. Their sudden appearance on Athenian vessels has been related to the Peisistratid building in the agora, although there is no proof (see section 5.7).\textsuperscript{91}

Plant material is very frequently shown alongside the women on these vases, most commonly in the form of long, small-leaved branches. These apparently ‘generic’ branches swirl across the background in several planes, with no distinguishable attachment; an example is Figure 63. In Figure 64, the branches are stylised almost beyond recognition.

![Figure 63: Athenian bf hydria, 550-500](image)

![Figure 64: Athenian bf hydria, 525-475](image)

The hydria in Figure 65, however, shows the branches attached to a tree, apparently growing behind the fountain-house. It was from the middle of this southern wall that the water entered (American School of Classical Studies at Athens 1976: 154-156), through joints that cannot have been entirely watertight (Figure 66). The wandering branches probably represent a stylisation of trees that may have arrived naturally, or been the result of deliberate planting and feeding on seepage and from the natural moisture of the site. \textit{Vitex agnus castus}, the chaste tree, known to be ritually significant (for example, Nixon 1995: 87, Kyrieleis 1993: 135), is a possibility; it grows avidly on watery sites. Excavations around the South-East Fountain-House found high

\textsuperscript{91} Tölle-Kastenbein 1994: 88 relates vases showing the South-East Fountain-House to a specific time phase 2, post 520.
ground water throughout the year, possibly traces of an earlier spring (American School of Classical Studies at Athens 1976: 154-156).

The leaf depiction and style of curving across the field is identical to that shown, for example, on the tree from which women pick fruit in Figure 82 (p. 154). Indeed, some fountain-house hydriai show fruiting branches and it is possible that the wandering and apparently ‘generic’ branches represent the branches of fruit trees. The hydria (Figure 67), showing women drawing water from a double-sided, lion-head fountain, has one or two trees with dark-painted fruits in the background. An olpe (Figure 68) shows a single woman at a human-head fountain, apparently touching the white-painted fruit of a tree with the generic leaf. White-painted fruits also appear on pelike fragments showing a fountain-house scene (Beazley on-line 9006707 and 9006708, 525-475). Such scenes reinforce the persistent association of women with fruit (sections 4.2.7-8).
There is a further dimension: a lekythos (Figure 69) shows two women dancing, one on each side of a double-headed lion-head fountain. A tree, with long-drooping branches, clearly resembles the wandering ‘generic’ branches; with dark-painted fruit, it is again located behind the fountain. The ivy around the column may be only a traditional decorative pattern or it may represent a real, climbing plant. These women have no hydriai; the fountain is shown as a place of a celebratory or ritual dance.

Other fountain-house vases clearly support an association of the fountain-house with celebration, as attested by decorative foliage and flowers. One hydria (Figure 70) shows a woman carrying a bunch of foliage; another bunch is lodged in the column, perhaps whilst the woman fills her hydria; the child bathing adds to the playful air.
In the hydria (Figure 71), six out of the seven water-carrying women also carry flowers or foliage. The foliage leaves are rather more carefully painted, with indications of a pointed leaf end, resembling myrtle.

The wandering ‘generic’ branches appear behind the women to the right of the fountain on the lekythos (Figure 72); however, the women to the left are holding, or waving, what looks like a stylisation of decorative branches in swirling coils.

Images removed for copyright reasons
The same waving branches are held by four women on the hydria (Figure 73); one woman carries a flower. In this case, the branches bear white-painted fruit and two deer accompany the women.

Figure 73: Athenian bf hydria, 525-475

Deer also appear on the hydria in Figure 74 where again two women are holding flowers against a background of ‘generic’ wandering branches.

Figure 74: Athenian bf hydria, 550-500

Image removed for copyright reasons
One hydria (Figure 75) goes further, giving the impression that the fountain-house itself is being decorated. Three fountain-heads have sprouted bunches of decorative foliage; two small figures perch on two of these. Two of the four women hold up wreaths, one raising hers to the water-flow. To the right, another woman approaches another water-flow, as if to follow suit, awaiting her turn at the spout, where another woman stretches out her hand to the water as if in invocation. None of these women carry hydriai, which stand ignored, beneath the fountains.

![Figure 75: Athenian bf hydria, 550-500](image)

These latter scenes of celebration and decoration point towards the role of women in religious ritual, particularly associated with weddings (sections 4.2.11-12), although it is difficult to establish whether these are depicting de facto preparatory rites within fountain houses or a purely conceptual linking of an important part of women’s lives with a building that they frequented, uniting two aspects of women’s world.

4.2.6: The fountain-house: analysis

This group of vases creates a body of evidence for the importance of fountains and fountain-houses (particularly the South-East facility) in women’s lives and equally for
the existence of trees and plants within these public spaces. The South-East Fountain-House, the later South-Western one (c. 350-325) and, long before that, the spring-house Klepsydra and the other city springs were small green enclosures, for any water splash or seeping encourages plant growth. There can be little doubt that they would have been considered ‘female spaces’. The sweeping branches of so many of these scenes probably represented both real plants growing in the damp soil (perhaps *Vitex agnus-castus*, pp. 142, 267, 278) and conceptual attributes of the ‘good’ water-gathering women.

The earlier scenes, all on black-figure hydriai, show greater unity than the later ones (on a wider variety of vessels, with greater individuality). It is these earlier, more unified hydriai that occasion debate, not least because it is easier to draw conclusions from scenes that are very similar. The reading of the iconography is complex, particularly around the status of these women. Their appearance and, where included, names appended give no indication of servile status.92 Yet, as with the Kerameikos, the presence of Athenian women in the fountain-house counters official rhetoric on their restriction. Both the South-East and South-West facilities lay on the southern edge of the very public *agora*, whilst the Klepsydra and several other springs surrounded the very public Akropolis (section 5.7). The fountain-house vases have been connected with Peisistratid propaganda, myth and different forms of religious ritual, yet each theory raises as many questions as it answers.

Ferrari (2003: 43-51) underlines the ‘narrative capacity’ of such images, which can resolve interpretative contradictions. In the case of the fountain-house vases, their mythical point of origin lies in the Pelasgian rape of Athenian citizen women gathering water (Herodotos, 6.137.1-4),93 at the earlier, natural Kallirhoë spring (Thucydides, 2.15.3-6). Vase painters then explored this theme imaginatively, introducing elements from the new reality of the fountain-house and the fifth-century rhetorical agenda. The reminder of the myth would reinforce the desirability of keeping women secluded.

---

92 For examples, see Ferrari 2003: 45.
93 A conclusion explored earlier by Hannestad (1984).
In Ferrari’s interpretation, the scenes represent a complex imaginative amalgam, with the myth harnessed to the contemporary politico-moral agenda. This does solve the inherent contradiction of the popularity of these vases so long after a mythical event which, to modern eyes, appears anachronistic. It seems highly probable that such an artistic conceptual combination of myth, reality and idealism lies behind these scenes (and the later depictions of fountain-houses on a wider variety of vessels and interpretative potential). It creates an idealised, public view of the city’s wives and daughters for domestic and foreign consumption. The scenes reflect concern to show ‘good’ women, with the attributes of ideal womanhood, including the age-old female task of water-carrying, together with the plant material that is both natural and also a female attribute. This encompasses a reading of some vases linking them to specific religious rituals - another desirable female activity.

This ritual element cannot be tied down to one single celebration covering all the scenes; water was part of any ritual preparation. However, the most persuasive candidate for the imaginative origin of these scenes is water-drawing for bridal baths, particularly argued by Manfrini-Arango (1992) and Sabetai (2014b). Certainly, the more festive scenes fit this scenario. An established visual tradition, and a lived female experience, of the drawing of bridal baths from fountain-houses would explain the later dedication of an agora fountain by the citizens of Teos to the Hellenistic queen Laodike (Ramsay 2011). Laodike was an early female city patron, strongly associated with women as wives and mothers, especially with the preparatory bridal stages. This reciprocal gift to the city’s patron would be particularly appropriate if the traditional link between women, bridal baths and fountain-houses were already longstanding in Greek culture.

An emphasis on female roles is indicated by the double aspect of Athenian hydriai. The vase scenes normally show the side view that passers-by will see. However, the viewpoint of the women themselves, standing above the vases as they filled, would be different: they would see the vessels’ shoulders, which frequently display scenes of male activity - fighting, chariot racing and heroic deeds. The women would, therefore, often look down on activities appropriate to their male counterparts, whilst passers-by
would see the message that these women were not wandering in public, but fulfilling appropriate gender roles (section 5.8.1-3). This would apply to brides and women at other life stages.

However festively this bridal stage was portrayed, it had its darker side. Not only were girls leaving their natal family, but they were also at their most vulnerable to male assault, being perceived as most desirable in this transition from maiden (παρθένος) to bride (νύμφη) (also section 4.2.12). There are numerous mythical stories of *parthenoi* at wells and fountains being seduced or worse. The threat of violence is clear in bell-krater (Figure 76), where a woman draws water, with rampant satyrs hedging her in.

![Image removed for copyright reasons]

*Figure 76: Athenian rf bell krater, 450-400*

Although this scene obviously has mythical allusions, the perception and reality of threat operated equally in a more realistic world, as indicated by the hydria in Figure 77. Here a woman at far right fills her hydria at a public fountain; to her left another woman turns to warn her of the threat occurring further left, where the two men accosting two women are being firmly pushed back (Keuls 1993: 238).
One amphora (Figure 78) seems to show a woman hemmed in by three men; one on the left raises a hand to her head, whilst two men on the right look as if they are competing to move towards her. The woman’s feet show her running from two men, only to encounter a third; the reverse shows a further male intervention.

Two hydriai (Figures 79 and 80) show potentially threatening situations. Keuls (1993: 236, 238) identifies likely slaves on one (because of their rudimentary clothing) in close proximity to a woman, whilst the other shows a similar figure apparently reaching to touch a woman’s breast.
Manfrini-Aragno (1992: 136) refers to the fountain-house as ‘un espace ambigu’, because the desirable girl is in a public space accessible also by men. It is, therefore, almost certain that the Pelasgian rape was indeed one mythical reference point of the fountain-house scenes. An equally important visual mythical link, however, was surely the Polyxena and Akhilles encounter of the earlier fountain-house ‘genre’ scene with its threat of violence (p. 141; Sabetai 2014b: 105-111). Some examples of this scene include a fig tree. This may be because figs spring up readily in moist ground. It may also, however, allude to sexual activity, as the σῦκον can also be slang for female genitals (Aristophanes, Peace, 1344-1350). The fountain-house remains a known meeting point between the sexes in traditional societies even today (Buxton 1994: 112, Cohen 1989: 11-12).

It seems logical, therefore, to accept the fountain-house scenes as primarily expressing contemporary conceptual associations of ‘good women’, imaginative reconstructions including elements from myth, daily life and general perceptions. A major element of the concept is the risk of water-gathering, especially to the parthenos/nymphe (section 4.2.12). Again, a space with water and burgeoning plants is an ambiguous, borderline zone. Again, plants are shown to be an attribute of ‘good’ women going about their proper tasks.
4.2.7: The orchard: women harvesting fruit, examples from the vases

The series of vases showing women harvesting fruit should be considered in the same light as the fountain-house vases. The iconography shows the orchard to be a ‘female space’ and, although more are on smaller, later vases associated with female use, the harvesting women on the hydriai recall the dignity of the water-gatherers. Firstly, some prime examples on both large and smaller vessels are described.94

One hydria (Figure 81) shows seven women harvesting a single tree, one with robes spread ready. The woman climbing the tree may be shaking down fruit, or picking the higher specimens. Another woman carries a grape-collecting basket on her head; however, the fruit (growing in unnatural pairs) is unidentifiable, being small for apples, but the wrong shape for grapes. Olives are possible, but the basket and the presence of Dionysos on the shoulder of the vase suggest grapes. Most plausibly, a generic ‘women harvesting fruit’ conception is at work here, or a sanctuary context (pp. 164, 168-169).

94 Further examples may be found in Lewis 2002: 229, f/n 75.
The lekythos (Figure 82) shows two women seated on blocks, harvesting large fruit into a tall basket normally used for grape-harvesting. It is possible that a vine is growing up the fruiting tree.

A further lekythos (Figure 83) seems to show a vine grown either with a double, entwined stem in a splayed shape (as if to cover and shade a trellis or pastas), or a single species growing up a tree; in either case, productivity combines with ornamental considerations. The triangular shape of the fruit clusters indicates grapes and the basket is again suitable for grape-harvesting. Three women are involved in the harvesting and again one is climbing the tree.
A hydria (Figure 84) shows a seated woman by a tree, packing fruit (which seems to be apples) into a tall basket. Her seat is decorated, possibly indicating an altar. Two other women help by collecting, but the seated woman seems to be in charge. As with some other examples, the tree is leafless. Fracchia (1972: 103, 105) comments that the absence of leaves is due to poor preservation of the white paint, which might have been added after firing. This raises the possibility that other ‘generic’ branches, particularly fountain-house examples, may also have originally included white-painted fruit. She identifies the basket as probably a phormos, a general agricultural purpose type.

A krater (Figure 85) shows a very similar tree. Again the leaves are missing from the fruit - pears, quinces or apples. The tree appears to be planted in a pot. However, the resemblance of the ‘pot’ to the full basket being carried away by another woman bending under her load means that Fracchia’s interpretation is correct (Fracchia 1972: 108): the tree is standing behind a second basket into which the women are depositing fruit. Lewis (2002: 29) cites the burdened woman as a rare example where lower status is indicated (by her darker dress). This seems probable, as it is much plainer than the other women’s robes; unlike them, her head is covered by a cap and her bent posture is unlike the dignified bearing of the others. Three other women gather fruit and a further woman holds a staff - probably to dislodge high fruit for the others to catch.
A hydria (Figure 86) has two women picking fruit into a small hand-held basket. Here the tree has small, generic leaves, but the fruits, looking like apples, are clearly ἄκροδύα (see Appendix 3) and the tree is top-grafted (section 2.1.4). The cup in Figure 87 has a complex scene with numerous women engaged in domestic activities: talking, admiring a flower, looking in a mirror, carrying objects. Two are picking an unidentifiable fruit into a similar hand-held basket or robe. Four of the other women also hold such baskets, implying that they were involved in the harvest. The tree’s leaves are faint but visible, which confirms a lack of durability in the colour used for leaves proposed by Fracchia above.
4.2.8: The orchard: women harvesting fruit, analysis

Whilst there are differences between the fountain-house and the harvesting women scenes, there are also significant correspondences. The most interesting feature of the harvesting scenes is that they came into prominence just as the fountain-house scenes faded from fashion. The latter scenes on the hydriai belonged to black-figure, from the later sixth century into the earliest years of the fifth, whereas the harvesting scenes on the large vessels mostly belong to the earlier fifth century and cross the black-figure/red-figure change. In both cases, the scenes on later, smaller vessels are less homogenised than the earlier scenes and therefore, fewer conclusions can be attempted.

As the large-vessel harvesting scenes follow the fountain-house ones chronologically, they may primarily demonstrate a conceptual shift to a different way of portraying women, to be read in the same way. This appears to be partially the case: the hydria of Figure 81 for example, one of the earliest in the orchard series, was also the work of the AD Painter, who created several of the fountain-house hydriai.

As with the fountain-house vases, the main problem is the degree to which the orchard vases depict outdoor harvesting scenes that were commonplace despite the rhetoric, or merely the artist’s conceptual associations. Again, Ferrari’s amalgam (pp. 148-149) appears to be the most productive approach. There is no apparent mythical allusion in these scenes and the general source deficiency on rural, especially female, activity does little to enlighten. The literary references have women working outdoors only out of necessity (p. 126). The latter includes τρυγήττωι or grape gatherers (Dem. 57.45), who also appear in Homer from the *ekphrasis* of the Shield of Akhilles (*Il.* 18.567-568). Specifically female agricultural workers appear in fragments of Aristophanes: women–winnowers (πτισσουσῶν) and a woman reaper (γυναίκα θερίστριας). A fragment of Arkhippos refers to female weeders or grass cutters (γυναιξὶ προσέτε ταῖς ποαστρίαις) and Plutarch cites a gleaner or straw gatherer...
(καλαμήτρια). Although Plutarch is very late, female gleaners have been recorded since the days of Biblical Ruth.

Equally, female vendors of garden produce almost certainly sold the produce they had grown in privately owned or rented plots around the city. Vegetables were sold by ἡ λαχανόπωλις, figs by ἡ ἵσχαδόσωλις; a widow sustained her family by selling plaited myrtle garlands - στεφανηπλοκούσα ἐν ταῖς μυρρίναις; vendors of grain, eggs, pulses and vegetables are included in the wonderful coinage of the women σπερμαγοραιολεκιθολαχανοπώλιδες. Such references from comedy are not always to be taken at face value but, as female vendors are confirmed in fourth-century epigraphic fragments, they seem secure. Onesime sold sesame seeds and Atta pulses (Lewis 1959: 214, 223: a, Col. II, 221; b, Col.I, 112-113); Midas and Soteris were female vendors of sesame seeds (IG II² 1561, 22-23, 26-27) and Mania was a female grocer living near a spring, which no doubt watered her garden (IG III³ 87, 8). All these women were manumitted and their occupations involved the low-value transactions to which women were legally restricted (Saller 2007: 102). Lowly status is confirmed by the gibes at Demosthenes’ and Euripides’ mothers for their market-place trading.

Therefore, these women, like the gardeners often referenced in comedy, have little in common with the well-dressed, dignified and relaxed harvesting women depicted on vases. The ‘servile’ woman of Figure 85 is unusual in showing the use of muscle power; this is also the case with the fountain-house vases. This probably indicates an idealisation of the work, due either to a highly-conceptualised vision or to a reluctance to show women physically working, despite reality. Whilst vase painters made remarkably little distinctions in female status, the disjunction between the two is sufficient to rule out a depiction of poverty-stricken women forced to harvest. In any event, scenes of female labour are avoided by vase painters (Lewis 2002: 37-38, 83,

95 Respectively Frag. 352, Frag. 829, Frag. 46, Mor. 784a.
96 Harris 2002 discusses the question of women’s outside work.
98 Demosthenes, 57.33-34, Aristophanes, Achar. 478, Thesmo. 446-458.
Equally, as Chapter 3 has shown, the orchard carries associations of elite status, not poverty.

It is necessary, therefore, to look more obliquely at the ways in which the associations between women and agricultural activity, including harvesting fruit, might be operating. Here sociological and anthropological contributions may help to inform a more nuanced approach than the older, simplistic view that women played virtually no part in agriculture (Fitton Brown 1984). In fact, for most smallholder households, female labour would have been essential, especially at critical seasons (Scheidel 1995: 210-213). Cross-cultural studies demonstrate universal factors in the gendered division of agricultural labour, irrespective of culture, geographical area or time. Female tasks are characterised by being compatible with child and animal care; they are monotonous, interruptible, not dangerous nor requiring much travel. The gathering and processing of foodstuffs are important, as are water-related domestic activities (Burton, White 1984: 569-573, Murdock, Provost 1973: 206-211). Scheidel adds an associative tendency between women’s labour and subordinative postures like bending (Scheidel 1995: 212; p. 155; these are characteristic of gardening tasks. A specifically gendered division of labour between male and agriculture/female and gardening is indicated, with the intensive care and higher yields of the garden possible because of women’s repeated brief visits to plant, weed, water and harvest (Betancourt 2007: 23, Krasilnikoff 2000: 178-179, Leach 1997: 135-136). Like vegetables, individual fruits ripen in sequence, demanding daily attention to catch crops at their best; therefore, harvesting fruit would fit ideally within the parameters of typically female tasks, provided that the orchards were not too far distant from home.

Therefore, it seems likely that lived experience is one element of these scenes and that harvesting ripened fruit was part of the daily round for women fortunate enough to have fruit trees on their households’ land. Because of fruit’s value, its harvesting was probably a higher status task than the growing and picking of vegetables. It is a task that lies within the role of women as guardian of the household stores, emphasised across the centuries. Only the industrious bee gains the approval of the misogynistic
Semonides, because the substance of the household thrives (Frag. 7, 83-93, Appendix 1). Xenophon’s Iskhamakhos instructs his wife dutifully to guard, store and distribute (Oik. 7.35-36) and Aristotle defines the female function as protecting the domestic products (Pol. 1277b). Harvesting is not specifically mentioned, perhaps because it would counter rhetoric on female invisibility. Harvest is, however, part of storage and the reapers, grape harvesters and gleaners cited above are all part of harvesting and processing.

A full orchard, rather than the odd fruit tree, is an elite possession and here the actual labour would fall to female slaves, perhaps also the chaperoned daughters of the household. This may account for the appearance of an apparently senior, seated woman in Figure 84, who appears to be in charge; she carefully packs the basket, attended by two younger women. The seated woman would be supervising both girls and safe storage. A series of six lekythoi (525-475, five attributed to the Kalinderu Group) showing women seated on folding stools and picking fruit supports the picture of fruit-picking as a responsibility of privileged women (Beazley on-line: 6327, 305453, 305454, 305485, 306762, 361367).

One possible way in which this outdoor activity could be further reconciled with the rhetoric of women’s restriction to the household may be found via their life in the domestic courtyard. A potential courtyard context was considered above in the Brygos Painter’s woman, well and fruiting tree composition (pp. 135-136, Figure 55). The inference of a courtyard context can also be made for the seated woman in Figure 84; if she is seated on an altar, this could be a domestic one used for household ritual in the courtyard; equally, it could indicate a sanctuary context (pp. 153, 164, 168-169). Both these examples suggest that, although the association could be largely artistic and imaginative, outside the central city fruiting trees could have been planted within, or close to, domestic courtyards.

The most definite evidence of a courtyard setting comes from the cup (Figure 87) - one of the latest, most individualised in the harvesting series. An alabastron hangs on the wall, a plenochoe on a sill or shelf. On the other side of the cup, a woman sits before a
low table; other women are domestically occupied with female-appropriate objects. A basket of fruit is carried to a woman, who looks like the mistress of the house, in the tondo, whilst younger women do the picking. Fruit harvesting is depicted here as a further, and important, female task.

Apart from this scene’s connections with the hydria (Figure 84), it also links with the krater (Figure 85) where two older women stand close to the tree, picking the fruit, attended by two younger women, whilst a slave carries away the loaded basket. In these vases, the impression is of the wife in charge of the fruit harvest, whilst younger women are being trained into their role. In the later cup (Figure 87) the wife sits at leisure, whilst younger women do the work, which fits with the greater emphasis on women’s leisure towards the end of the fifth century (Lewis 2002: 88, 134). This cup has resonances, firstly, of the role of the good wife as guardian of the household stores, picking, or overseeing the picking, of fruit as it ripens and ensuring its careful storage. But, like many of the later vases, it is a rather idealised scene, with resonances also of the same paradise-like leisurely existence referred to in Chapter 2 (especially section 2.2.4).

Although the courtyard is a potential venue for the occasional fruiting trees, other scenes are entirely context-free and may be sited (ideologically or in reality) in the domestic orchard, outside the home and courtyard. In discussing such orchard vase scenes, Foxhall (2007: 232) wonders whether the ‘tamed’ orchard might have been considered as an extension of the female’s tamed domestic environment. This seems highly probable. Garnsey (1999: 109) comments that food ‘acts as a feminine signifier’, being a resource over which women had some level of control.

As was discussed in section 1.1.3, the χώρα of most city-states was visualised as a series of concentric conceptual circles, from the πόλις at its heart, the landscape becoming increasingly wild, to the ἐσχατικά at the margins. The city of Athens conforms to the model, its gardens closely packed around the outskirts of the city;

---

100 For inferences about the age of the women, see section 4.2.12.
those gardens included orchards. One large olive orchard was even within the walls (section 5.4.2). There seems no reason why this disposition should not have been echoed in miniature within the individual oikos and every reason why it should. A passage of Demosthenes 47.52-53 (Appendix 1) may demonstrate this. We do not know the plants grown in this farm’s garden, situated near the Hippodrome, but it is likely to have included some fruit trees. Sheep were pastured on the margins of the farm, then the farm proper, and finally the garden and house together at the heart of the property, within, or by the side of, the courtyard (47.53-57). Osborne (1987: 53) comments that cultivation decreases in intensity with distance from the house. This is not always the case, as a more distant fertile patch would certainly be exploited. However, fruit trees, requiring constant attention, would find their natural place close to home wherever possible. Demosthenes’ agenda here may mean that the spatial relationships were simplified, but the conceptual relationships are clear.

Further, households that owned fruit trees would have guarded such valuable food resources close to the home. One of the cross-cultural characteristics of traditional female tasks is that they should be local (p. 159). Young trees would need water, especially during their first summers when roots were being established, water that would normally have come from recycled household supply; proximity would have made this feasible. As with the other ‘female spaces’, water would have been associated with the orchard - either because it was supplied by irrigation or because it was located in an area of moister ground. All these considerations would equally have applied whether an orchard was elite, ornamental and large, or small-scale and domestic.

Therefore, it seems likely that harvesting fruit, in preparation for careful storage or processing, was a task that fell to women, slave and free; that conceptually and physically, they were close to the oikos and perceived as part of its inner zone. At the same time, the fountain-house conceptual ambivalence would equally apply: if

---

101 The traditional site of the Hippocrome is New Phaleron. Challenging this, Benton (1972) locates it at Kolonos Hippios. Either were areas of moist ground.
harvesting fruit were part of women’s responsibilities, contrarily it would remove them further from domestic safety.

It seems reasonable, generally, to read these orchard scenes in much the same way as the fountain-house images: as conceptual associations of the role of ‘good women’. It is appropriate for women both to gather water and to harvest and store fruit. The fountain-house scenes appear particularly geared to the parthenos to nymphe transition. The orchard-pickers may also relate to this transition, with older women inducting their daughters/in law into their wifely tasks. Fruit-gathering seems to represent an iconographic shorthand parallel to the women working wool scenes, which show women being educated in, and practising, their gender-appropriate tasks. Plants and fruit seem equally to be gendered attributes.\(^\text{102}\) Again, it is noticeable that the harvesting women give every appearance of being ‘decent’ women. As with the fountain-house scenes, there is no association with the women portrayed in explicit vase scenes; none of these show plants, and fruit is displayed only as an object of male consumption.

However, in addition to these harvesting and storage associations, there seem to be further resonances in these scenes, as in some of the fountain-house sequence. In purely practical terms, the number of women shown in, for example, Figure 81, p. 153) would be more of a hindrance than a help. It does not take more than two to harvest a tree effectively. Other factors, particularly ritual are certainly involved.

4.2.9: Sanctuaries and celebration: Dionysos

Some of the scenes showing women with fruiting trees (on the smaller and later vases referred to above) seem related more to the ritual than to the agricultural world, because they appear more animated or show other activities. Many of these vessels are associated with female use. Therefore, some sanctuaries, to some deities, on some occasions, should also be considered ‘female spaces’, which is unsurprising in view of

\(^{102}\) There is a male olive harvesting scene in Beazley on-line 320060. Cultivated fruit is, however, distinguished from the Mediterranean triad; see 3.3.2 and Appendix 3.
the essential role that women played in Greek ritual life. Such scenes seem related either to festivals, or to notions of a paradisiacal existence.

One of the examples of women harvesting given in Section 4.2.7 (lekythos, Figure 83, p. 154) has a scene more lively and mobile than most of the earlier harvesting group and there are other women and fruit scenes sharing this characteristic. In these livelier images, the women are often not even picking fruit; sometimes music or dancing is shown. The context of such scenes seems most likely to be celebratory festivals in sanctuaries, which would account for their lively impression. It is possible to imagine the lekythos of Figure 83 as a harvest of fruit preparatory to feasting or for sacrificial offerings – as at tombs in section 4.2.3. As it shows a grape harvest, the automatic connection is to Dionysos; this would be appropriate for the Underworld (section 2.2.4). Firstly, some further examples of celebratory scenes are given. Almost invariably, they are on black-figure lekythoi, dating from 525-475.

The lekythos in Figure 88 is interpreted as an agricultural scene, but the women, raised on their toes, seem to be dancing among the trees (the fruits look like apples) rather than harvesting. They could be on tip-toes to reach top-fruit, but their hands do not seem to be stretching towards high branches and their gaze is towards each other.\footnote{Compare the Sotades Cup which does show such an action; Figure 13, p. 34.}
At the same date, an oinochoe (Figure 89) has a similar scene of women dancing around a large-fruitied (probably apple) tree, with every appearance of free abandon.  

These women may be interpreted as maenads dancing at a Dionysiac festival. It is impossible to know the extent to which they represent real women, or mythological prototypes. As Keuls has pointed out, there is considerable vase painting evidence of maenads, but almost no other descriptions (Keuls 1993: 357-378). Although these dancing figures have no specific attributes, they link closely with scenes on other lekythoi with identifiable maenads, such as those in Figures 90 and 91. Here maenads dance, around a fruiting tree or a laden vine.

---

104 Scenes of males dancing do occur (for example, Beazley on-line 7702); interestingly no fruit is shown - an attribute that seems female-associated.
Sexual overtones are present in some of these scenes. In one lekythos (Figure 92) two couples dance closely, or embrace, among similar fruiting trees; the males are bearded, so fully adult. The context seems to be either dancing as part of a (probably Dionysiac) festival, or a scene of erotic encounter in an orchard (sections 4.2.13-14). Equally, on a pelike (Figure 93) there is a similar scene, with a couple embracing under arching branches; on the other side a satyr carries off a maenad, indicating a Dionysiac context.

Music is sometimes specifically shown. A lekythos (Figure 94) shows a semi-clothed woman (playing an aulos) and a man sitting on the ground, backs to the tree between them. The tree has long tendrils, like a vine growing across a portico and heavy triangular bunches are shown, but also large, white, circular fruits. Presumably, it represents a vine growing around a fruiting tree and spreading out. Again, the context of this scene is most probably ritual feasting for Dionysos, the meal having taken place and the woman providing the musical (and possibly erotic) entertainment.
These women and fruiting trees vases complement those examined by Pingiatoglou (1994), whose conclusions make it more probable that some of the women and fruiting tree lekythoi above do indeed relate to sanctuary celebrations. She has examined a small series of slightly earlier black-figure vases, showing women at table, mostly surrounded by vines and other greenery, concluding that they show scenes of women’s ritual feasting.

Although a Dionysiac context has been suggested (Pingiatoglou 1994: 40-44), she herself identifies the Thesmophoria as the festival context of her ritually feasting women. This is not necessarily the case for all her examples. Her arguments are based on the absence of maenads or other Dionysiac attributes, plus the fact that meat (shown on the women’s tables) was consumed at the Thesmophoria (Pingiatoglou 1994: 43-49). However, her Athens lekythos (Figure 95) has two dogs in the scene, which are often found in Dionysiac festivities (Lyons 2008: 76).

Further, meat-eating and women’s participation in feasting was not restricted to one festival. More telling is the presence of vines and grapes on four of Pingiatoglou’s cited vases. The lekythos in Figure 95 has a burgeoning background vine with fruiting trees on either side, whilst the lekythos in Figure 96 also shows a fruiting vine. Two others
have flourishing vines and a further one has ‘generic’ branches. All these connect with the potential sanctuary lekythoi of Figures 88-94. Furthermore, on her krater (Figure 97) a maenad dances between satyrs and vines. Figures 95, 96 and 97 are all the work of the Leagros group of painters, who also painted Figure 108 (p. 175) with Dionysos and satyrs on the reverse of a scene with Apollo, Artemis and branches. Therefore a Dionysiac context is possible for Pingiatoglou’s series.

When vase painters depicted women, they often displayed them occupied in their ritual roles, though the type of activity depicted varied (Lewis 2002: 22-26, 43-54). It seems probable, therefore, that the lekythoi cited above, and Pingiatoglou’s series, are examples of different forms of sanctuary activity by women.

There are other vase scenes that suggest that the harvesting may be taking place in sanctuaries. On a kalyx krater (Figure 98) one woman climbs a tree, whilst the other stands to the side holding a crook-like implement, presumably to lower branches. To the right is an altar, which locates them in a sanctuary, or possibly a courtyard.

---

105 Beazley on-line: lekythos 302368, hydria 302070, krater 302316, amphora 302957.
106 Also Figures 65, 73 and 74, all showing festive fountain-houses and foliage.
Other harvesting vases have minor features that might indicate a ritual rather than an agricultural setting: for example, the lekythos (Figure 82, p. 154) where the vine harvest may relate to a Dionysian sanctuary; the women sit on blocks that could be portable altars. Hydria (Figure 84, p. 155) again has an altar/seat and hydria (Figure 81, p. 153) has so many women gathered round the one tree that a ritual aspect is possible.

Given that the vast majority of the scenes of this section are on funerary lekythoi, Dionysiac celebrations would be particularly appropriate. He is the most popular divinity for ritual depictions on Athenian pottery and also offers an imaginative opportunity for artistic mixing of contemporary ritual practice and myth (Lewis 2002: 51). The second day of the Anthesteria was focused on wine and Dionysos, whilst the Lenaia was named for the maenads who worshipped him on that day (Dillon 2002: 152). Lewis points out that the maenads of these vase scenes show not the wild, raving women of myth, but ‘domesticated’ real city women undertaking ritual roles, which could include sex (Lewis 2002: 52-53, 116). Dancing was an essential part of Dionysos’ worship (Dillon 2002: 144-145). Therefore, reading the more lively ‘harvesting’ scenes as part of Dionysiac celebrations seems the most probable interpretation, this being more likely because Dionysos and the orchard-garden became closely associated with ideas about the afterlife.
4.2.10: Sanctuaries: the afterlife

Other scenes showing women and fruiting trees, especially later fifth-century examples, seem to relate to another aspect of the sacred world: the association of the fruiting garden with heroes and divinities, referred to in chapter 2. Two black-figure skyphoi illustrate this, both 525-475. Figure 99 shows a lyre-playing figure, presumably Apollo, between fruiting, cultivated trees, of quasi-espalier shape. A harvesting basket is also present. Figure 37 (p. 103) shows Peleus abducting Thetis between fruiting trees of the same shape. The sexual resonance of the abduction is clear (further discussed in sections 4.2.13-14).

During the latter half of the fifth century, this afterlife fit for heroes developed into a more generalised concept of the orchard-garden as a metaphor of a paradisiacal afterlife available for all (section 2.2.4). Presumably, the associations of sanctuary festivals with music, dancing, relaxation and potential sexual activity contributed to this development, as well as the cool, watered beauty of the fertile orchard-garden, plus reinforcement from the east (see pp. 60, 65, 119-120). This conceptual paradise garden is epitomised by the Meidias Painter and his School (section 2.2.4), but there are many red-figure vases c. 425-375 which explore this intermingling of leisureed women, fruit, trees, plants, and divinities or heroes. Many relate to sanctuaries of Aphrodite (section 4.2.13) but there are also examples linked again with Dionysos, such as a pelike (Beazley on-line 230492).
It seems that, no matter what the sanctuary activity (feasting, dancing, music, fruit gathering, visions of a paradisiacal afterlife), women and greenery (especially vines, and fruiting trees) are consistently shown in the same artistic conceptual frame; plants appear again to be a feminine attribute. Such ritual activities appear mostly to mark the ‘good’ citizen wife, fulfilling her ritual obligations just as she dutifully gathers water and harvests and stores the household’s produce. There is, however, another highly important deity who is likely to be implicated in some of these harvesting and sanctuary scenes.

4.2.11: Artemis: landscape and greenery

There are good reasons why the sanctuaries of Artemis were particularly ‘female spaces’. Not only is she a female divinity, but her sanctuaries were usually sited in a specific landscape: areas that were watered, border zones, and/or areas of potential risk (Cole 2004: 178-230, Bradley 2000: 26, Calame 2010: 255). This is appropriate for the goddess who ritually oversees women’s transitional life stages, times of particular vulnerability. The connection between women’s lives and water has been noted throughout this chapter; water was essential to all Artemis’ rituals and to women’s life stages, especially for purification (Cole 2004: 193).

The sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron, from which most evidence comes, played a vital role in the sacred and civic transitional stages of Athenian women. Brauron is located very close to the boundary between land and sea, on characteristically damp ground around a plentiful spring, close to a river and surrounded by woodland. It is very probable that the associated vegetation was important to Artemis’ rites (Calame 2010: 248).

From Brauron, various fragments of black-figure krateriskoi have been recovered - a vessel that appears vital to the Brauron cult and to the Arkteia rite, believed to mark the transition from childhood to puberty. Although archaic in form, most date from the fifth century and are designed for ritual use. Some have been found in other sanctuaries of Artemis, but only in Attica (Kahil 1977: 87-88). Early fifth-century
fragments give evidence of women dancing, including the double flute (Figure 100); also of girls racing nude with flaming torches (Figure 101). An altar is part of the scene and often a palm tree, frequently a signifier of Artemis. Kahil notes that these rites take place in the open air (G.-Kahil 1963: 28).

Some fragments of additional, rather later and larger red-figure krateriskoi (425-400), have been reconstructed to give a better impression of the rites. They are products of an Attic workshop, almost certainly Athenian and made for Brauron (Kahil 1977: 89). On krateriskos 1 (Figure 102), small girls are prepared for, and run, a race. A volute attests an altar, two palms are present; one of the women preparing the girls carries branches of bay in both hands (Kahil 1977: 89-90).

Whilst this race shows girls of the Bears’ age, krateriskos 2 (Figure 103) shows a similar race, but of young women, apparently parthenoi. Many have the long, flowing locks seemingly associated with this life-stage (section 4.2.12). These girls are racing nude, holding wreaths. Again, two palm trees are present and part of an animal, almost certainly Artemis’ bear (Kahil 1977: 90-91). In the border, hounds chase the goddess’s deer; a border of bay adorns the rim.
Bay is again shown on krateriskos 3 (Figure 104), which Kahil believes showed the Leto, Artemis and Apollo triad and depicted part of her mysteries (Kahil 1977: 92-93). The stock of a bay tree remains behind Apollo and a fuller bay by the handle.

Enough can be gleaned from these fragments to state that the seclusion of a thickly-wooded site would have been vital, given the nudity of desirable, vulnerable young girls and the undoubtedly secret nature of these rites. Whilst the Brauron site is not a garden in modern terms, it undoubtedly had the characteristics of a garden in ancient Greek eyes: there must have been a grassy meadow, a λειμών, for the dancing and racing and the surrounding woods were probably an ἄλσος of Artemis. Whilst the palms depicted may owe more to aetiology than to reality, there can be little doubt that the bay would have embellished the shrine. Artemis is essentially a goddess of the
outdoors, also a characteristic of Dionysos, already shown to be associated with scenes of women’s outdoor rituals.

Other, non-Brauron, vase scenes show the same associations of Artemis and plants, though in these Artemis is normally accompanied by Apollo. Whilst the palm may be an attribute along with the deer, several scenes show the goddess with ‘generic’ branches, particularly a series of black-figure amphorae of the latter half of the sixth century. For example Figure 105 shows Apollo with his lyre to the left of the central palm and deer facing Artemis, holding out a wreath as her insignia. Behind the palm, long ‘generic’ branches curve to the ground. In Figure 106, the greenery is separated into the usual trailing branches and a young tree with identical foliage.\(^{107}\)

![Figure 105: Athenian bf amphora A, 550-500](image1)

![Figure 106: Athenian bf neck amphora, 525-475](image2)

The image projected is again that greenery is an attribute of Apollo and Artemis. Apollo is the god for whom the greatest number of sacred groves is known, whereas Artemis’ association with verdure is expressed through branches, wreaths, flowers and the palm associated with her birth. It seems more probable that a conceptual association of these divinities with foliage is depicted rather than any specific species.

Some of the early amphorae show an association between Artemis and Dionysos, which is interesting in view of the connections of this god and greenery in section 4.2.9 - as if the deities of green growth were being linked conceptually. For example,

\(^{107}\)See also, for example, Beazley on-line 301824 and 302161.
amphora Figure 107, the Apollo and Artemis with palm and ‘generic’ branches is balanced on the opposite side by Dionysos, with vine, goat and satyrs.

Figure 107: Athenian bf neck amphora, 550-500

Like the scenes of Dionysos in section 4.2.9, the context of such scenes should be seen as sanctuaries of Artemis, or Artemis and Apollo. This is occasionally made concrete, as on a lekythos (Figure 108), where Apollo and Artemis, palm and deer, are bounded on each side by a column, perhaps of a stoa along which the ‘generic’ branches ramble.

Figure 108: Athenian bf lekythos, 525-475

There is a visible link between Artemis and her dancing chorus on an unusual plate (Figure 109). In the main scene two males (probably komastai) seem to be participating in a celebration within a sanctuary to Apollo and Artemis, given the central palm and two deer. Again, ‘generic’ foliage crosses the background. In the base of the scene, women are celebrating - dancing to pipe music. Although the plate was made in Attica, it has orientalising resonances, perhaps painted by an eastern Greek.
The tree with animals to either side is an oriental motif and the caps the men wear\textsuperscript{108} are Phrygian in appearance. They are like those on the heads of the four dancing women on the lekythos (Figure 88, p. 164). The lekythos was found on Euboea, an area of early, constant eastern contact.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image109}
\caption{Athenian bf plate, 500-450}
\end{figure}

On another lekythos from section 4.2.7 (Figure 83, p. 154) showing fruit harvesting, three of the five women wear similar caps or topknots, reaching a high point at the top. These caps may also be connected with Artemis, as two Brauron lekythoi also show conical caps (G.-Kahil 1965: 29, pl. 10.3, 4, 5). Figure 110 shows women dancing or walking, with legs bared, and wearing extremely conical caps.

Although identification with the Amazons has been suggested, Kahil connects them with the Thracian deity Bendis, linked to Artemis (Planeaux 2001: 180-181) and often referred to as Artemis Bendis. In iconography, Bendis and her adherents wear either Phrygian or elongated conical caps. However, as Kahil notes, the lekythos is dated a few years before the introduction of the cult of Bendis into Attica, c. 429/430. A second lekythos (Figure 111) is similar, showing younger girls racing or dancing close

\textsuperscript{108} They are archers and described as hunters, which would fit with Artemis (Marconi 2004:23).
to a burning altar (G.-Kahil 1965: 30, pl. 10.6, 7). Their heads carry either caps or a cap-like hairstyle. In the background of both these lekythoi are the same ‘generic’ branches, bearing large fruit.

It seems probable that these two vases depict the same type of ritual and that they may connect with the caps on the Bologna plate and lekythoi in Figures 83 and 88. Although the lekythoi and the Bologna plate are older than the introduction of the cult of Bendis into Attica, it is possible that these older examples represent dances or races to Bendis under the name of Artemis. Alternatively, their artists may have come from an area where her worship under this name was practised or, indeed, that her worship was practised in Attica before the official introduction of her cult.

If the capped figures on these vessels do, indeed, link to the cult of Artemis as Bendis, then the fruit and foliage attributes of Artemis possibly originated in the earliest stage of her worship in the Near East, before differentiation into the different forms adopted in different areas. The four lekythoi all display branches with large fruit and the Bologna plate has spreading ‘generic’ foliage.

Whilst greenery is appropriate for a goddess of the wild, the fruiting element seems less obvious. As far as garden-like spaces are concerned, Artemis relates to the wild wood, or to the meadow of Hippolytos, 73-81 (Appendix 1). Hippolytos’ meadow is,

---

109 See Burkert 1985: 149-152.
uncharacteristically, associated not with fertility but with virginity; it is ἀκήρωτος - inviolate, or pure, appropriate to the young girls of the Brauron rituals. It seems to contradict the fertility of cultivated fruiting branches. For a second strand of interpretation, it is important to look further at the vital parthenos stage of a young woman’s life, where the water highlighted in Hippolytos 78 is significant.

4.2.12: Artemis and the parthenos

The squat lekythos from Malibu that can negotiate the purity/fertility contradiction is mentioned in section 2.1.3 (Figure 12, p.32). Painted within the Meidias Painter’s circle and dated c. 420-400, it is considerably later than the vases considered above. Beazley identified it as a Hesperides scene, which Burn does not challenge, whilst Schefold links the water in the scene to Orphic doctrine (Beazley 1963: 1317, Burn 1987: 21, Schefold 1988: 165). Without Herakles or snake, however, but with Artemis in a deer-drawn chariot and a centaur included on the reverse, the context of this scene seems more likely to be a sanctuary of Artemis. The flaming torch she carries, recalling those of the Brauron girls (p. 172), is a symbol of the weddings she oversees.

Lewis, who has examined hairstyles on vase iconography, notes a particular style of hair from the early red-figure period, although declining by the period of the Malibu lekythos. It is consistently used in depicting virgin goddesses and parthenoi in mythological and ritual scenes. The style has the ends of the long hair secured in a small bag or net and is often used to depict Artemis (Lewis 2002: 27-28, Byvanck-Quarles van Ufford 1986). On the Malibu lekythos, the girl picking fruit from the larger tree wears this hairstyle, whereas the two women to the right of it wear the bun more characteristic of married women (Lewis 2002: 27). The vessels on the pot present more clues: at the tree’s foot is the water-carrying hydria; on the right is a loutrophoros, used to carry water for the ritual bath preparatory to marriage (Sabetai 2014a: 52-56). Kahil notes the frequency of loutrophoroi recovered from Brauron; although they are from a slightly earlier period (G.-Kahil 1963: 27), the same rites endured. Therefore, the context of the Malibu scene should be interpreted as part of
the transition rituals from *parthenos* to married woman, taking place within a sanctuary of Artemis.

The centaur may represent the impending arrival of the wilder male element into the girl’s life, as lustful behaviour was characteristic of the creature (Pomeroy 1975: 25), but this is not necessarily so, since the centaur Kheiron was famous for his fostering and educative qualities, whilst the *parthenos* was believed to have a potential for wildness and to be in need of taming to marriage (Lefkowitz 1995: 32, 34). In either interpretation, it is noticeable that all three women turn their gaze towards this centaur, as though awaiting his eruption into their quieter female world. Artemis, whom Anakreon (*Frag.* 3, Appendix 1) characterises as the tamer of wild beasts, directs human instincts into socially-approved channels.

The goddess appears to be negotiating this nuptial transition in the Malibu scene and probably in many of the other vases displaying women and plant material, especially when associated with fountains. The festive and decorative air of many of these has already been noted (sections 4.2.5-6) and further examples occur, such as the hydria (Figure 112). The girls, with long, trailing ‘generic’ branches and wreaths, bedeck the fountain house. At least one girl, bending to fill her hydria, has long, tied-back hair, as in several other ‘festive’ examples. For example, on Figures 73 and 74 (p. 146) some girls have the long flowing hair appropriate to *parthenoi*, although the black-figure fountain-house scenes pre-date Lewis’ *parthenos* hairstyle.
Many fountain-house scenes are far less festive, however, and there is a wide variety of hairstyles, from covered heads to the buns often associated with married women, giving an impression of varying ages and stages. It can only be impressionistic, as painters fail to differentiate age and stage classes, or do not do so in easily decoded ways; therefore, hairstyle cannot be definitive. Overall, and considering the fact that many of the fountain-house vases appear utilitarian rather than celebratory, it seems unwise to take the entire category of these vases as being an ‘iconographical topos’ (Sabetai 2014b: 104) for the parthenos/nymphe stage overseen by Artemis.

Equally, it is highly probable that the especially decorative and festive ones do have this association. Where a deer is present, a specific Artemis connection is likely, and makes a watery connection with the later iconographic conventions and water associations of the Malibu squat lekythos. In any event, Artemis is the natural deity in a fountain-house setting, being linked both with water and with the element of risk in this ‘espace ambigu’.

Her primary role in negotiating risky, marginal areas has recently been stressed by Ellinger (2009). The goddess’ rites had to be performed correctly, so that young Athenian females could adjust to their changing roles as brides and mothers of future citizens. Inscription SEG IX.72, 84-85, states: ‘Before a bride enters the bedroom, she must bring a sacrifice to Artemis’; the word ζαμίαν (sacrifice) implies a penalty to avoid Artemis’ wrath (Oakley and Sinos 1993: 12). The inscription is from Kyrene, but reflects general attitudes. The parthenos was now at the life stage when she was believed to be most attractive to mortals and gods, as previously noted, and also most vulnerable to delusions (Hippocratic Corpus, Περί Παρθενίων, 1: Lefkowitz 1995). A few lines from Theognis (Eleg. 1, 261-266, Appendix 1) hint that the risk might equally be from female ‘delusion’ as from male aggression: the girl in these lines is making frequent visits to the well in order to flirt with the man, who is happy to oblige. A visual equivalent might be a fragment of a white-ground cup, c. 470, found in Iphigenia’s shrine in Brauron (Kahil 1963: 18-19, Figure 113) and part of Artemis’ sanctuary. It shows a young woman (with hair in a parthenos bag) fetching water from
a fountain-house. Her clothing is diaphanous, which underlines the risk involved in water-gathering and equally emphasises the role of such activities in displaying the maiden’s charms to attract potential suitors (pp. 182-184).

Only Artemis could negotiate this physical and conceptual space - one filled with greenery and fruiting branches. Given that women harvesting fruit would be equally in a zone of marginal safety, it is worth considering whether some of the ‘harvesting’ vases might not also be linked with religious rituals to Artemis. There are certainly connections between the goddess and fruit in the fruiting branches associated with Artemis/Bendis (section 4.2.11) and the fruiting tree of the Malibu lekythos. A fruit orchard existed in the sanctuary garden estate dedicated to Artemis that Xenophon created (Ana. 5.3.7-13, Appendix 1) and one is recorded near a spring in a sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis (Pausanias, 9.24.4), albeit this is very late and in Boeotia.

Xenophon describes Artemis’ annual festival and the taking of a ‘tithe of the products of the land in their season’, which must have included the products of the ‘grove of

---

110 Similar clothing is being worn by one girl in a further fragment of this cup (Kahil 1963: pl. 9.3), whilst the other women (involved in ‘good’ domestic tasks including wool working) are fully clothed. The girl is probably a parthenos, training for her role and displaying erotic potential.
cultivated trees, producing all sorts of dessert fruits in their season’ (5.3.12). Thus a ritual gathering of a tithe to Artemis, and indeed to other deities, is a potential context for some of these harvesting scenes, such as those in Figures 81, 82 and 83. Being free of a specific context, the vases could carry multiple additional overtones to contemporaries beyond the fact that the women were occupied in appropriate tasks.

In a ritual connection, it is interesting that hairstyles potentially associated with young girls occur on most of the harvesting vases of sections 4.2.7-8. The hydriai that define the series are too early for the style of hair that Lewis characterises as typical of the parthenos (p. 178); however, the long, tied-back hair more associated with young girls occurs. On Figure 81, of the seven women, the one to the left and the one climbing the tree have this style; probably also the women on the far right. In Figure 85, the two central women have buns, but the two outermost have the long, tied-back style. In Figure 84, the central woman has a bun, the one on the left the parthenos ‘bag’ and the one on the right the tied-back style.

The cup in Figure 87 is similar. In this harvesting scene, the girl to the left of the tree wears the parthenos ‘bag’ and this vessel is in the early red-figure period which Lewis pinpoints (Lewis 2002: 27-28). In general, there is a tendency for the women with buns, the potential matrons, to be central and apparently in charge; also for the potential long-haired parthenoi to be towards the edges of the scene, though this is not invariable. These scenes, already discussed as indicating the training of girls in their harvesting and storage duties (Section 4.2.8) could equally well include overtones of a ritual context specific to Artemis.

Artemis was very much in charge of another dangerous area for the parthenos - the dancing choruses sacred to this goddess, which were quite different from the private dancing and racing of Brauron. Artemis dancing with her nymphs is a focal motif in myth (Calame 1997: 91). The chorus of young captives attending Iphigenia, priestess of Artemis in Tauris (1143-1152) are some of several in tragedy who recall their youthful participation in these choruses (text Appendix 1). The passage emphasises the role of
competitive marriageable potential in these rituals, including the display of half-concealed, long, luxurious hair. Any literary references to the dancing choruses of Artemis in myth or real life emphasise one aspect: the girls’ desirability, thus the risk of rape or seduction. Yet, for the more privileged girls at least, the choral dancing could not be avoided: it was essential to the female rite of passage and taken very seriously (Lonsdale 1993: especially 21-43, 169-171).

The risk is documented from myth and in reality across a very long chronology. Alkaios (Frag. 130b, Appendix 1), whilst in exile, saw women being assessed for their looks in seventh-century Lesbos as they danced. The festival is not named and dancing was common to many rituals. However, their assessment (κρίννόμενοι φύαν) implies that they were being evaluated for their growth, or stature, or form like a plant. They were almost certainly young women displaying their marriageable potential; the fact that they were dancing in woods also may indicate Artemis. The role of such dancing in controlling sexuality within approved bounds is shown in Plutarch’s late (and highly improbable) statement (Mor. 249d-e) that there had been neither seduction nor adultery in Keos for 700 years. This was, allegedly, because sexual relations were controlled by marriages arranged after potential husbands had assessed their brides whilst lightheartedly dancing - παιζούσας και χορευούσας.

It is possible that the few vases showing women on see-saws might relate to this context. A good example is a krater fragment (Figure 114); a further fragment has a draped man - possibly a watcher, or admirer. Another example on a hydria is Figure 115, with Eros at the balance point of the see-saw, which indicates a potentially erotic context. The girl on the left has the parthenos ‘bag’ on her hair.

111 Mythically, for example, Hermes seduced Polymele, having seen her dancing for Artemis (Iliad, 16.180-192). Aphrodite seduces Anchises disguised as a parthenos taken from Artemis’ chorus (Hom. Hymn Aph.(5) 117-127) and some versions of the Persephone myth have overtones of this context (other examples in Buxton 1994: 111-112).
112 Dancing choruses to Hera, goddess of marriage rather than transition, is also a possible context; see, for example, Euripides, Elektra, 171-180.
Choral dancing was, therefore, again an ambivalent, borderline activity with considerable risk and the roles of Artemis and Aphrodite blurred. The wooded and watery landscapes of Artemis were prime ‘female spaces’, with some association with fruiting trees (presumably linked to forthcoming fertility) as well as a general greened environment. Such green and fertile spaces and associations were, however, also very much the realm of Aphrodite, who used the natural beauty of such spaces for seduction. As the two goddesses shared the same watery and beautiful landscape, so they shared the responsibility for sexual conduct, separated into civic, reproductive aspect and the pleasurable. Both, however, were considered essential; Hippolytos paid for his rejection of Aphrodite. The meadow was not only ἀκηρατός, dedicated to virgin Artemis, but was also the venue par excellence of sex, seduction, Aphrodite and fertility. That contradiction must have been apparent to Euripides’ audience. The same double resonance must have been part of Artemis’ real-life choruses. Although associated with virginity and marriage, Artemis’ dances were also mythologically associated with her band of dancing nymphs (Burkert 1985: 150, Larson 2001: 107-109; Hom. Hymn Aph. (5) 117-118, Hom. Hymn Art. (27) 13-15). Nymphs, who haunted garden-like landscapes normally described as κῆποι, were closely associated with sexual activity and the realm of Aphrodite. The word νύμφη can mean either bride or nymph, thus including the realms of both divinities; equally, the word γάμος can mean either marriage or sex itself (Oakley and Sinos 1993: 13). Mutual vocabulary reinforces the mutual landscape.
Further, plant material was equally involved in Aphrodite’s rituals. Stesikhoros (Frag. 10) records that people threw quinces, myrtle leaves, rose garlands and violet wreaths at Helen and Menelaos’ wedding, which may relate to ritual fertility; plants believed to promote fertility or to be aphrodisiacal were used generally in wedding ritual (Oakley, Sinos 1993: 16, 27). The late source, Plutarch (Solon, 20.3), records that new brides ate a quince (μήλου κυδωνίου), which probably related to fertility. The association of brides with flowers, violets in particular, is marked in Sappho (Frags. 30, 103, Appendix 1).

Flowers and fruit may, therefore represent Artemis and respectable fertility and wifely reproduction. They are more closely associated, however, with the realm of Aphrodite and, in this context, seem to represent pleasure, enjoyment and relaxation.

4.2.13: Aphrodite: the paradise connection

In section 4.2.9 the relationship of Dionysos to scenes of the afterlife was discussed, whilst the appropriateness of a garden, with fruit and ornately dressed, leisured women, as the symbol of a paradisiacal existence was discussed in section 2.2.3. Aphrodite was well-placed to evoke such ideas and is frequently placed in such scenes. Trees, plants and flowers are used to symbolise these pleasant spaces and fruit for its luxurious taste. In the later fifth century such ideas were flourishing and many vases, particularly those associated with the Meidias School, show Aphrodite surrounded by greenery. For example, on a squat lekythos (Figures 43, p. 114) Aphrodite is characteristically accompanied by a fruiting olive along with Eros, whilst handmaids proffer fruit.

Fruit is also carried to an amorous Aphrodite and Adonis on a similar squat lekythos (Beazley on-line 215563). The names of three of the four handmaids on Figure 43 (Eumonia, Eudaimonia and Paidia) indicate the happy, playful and conceptualised nature of the scene. The fruit that was shown in chapter 3 to have elite associations fits Greek concepts of a paradise garden.
The fruit most closely linked with Aphrodite was the apple (Littlewood, 1968, Foster 1899). Sappho (Frag. 2; section 2.1.3, Appendix 1) describes beautifully a sanctuary garden of Aphrodite which has a grove of apple trees; the paradisiacal nature of the green, watered space is clear. In Fragment 105a (below) there is a specific apple image; the context is unclear, but probably relates to another of Aphrodite’s sanctuaries, and thus has sexual overtones. The fragment finds an echo in the Sotades Cup (Figure 13, p.34) which, if not deliberately intended to illustrate this fragment, certainly gives a remarkable reflection of it. The context for both fragment and cup has certainly been read as sexual and nuptial (Winkler 1981: 79). The transparent nature of the clothing works to this interpretation, although the extent of colour loss on white-figure is well-known. Although Winkler suggests that quinces rather than apples are intended by Sappho, the phrase γλυκόμαλον is more appropriate to apples than to quinces; apples are depicted on the cup.

as the sweetapple (sic) reddens on a high branch
high on the highest branch and the applepickers (sic) forgot -
no, not forgot: were unable to reach
(Carson, 2002; Greek text Appendix 1)

It is clear from all the iconography of Aphrodite and the associations of apples that her sanctuaries were very much ‘female spaces’. This is not only because of her essentially female nature, but also because of her specific landscape associations.

4.2.1: Aphrodite: the meadow and sexual vocabulary

Whereas Artemis was more readily associated with darker wooded spaces, Aphrodite’s landscape domain was the meadow, a light, bright, watered place of soft grass and flowers and seduction. Soft grass was fundamental to her image: landing in Cyprus after her strange conception, grass grew beneath her feet - ἀμφὶ δὲ ποίη ποσσίν

113 Other contexts have been proposed: a simple harvesting scene and one depicting honey nymphs (Burn 1985: 94-95).
ὕπο ὰδινοῖσιν ἀέξετο (Hesiod, *Th.* 194-195). The λειμών, as one form of sacred garden (section 2.1.3), was frequently synonymous with κῆπος. Anakreon (*Frag.* 72\textsuperscript{114}) makes a suggestive analogy between horse and woman, the locus being the horse’s grazing meadow - a place of lighthearted play - κούφα τε σκιρτῶσα παίζεις. Anakreon (*Frag.* 1) also makes a direct link between the object of sexual desire, Aphrodite and the meadow; the locus is the fields of hyacinth (ὑακιν[θίας ἀρ]ούρας) where Aphrodite’s horses graze. Again, in Theognis (*Eleg.* 2, 1249-1252), a horse-grazing meadow is the venue of a homo-erotic analogy - ἀγαθὸν λειμώνα τε καλὸν κρήνην τε ψυχρῆν. The cool spring water and the beauty of the place make it a fitting place for love. The frequent references to horse-grazing and the specific mention of water mark a particularly privileged part of the Greek landscape. The rarity of pasture fit for horses was referenced as early as Homer (*Od.* 4.601-608). It was the privileged status of such a place that made it appropriate for Aphrodite’s sanctuary, as in Sappho (*Frag.* 2) where the horse-grazing meadow was rich with spring flowers (p. 34). The description of Kalypso’s natural garden in *Odyssey*, 5.63-74 picks up on the same resonances, the landscape offering a promise/threat of the nymph’s sexual allure. The same topos is exploited in Plato’s *Phaidros* (229a-c, 230b-c, Appendix 1), a nymphic natural garden, deliberately selected as appropriate for a discussion on love.

Specific sexual vocabulary reinforces the connections between Aphrodite’s art, the land and some of its products. This vocabulary is found not only in poetry but also in comic fragments, which show that the garden/sexual resonances of the mythical world were very much alive in everyday, frequently crude, language. Menander (*Perikeir.* 1013-1014), quotes ‘I give X to you for ploughing (ἐπ’ ἀφότωι) of legitimate children’ as the words with which a girl was handed over to her betrothed. This concept was earlier evident in drama: Sophokles, for example, refers to other women from whom Haimon could produce children as other ‘fruitful fields’ - ἄφωσμιοι γύαι (Ant. 569). Closer associations with specific fruit crops are of breasts with nuts - καρύα

\textsuperscript{114} Texts of all these fragments in Appendix 1.
(Aristophanes, Frag. 664\textsuperscript{115}); Anakreon describes a woman aged by sexual over-exploitation as πεπείραξ - a word meaning soft, pulpy and over-ripe, as if describing fruit (Frag. 87).

In a context of visualised Bacchanalian drinking and dancing (Euripides, Cyclops 168-172), the satyr Silenos uses λειμών in its secondary meaning of female genitals. The word κῆπος also carries this secondary meaning; in both cases, this is presumably due to their moist and ‘grassy’ nature. Arkhilokhos (Frag. S478a, 23-24) exploits this with the ‘grassy gardens’ - ποηφόρους κήπους. The fig (σῦκον, Aristophanes, Peace, 1344-50) also carried this meaning. Pasiphile, sexually open to many, was compared to a fig tree (Arkhilokhos, Frag. 331). μανιόκηπος (Anakreon, Frag. 446) literally ‘garden-mad’ was a euphemism for ‘sex-mad’. The κόλπος, where women stored their gathered fruit (pp. 29, 38, 49, 51, 66) had the secondary meaning of vagina; sexual activity in vase scenes in orchards was noted in section 4.2.9.

Unlike the other ‘female spaces’ discussed above, in the sources that have come down to us, Aphrodite’s flowery, meadowy landscape belongs to the conceptual, rather than the physical female space. This is largely because Aphrodite carried so much of the symbolic burden of the garden; thus it is this aspect that is portrayed in vase paintings, as it is in poetry. Undoubtedly women were closely involved in Aphrodite’s real-life sanctuaries, as both priestesses and petitioners, but little is known about them. The pleasant meadow-garden as Aphrodite’s natural home accounts for the vase painters’ use of trees, plants and fruit as attributes of the goddess. So close was the association that a specific cult of Aphrodite ἐν κήποις existed in classical Athens (section 5.3.2).

The top register of the Meidias hydria (p. 38) is obviously an idealised representation, but is the best evidence available of how some Greeks viewed Aphrodite’s sanctuaries. In depicting a scene of mythological rape, the location is portrayed as a place of lightness, gentleness, verdure and decorative women; a girl close by Aphrodite and her altar picks flowers. The rape that the myth records has been turned into seduction.

\textsuperscript{115} For all these texts, Appendix 1.
The mood is exactly that expressed by Sappho (Frag. 2 Appendix 1). Whilst there is no direct indication of sexual activity in this fragment, other than a reference to Aphrodite, Fragment 94 (Appendix 1) is more explicit and the flowers that were part of the allure would have grown naturally in the sanctuaries of the final lines. Despite the poetic nature of the evidence, there can be no doubt that it both reflected and influenced perceptions of the real landscape.

Alkiphron was writing considerably later (somewhere between the fourth and second centuries). In his purported letter from the courtesan Phryne to Praxiteles, she invites him to lie with her in the sanctuary of Aphrodite and Eros (Letter 4.1, 8-11, Appendix 1). Given the crowded nature of Greek living space, sanctuary gardens were probably a common site of sexual liaisons. It is no coincidence that garden spaces of Aphrodite or her alluring Nymphs were almost always described as a κῆπος, no matter how unpromising the site - for example, the kepos to the Nymphs in the rocky landscape of Vari and the site identified as the north face of the Akropolis Aphrodite en kepois shrine (section 5.3.2).

Aphrodite’s meadows share the close association with water found in the other female-associated spaces of section 4.2, for only moist ground would support her grass and flowers. The presence of cooling water is an important part of the paradisiacal associations of such spaces - the most privileged part of the landscape. Her spaces must also be considered borderline zones, not only between risk and allure, but also between the conceptual and real worlds, each influencing the other.

In the final example of gardens associated with women a considerable anomaly can be claimed, for the gardens concerned are small, potted and frequently linked with intense heat, desiccation and plant death rather than life, even though the link between the κῆπος and sexual activity was strongly maintained. More recent interpretations, however, restore the link with green freshness.
4.2.15: The Adonia: sources

The Adonia festival includes the most specific female-associated garden, since we know that the word κῆπος was used: Parker (2005: 284) calls the κῆπος the *sine quibus non* of the festival. Because the festival was celebrated over a wide spatial and chronological range, and because it is based on inherently fluid myth, it is difficult to extract information relevant to Archaic and Classical Athens from the late sources. Only those directly relevant are included below, although others are necessarily referred to.

Sappho is the earliest reference to an Adonis cult, which reached Lesbos from the Near East long before there is any evidence of it in Athens. There are two very brief invocations, the first at the conclusion of a wedding hymn: ὦ τὸν Ἀδώνιον and ὦ τὸν Ἀδώνιον (*Frags*. 117b and 168). There is one expanded reference, clearly related to a context of mourning and lamentation, probably from an Adonia ritual hymn (*Frag*. 140, Appendix 1). In this Adonis is described as ἄβρος, which carries connotations of softness and delicate prettiness. Aphrodite is clearly linked with Adonis from the beginning; he appears to have no existence other than his role as Aphrodite’s mourned lover.

The earliest written evidence of the cult in Athens comes from Aristophanes: a passing reference in *Peace*, 420, then *Lysistrata*, 387-398, where the unbridled women celebrating the Adonia disturb the serious Assembly debates. The same ritual cry and breast-beating are cited (393, 396). The rites are described as Ἰ ΤΡΥΦΗ (387) - a quality involving softness, luxuriousness, daintiness and licentiousness, already referred to in connection with the garden (section 3.3.6). The same disturbing noise (43-44), dancing (46) and frivolity (here described as παιδί, 41) are recorded in Menander’s *Samia* (35-46) and also licentiousness, as Moskhion seduces a citizen’s daughter at the festival.
The *Samia* passage mentions that gardens are carried up onto the roofs (45) and an undatable scholion on *Lysistrata*, 389 stated that ‘the women carried gardens up to their housetops’. There they celebrated rites that were neither public nor orderly.  

The scholion gives *Adoniazousai* as an alternative (incorrect) title for *Lysistrata* and there are records of several Middle Comedy plays by that name (Reitzammer 2008: 283). The playwrights were presumably attracted by the comic potential of boisterously celebrating women. There are also references in Plato’s *Phaidros* and in Theophrastos (Appendix 4).

For the gardens that are the focus here, vase paintings are the best source; all date from the end of the fifth and into the fourth century. Several have been claimed to show the Adonia, but are more likely to represent a bridal context and have, therefore, been excluded (Edwards 1984: 62-71, Dillon 2003: 10-11). Scenes where potted gardens plus a ladder are shown with women and Erôtes and/or evidence of celebration are almost certainly depicting the festival, although the Erôtes clearly invoke the aura of myth.

One lekythos (Figure 116) shows two half-amphorae and a large, stemmed cup shape being used as plant containers, Eros hands one to a woman on a ladder; the containers are roughly broken and the plants low-growing sprigs and possibly small flowers. Two other well-dressed women attend.

For all these texts see Appendix 1.

---

116 For all these texts see Appendix 1.
On a squat lekythos (Figure 117) a man and a woman sit watching, whilst Eros hands a reversed conical container to a woman on a ladder. Two other women, with a third unidentifiable figure, approach. All the women are either wrapped entirely in long cloaks or have partially removed them, apparently nude beneath, although the image is insufficiently clear. To the left of the ladder stands another, larger container, like a flat bowl, with flowers or berries visible; a similarly shaped vessel appears to hang high on the wall, but probably represent a container already taken up onto the roof.

The container is very similar to that on squat lekythos (Figure 118) - a cup shape, but with downturned handles. Here, Eros on a ladder sprinkles something into the container. A further Eros crawls on the floor, among other seated and standing women, one perhaps Aphrodite; one appears to be dancing. One woman sprinkles something into a krater, identified as pouring wine (Atallah 1966: 186); the sowing of a further Adonia garden is possible, although no others are shown in a krater and incense is possible.

\[^{117}\] Identified as ‘mantle dancers’ (Burn 1991: 118).
The hydria in Figure 119 similarly shows one woman on a ladder, sprinkling something into a cup-shaped vessel held by another. Five other women are present, dancing or playing instruments, also Pan and a Nike. The container is smaller than on other examples; an incense container is possible. However, the ladder, evidence of celebration and the sexual connotations of Pan replacing Eros make the Adonia a more probable context.

A squat lekythos (Figure 120) shows a poorly-preserved scene of several women, including some playing instruments and two Erotes. The focus is on a woman on a ladder, again sprinkling something into a container extended to her. As an incense burner is beneath, it may again represent incense. Figures 118-120 are all the work of
the Apollonia group of painters; the consistency of painters and theme perhaps make incense more probable, but the context is almost certainly of the Adonia. Interestingly, a fruiting tree is also present in this scene, which is likely to represent the courtyard.

One further scene, whilst not showing the Adonia, may refer to it. A lekythos (Figure 121) has been interpreted as an illicit courtship scene, taking place in a courtyard (Stafford 1997). The Adonia link comes from the woman to the side, who appears to be watering containers like the Adonis gardens, albeit smaller. Stafford believes the odd shape of these vessels, especially the handled central one, are the cut off tops of amphorae (Stafford 1997: 202), as on Figure 116, reduced in size.
Many aspects of these vases are subject to different interpretations and their degree of reality is especially relevant, given that the series began at the end of the fifth century, when images of women became more romanticised and unreal (Lewis 2002: 130-132). The lekythoi of Figures 116 and 119 have been interpreted as the epiphany of Aphrodite or Adonis at an Adonia rather than its ritual (Edwards 1984). Nevertheless, something as basic as planting containers are likely to imitate their real counterparts. From the images, all that can be claimed is that the planters were of no specific size or shape; the impression is that any handy cracked, broken or unused vessel was used. The plants appear all low growing and could represent foliage, small flowers or berries.

4.2.16: The Adonia: participants and date

That the Adonia was a women’s festival has never been questioned. Some male involvement is possible. Not only do some of the vases show a male figure (possibly intended as Adonis), but the girl in Samia became pregnant at the Adonia (p. 190). The comic fragments indicate a licentious festival and Detienne sees the women’s sexual behaviour as a characteristic feature (Detienne 1994: 65-66). These sources are however, all late and earlier male involvement in the festival has also been denied (Reed 1995: 318-319). Equally indeterminable is the status of the women. The Samia girl was a citizen’s daughter. The best evidence is the magistrate’s diatribe in Lysistrata, 387-398: Demostratos’ wife was dancing at the festival whilst her husband debated in the Assembly. Aristophanes was writing satirical comedy and possibly playing on male fears by extending to citizen wives the uncontrolled behaviour believed characteristic of metics and slaves. There is, however, no reliable evidence for this and the fact that she links the festival with a debate about the ill-fated Sicilian Expedition as an omen is important (Reitzammer 2008: 287-288, 303, 318-324). It seems improbable that the Adonia would have had such ominous potential had citizen

118 A letter, written by Alkiphron (Letter 4.14 at an unknown date, possibly as late as the second century AD), and purporting to be written by a courtesan, shows the Adonia to be an amorous free for all, including married women.
wives not been involved. Equally, given the male disapproval the festival incurred, it could more easily have been banned had only non-citizens been involved.

Considerable contention surrounds the timing of the festival. It has, for decades and following Detienne (1994: e.g. 120-121), been generally accepted as summer (see, for example Reed 1995: 319, Simms 1997: 127, f/n 31). Most scholars agree, although the date varies between June and August. Atallah resolved the problems by proposing a double festival, held in both spring and summer, but this has not found wider acceptance (Atallah 1966: 229-258).

Dillon (2003), however, has taken issue with the generally accepted interpretations placed upon the relevant evidence from Plato, Theophrastos and Plutarch (Phaidros, 276b; HP 6.7.3; CP 1.12.2; Alk. 18.2-3, Nik. 13.7). Dillon’s proposal of a spring festival has considerable interest, not only because of its association with the sanctuary of Aphrodite en kepois (section 5.3.2) but also to the plants of the Adonis gardens and the significance of their creation. As the vases have shown, no specific plants can be identified. Lettuce, fennel, wheat and barley are normally cited (Atallah 1966: 212, Detienne 1994: 107), but the late sources cannot be relied on for the classical period. Lettuce is traditionally associated with Adonis; in myth, his dead body is placed by Aphrodite on a lettuce bed. Dillon (2003: 3, f/n 13, 4, 9) points out that lettuce would be good for the Adonis gardens: easily obtainable, quick germinating and providing a green bed on which the women could lay the small Adonis dolls (εἴδωλα) that are associated with the festival. He adds that the traditional scorched plants of summer would be inappropriate for this purpose, whereas the fresh growth of spring would respond to the myth. Parker (2005: 285) comments that there is no evidence that the gardens were not green during the festival. Unfortunately, given that the relevant sources are so late, it is impossible to be certain that either the named plants or the mimesis was part of the Athenian festival.

---

119 Testimonium on Sappho (Voigt 1971: 211c, p. 159) is the earliest record; text Appendix 1. The plant was believed to be anaphrodisiac. There are several references in Athenaios, 2.69, b-e; also in Eubolos, Frag. tit. 14, Suda, s.v. Αδώνιδος κήπων.
120 Suda, s.v. Αδώνιδα; Plutarch, Alk. 18.3, Nik. 13.7.
Dillon’s interpretation may partially be maintained. The difficulty is to decide which of the two relevant sources is more credible. A time before the sailing of the Sicilian expedition in the summer of 415 is indicated in *Lysistrata*, 387-398: the expedition was only being proposed at the time the Adonia disturbed the Assembly’s considerations. Aristophanes, a contemporary, seems more likely to have the date accurately fixed than Plutarch several hundred years later (*Nik.* 13.7, *Alk.* 18.2-3; Dillon 2003: 5-7, 11-13). More difficulty arises with Dillon’s critique of traditional interpretations of Plato and Theophrastos (Dillon 2003: 8-9; Appendix 4).

Given the paucity of contemporary evidence, a resolution of the spring/summer argument is impossible. It is significant that no contemporary account refers to the withering of the Adonis roof-gardens in the intense heat, which is a major factor in Detienne’s account. The later use of the proverb Ἀκαρπότερος Ἀδώνιδος κήπου (Suda A807) - more fruitless than an Adonis Garden, could equally have originated in the throwing away of the gardens at the end of the festival, rather than their withering in the heat (Reed 1995: 324). Certainly, if lettuce were involved, the cooler temperatures of spring would be better for germination than high summer’s heat. Simms (1997), in a clear summary of the dating evidence, persuasively advocates a date in early June. Although this would rule out a connection with Aphrodite *en kepois*, it does not strain the Greek of *Phaidros* and Theophrastos. In accounting for Aristophanes’ spring date for Assembly debate and the Adonia, Simms focuses on the fact that *Lysistrata* is drama, not history, and that it makes a more dramatic focus to elide the two events (Simms 1997: 52-53). From the point of view of the Adonis Gardens, early June would still be consistent with easier germination and fresher growth.

Dillon mentions that, if Adonis dolls were laid on the gardens as a bier, fresh greenery or lettuce would be ideal, rather than withered shoots; this idea is also expressed by Reed and Simms (Dillon 2003: 9, Reed 1995: 325, Simms 1998: 133). Where plants are shown on vases, they appear fresh (section 4.2.15). A revised date between spring
and June, therefore, seems more probable. The new interpretation of the festival’s context given below places women’s experience in the foreground.

4.2.17: The Adonia: significance

Interpretations of the festival fall into three categories: agricultural, political and funerary. Original scholarly interpretations of the Adonis Gardens in Athens saw them as expressing mythologically the annual vegetative cycle of birth and death. This was overturned by an interpretation of the gardens as a polar opposition of normal agricultural practices, most rigidly expressed and developed by Detienne (1994), who set out a series of structural oppositions around the festival. Challenge was, of course, inevitable to any theory which made a rigid pattern out of something as variable as Greek myth and the most fruitful work has come as a result of the development of a more gendered approach to the period. The festival has been interpreted in terms of sexual politics: as culturally inverted and rebellious (Keuls 1993: 23-30, Reeder 1995: 238) or a mocking of male sexuality (Winkler 1990: 205-206).

However, scholars such as Reitzammer (2008) interpret the festival firmly within the field of deliberate political protest. Reizammer believes that Lysistrata (with alternative title Adoniazousai), reconstructs the Adonia as a public festival on the city’s rooftop – the Akropolis. There are certainly Adonia resonances in Lysistrata; however, Reitzammer’s structuralism appears rather forced, relying heavily on many of Detienne’s now discredited oppositions (Appendix 4). Equally, one would have expected explicit references to the gardens, particularly exploiting the sexual potential of garden vocabulary given the dramatic plot. Her argument seems to owe more to modern than to ancient thought patterns and to underplay the fact that Aristophanes was writing satirical comedy. Indeed, such a political protest would fit the world of Aristophanic comedy better than real life.

In fact, the most probable interpretation of the festival is to see it within the context of women’s mourning, funerary role; it is this that makes most sense of the gardens that were the main feature of the Athenian festival. Reed and Simms (Reed 1995: 322-
325, Simms 1998: 122), who hold to the traditional summer date, examine the festival through the eyes of its participants rather than later male interpreters. The earliest evidence cites women’s lamenting cries (Sappho, p. 190) and Reed and Simms include the festival and gardens within traditional female mourning practice - an emotional and compassionate response to the loss of youth in death. Like Dillon, they see the gardens as biers of lettuce for the Adonis εἰδωλέα; indeed, Simms records a remarkably similar ritual game of ‘corpse in the grass’ in modern Greece (Reed 1995: 325, Simms 1998: 133).

Both authors connect the adoption of the festival (first attested in Peace, produced in 421) with the increasing restriction of women’s funerary display, combined with the drastic loss of young life in the Peloponnesian War. The festival would allow women to express their emotions, mourn their own losses and enjoy the company of other women; perhaps also to express their sexuality by playing Aphrodite (Reed 1995: 345-346, Simms 1998: 134-137). This interpretation seems to answer a major anomaly of the festival: the fact that it was permitted, despite the very negative male view of the behaviour that it occasioned.

The Lysistrata passage expresses that disapproval well: unbridled women, making a noise, dancing, drinking, with uncontrolled τρυφή and within a domestic festival. Yet it was tolerated and even included in a list of Athenian festivals in Peace, 420: the Mysteries, the Dipolia, the Adonia; the two former examples are public rites. If the festival is placed within the context of women’s right and duty to practice mourning in a religious context, then the festival had a guaranteed legitimacy (Simms 1998: 138) and equally had a public as well as a private face, for the religious duties of the city’s women were part of the structure of the state. Almost certainly, citizen wives were involved as well as others.

Perhaps, like the fountain-houses, the private rooftops gave women of different social categories the chance to meet – possibly as a regular experience. The Adonia was a festival that fulfilled an emotional need, especially after long years of war and loss;
because of this, it also crossed the boundary into political public space. It was not by chance that both Thucydides and Plutarch followed Aristophanes in linking the festival as an omen to the ill-fated Sicilian expedition. Its serious potential has been underestimated, the Archaic and Classical festival being obscured by the later adoption of the subject by comic playwrights, who exploited the festival to express their own fears of uncontrolled female behaviour (Reed 1995: 339-341).

The gardens themselves seem likely to have included lettuces, but what little is visible on the vases apparently shows a variety of plant forms. They were probably constructed as miniature biers, but enhanced, like Easter gardens today, by their decorative potential. Far from being sterile and desiccated, they seem to have been temporary expressions of the long-existing association between women and plant material within a funerary context. A clear example is shown on an amphora dating from the later sixth century (Figure 122), where a woman stands mourning a man lying on a bier made from branches of the surrounding trees. The figure seems mythical (interpreted as either Eos mourning Memnon, or Europa mourning Sarpedon), but the practice was real. To see the Adonis gardens as a miniature of this scene seems the most natural interpretation.

Further, whilst almost all female spaces are associated with boundary zones in some form, the Adonis gardens cross many boundaries: the mythical and the real, sacred and profane, public and private, lamentation and celebration, ephemeral life and the
reality of death. The opportunities for ambivalence in perceptions and experience are multiple.

4.3.1: Conclusion

Water, women and plants belong together in the real, the mythical, the conceptual, the literary and the artistic spaces examined above, because women’s real working and ritual lives were involved with water and with plants. The women portrayed in vase images were being established as the appropriately occupied women of Semonides’ ‘bee’ wife (above, pp. 159-160). When artists painted explicit scenes of women, expressing the contrary side of male conceptual imaginings, there is no association with trees or plant material.\textsuperscript{121} This is, perhaps, surprising, given the sexual resonances of so much garden vocabulary, which could have been exploited artistically. That it was not exploited, is a further indication that the women illustrated in fountain-houses, orchards, cemeteries, courtyards and sanctuaries were ‘decent’ citizen wives, acting out their appropriate roles. The καλός/καλή label found on some vases (such as the alabastron, Figure 53, p. 134 and the cup, Figure 87, p. 156) indicate that plant material enhanced the beauty of such women. On the alabastron, the bride sits holding the wreath that defines her, with wool basket at her feet. In this way, the plants and trees that frequently accompany them seem to have become an attribute of ideal female behaviour and attractiveness; wool-working equipment performed the same function. Given the conceptual amalgam, it seems pointless to try to assign a single meaning to vase series like the fountain-house and orchard scenes: they almost certainly carry multiple potential resonances from the real and conceptual worlds.

A blurring of boundaries seems also to characterise the garden and green spaces inhabited by women. In these spaces, women carved out real lives, which were then reflected in artistic conceptualisations depicting and reinforcing their roles and attributes. Other than the domestic courtyard, all the places where women and plants

\textsuperscript{121} Trees are shown in scenes of women washing which, if potentially mildly erotic, are not explicit.
were shown together were outside the protection of the home. The cemeteries, fountain-houses, orchards and sanctuaries that women inhabited were public areas of multiple usage, involving an element of risk. The Kerameikos crossed the boundaries between water and earth, male and female worlds, ‘decent’ women and prostitutes and was physically sited on the boundary of the city. In the same way, the South-East Fountain-House was on the boundary of the agora. The Akropolis springs clustered in a similar position around the focal area - neither within, nor without the centre. The orchard areas were in a borderline zone between the domestic courtyard and the wider agricultural world, whilst the sanctuaries blurred the boundaries between human and divine. Artemis, with sanctuaries sited in borderline areas, negotiated this risk/safety boundary for women. The sanctuary of Aphrodite en kepois (see section 5.3.2) was sited on the edge of the city’s heart and the Adonia on rooftops, which were both private and public. The fact that so many female-associated sites were ambivalently located on borders surely reflects the distinctive, separate position of women in society, neither within nor without the citizen body. It also argues for some conceptual extension of the ‘tamed’ domestic environment to these places.

The water from which the garden spaces of this chapter benefited made them spaces that did not function only as work places, but also as places of relaxation and pleasure in a hot and arid climate. The coolness would encourage women to linger when their work was done, enjoying a chance to socialise, shaded by the surrounding greenery. In this aspect alone, the women were privileged in being away from the glare of the sun in the most public spaces of the city. In one amphora (Figure 123), two women sit, with fruiting ‘generic’ branches behind them, apparently just talking companionably, with gestures. The context is irrecoverable, but seems to represent one of the more pleasant aspects of ancient Athenian women’s lives.
However, such pleasant spaces were particularly the landscape of Aphrodite, with an inherent element of risk. How women negotiated that risk within the real world is considered in chapter 5, which examines how the real and conceptual associations of ‘the garden’, examined in chapters 2, 3 and 4, were reflected in the planted spaces of the city of Athens.
Chapter 5: The Planted City

‘The city itself is all dry and does not have a good water supply; ……………
The produce of the land is all priceless and delicious to taste, though in rather short supply.’


5.1: Introduction: the physical background

This remark, made by a Hellenistic traveller c. 270, paints a negative picture of Athens’ natural landscape and its horticultural potential, especially when compared with watered and garden-rich Thebes (text Appendix 1). Indeed, Attica is one of the driest areas of Greece and adequate water supply has always been a problem.

It is easy, therefore, to envisage Athens as a place of hard stone, lacking green spaces. Certainly Athens’ rivers were a trickle compared with Thebes’, but green spaces existed, hugging the sources of its water resources. The Kephisos skirts the city to the north-west, the marshy Ilissos to the south; the tiny Eridanos joined the latter after crossing the northern part of the city, canalised. The rivers were supplemented by springs, fountains, wells and cisterns, the two former clustered particularly in an inner ring skirting the Akropolis – close, but peripheral, to the citadel: the famous Klepsydra and others to the north-west and a cluster to the south-east, where gardens exist today (Crouch 1993: 255-277; section 5.7.1).

Consequently, there were green spaces around all water sources in a rough suburban ring, extending to the sea at Peiraeus, where marshy ground followed the Kephisos to the sea. Trees and marshland are clearly visible on a late eighteenth-century map (Figure 124).
On epigraphic evidence, most of the city’s gardens were located in this close but peripheral zone; here, conveniently, the city’s manure was deposited for recycling as fertiliser (Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 50.2; Vatin 1976). Given the meagre rivers, the careful use of the limited natural resources to provide the green spaces for which we have evidence is a tribute to careful conservation of, and dedication to, the most privileged part of Athens’ natural landscape. It confirms the importance attached to the city’s green garden spaces, the locations for which are shown on a map, Figure 165 (p. 287).

This chapter focuses primarily on the physical garden spaces of Athens, the only city for which reasonable evidence is available. It covers gardens described as κῆποι and other planted spaces that functioned as gardens by supplying the pleasure of cool shade. How such spaces were designated is often unknown and terminology, where known, was inconsistent; it is the function of the space that is significant.

Apart from considering the location and function of these natural resources, this chapter also examines how this real landscape related to the conceptual amalgam
surrounding the word κῆπος, particularly elite associations (including the enjoyment of garden spaces for pleasure) and female presence. It will cover five key areas: the agora, sacred gardens, productive gardens, the gymnasia-philosophy gardens, domestic plantings and natural gardens round water sources, and will discuss women’s spatial negotiation of the city.

5.2.1: The agora: walkways

The buildings of this vital city hub are frequently discussed, but its planted spaces receive little attention. The earliest evidenced plantings are those famously made by Kimon within the agora and extending to the Academy, in the middle of the first half of the fifth century, recorded by Plutarch (Kimon, 13.7, Appendix 1). This provides an immediate elite association and specific links with eastern practice, for this elite statesman refurbished his city with Persian war booty, being the first to initiate an urban tree-planting scheme. This idea almost certainly derived from Persia. As part of the proxenia network\textsuperscript{122} of aristocratic relationships between Athens, Sparta, the Greek East and Persia itself, Kimon would have been familiar with the paradeisoi of Persian royalty and elites, copied in Persian-influenced areas with which he was familiar. His family ruled in Chersonesos, close to the Persian boundary (Herodotos, 6.34-40).

Early euergetistic practices are recognised in artistic and architectural forms as status-enhancing forms of elite display and expressions of personal power. It is believed that Kimon embellished the urban landscape with numerous other public monuments within the agora and elsewhere (Camp 1986: 66); his grandiose urban plantings acted in the same way. Such acts were, however, more than individual self-promotion. Raaflaub (2009) has examined how the Greek elite appropriated not only Persian styles of conspicuous consumption, but also their ‘instruments of empire’ as they themselves acquired imperial status. Athenian grand public buildings (sometimes influenced by Persian styles) were a new way of dignifying the developing ‘imperial’

\textsuperscript{122} For the significance of networks, including proxenia, see Gabrielsen 2009: esp. 183, Vlassopoulos 2009.
city. The adoption of Persian-inspired tree avenues fits logically with this latest wave of eastern influence and is the first recorded example of tree-planting used to boost personal and state power in Greece.

A need to overdramatise the euergetistic act to enhance status would account for an element of exaggeration in Plutarch’s description, as the Academy was probably not actually ‘waterless and parched’. It lay close to the Kephisos, which despite modern drainage, deposited river mud in the archaeological excavations in 1934 (Benton 1972: 15). Sophokles (OK 687) described the river as wandering – νομάς. It was probably irregularity of supply that Kimon remedied. Delorme (1960: 41) suggests that Kimon’s provision of trees and water may represent a restoration of the site after the Persian destruction. In this case an irony is apparent: using one Persian imperial practice to counter another. Other Plutarchian vocabulary choices are interesting, particularly ἐλευθερίοις καὶ γλαφυρᾶς διατριβὰς (bountiful and elegant places for spending time), ύπερφυῶς ἡγαπήθησαν (exceedingly fond), ἐκαλλώπισε τὸ ἀστυ (adorned the city). The verb interestingly echoes the Thucydidean ἐγκαλλώπισμα πλούτου (pp. 123-124). They give the impression of this aristocratic politician dispensing largesse in a refined, leisured major city. The vocabulary choice may, of course, be purely that of Plutarch, living much later and in an environment very familiar with euergetism and exaggeration.

Waterfield (Plutarch 1998: 114) states that Plutarch is anachronistically attributing to Kimon the imperially derived euergetism of the Roman empire. However, Gleason (2013: 8) notes that Kimon’s life is deliberately paired with the Roman general Lucullus, who equally employed Asian spoils to construct luxury gardens in Rome and that his grand landscape and water projects gained him the nickname ‘Xerxes in a toga’ (Lucullus, 39.3). Imperial and elite largesse, copied long before the advent of Rome, was itself Persian-inspired. The view of Kimon acting like a Persian aristocrat is supported by a further grand gesture reported by Plutarch: that Kimon, being very wealthy, opened his estates to share his fruit with the people (Kimon, 10.1). This story was found considerably earlier in Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 27.3). Aristotle specifically
comments that Kimon’s estate was worthy of a tyrant - ὁ γὰρ Κίμων ἀτε τυραννικὴν ἔχων οὐσίαν.

The precise locations of Kimon’s planes are unknown, but the agora has been replanted as appropriately and accurately as possible, largely running regularly and straight along the ancient drainage channels, with trees bordering the agora roads (Figure 125).

Figure 125: Plan of Agora

123 Following examination of all ancient written sources (some post-dating the classical period), D.B. Thompson reconstructed the ancient plantings; re-landscaping was carried out in the 1950s.
The replanting, if uncertain, does follow the most probable contemporary practice. The South-East Fountain House overflow originally tracked north-north-east (American School of Classical Studies at Athens 1976: 154-156, Thompson, Wycherley 1972: 198) and probably ran alongside the Panathenaic Way, irrigating the trees. Roadside plantings would have been the logical choice, providing shade for pedestrians. They are attested for Greece (Oik. 19.13, Demosthenes, 55.10-15, 22), providing shade and visibility (p. 120).

This again echoes Persian practice. Although Kimon’s plantings considerably predate Xenophon’s tale of Kyros impressing Lysander with his paradeisos at Sardis (Oik. 4.20-25), section 3.2.3 has shown the long history of garden management in the region. Persian paradeisoi were known for their rectilinear plantings; it was the straight lines and regular angles of the planting, plus the beauty of the trees, that Lysander admired (Oik. 4.21, Appendix 1). Aristophanes uses the verb διαφυτεύω to describe the planting of planes in the agora (Farmers, Frag. 113); the διά implies planting across or along an extended length, appropriate for roadside plantings.

Water resource management was involved, which again looks to eastern practice. The Assyrian and Persian east delighted in grands projets d’eau from Ashurnasirpal II onwards (section 3.2.3), later particularly associated with Kyros the elder (Herodotos, 1.185.1-186.4, 1.189.1-191.6). Extensive irrigation channels have been recovered from the palace at Pasargadae (Boucharlat 2002, Stronach 1990). If not earlier, tree-planting along the western agora road is highly probable following the construction of the Great Drain in the early fifth century and the drain from the South-West Fountain House in the later fourth century.

Sections of water pipes and drains have been archaeologically recovered from around the agora. Although none can be securely attributed to Kimon, sections believed to date from the period 475-450 seem to evidence water carried from a source east of the city out towards the north-west; the dates fit Kimon (c. 510-450). Furthermore, such sections have been recovered from behind the Stoa Poikile, continuing out.
towards the north-west and in the Kerameikos on a line leading towards the Academy (Camp 1986: 72-73; Figure 126).

![Figure 126: Terracotta pipeline behind Stoa Poikile, c. 470-460](image)

This stoa, also built c. 475-50 and displaying paintings of Athenian military glory and captured spoils, still visible to Pausanias (1.15.1), was linked with Kimon or his family (Camp 1986: 66-72). This, and the coincidence of construction date for both grandiose public building and complex artificial irrigation system to sustain large-scale tree planting, argues for a coherently-planned architectural conception that included green spaces as part of city embellishment.

Although these irrigated trees almost certainly ultimately derived from the personal pleasure gardens of eastern elites, their application in Athens is very different. It exemplifies how the waves of easterly influence were appropriated and changed to suit Greek realities (pp. 65, 88, 94-95, 119-120, 242-244). Raaflaub (2009: 111) mentions Kimon’s park-like plantings as Persian adoptions, but sees them as a ‘domestication’ of the paradeisos, failing to differentiate between the changes in function between the planted spaces in the two societies. Certainly the agora-
Academy plantings still acted as personal status-marker and political power statement. In the Athenian agora, however, the stately trees have become a public amenity space: an endowment of comfortable green shade for the benefit of the wider community, not of a great king or his satraps. In doing this, they fulfilled one garden function noted in chapter 2 – the provision of a pleasurable environment no longer restricted to divinities.

5.2.2: The agora: sacred plantings

Kimon’s planes were not the only trees in the agora. The Altar of the Twelve Gods lay at its northern point - a small rectangular shrine, within a low stone enclosure which is epigraphically identified and dated to the 490-470s (Camp 1986: 40). An Altar to Pity (Ἔλεος) added sometime in the fourth century seems gradually to have changed the name (Crosby 1949: 102, Thompson 1952: 49-50, Travlos 1971: 458). At that time, several pits were dug into the packed gravel surface, just to the south and west of its peribolos; the loose earth infill, and analogy with the Hephaisteion plantings (section 5.3.2), indicates planting holes for a miniature grove for the shrine (Thompson 1952: 50). A spur of the irrigation channel from the South-West Fountain-House led into a basin near the western entrance (reconstruction drawing, Figure 127). Having no outlet, this basin must have been used for the shrine, for purification and tree irrigation (Thompson 1953: 46), a practice recommended by Plato (Laws, 761b-c, Kritias, 117b).

![Figure 127: Altar of the 12 Gods](image-url)
As the shrine is considerably older than these tree pits, they may represent replacement plantings; possibly there were plantings with the Kimon phase. No species is indicated, but Statius in his epic *Thebaid* (12.491-492, later first-century AD, Appendix 1) records the continued existence of a tiny urban grove of bay and olive. A reconstruction drawing (Figure 128) gives an impression of how the *agora* planes and the miniature sacred grove would have enhanced the buildings, although the siting of the planes is only tentative; they appear over widely spaced and insufficiently tall.

![Figure 128: North-western Agora](image)

Very close to the Twelve Gods stood the Eskhara shrine, making a sacred focus at this nodal point of the *agora*, where roads ran together. The planes and the tiny grove, clustering at this point, made one small urban green space. The *agora* greenery was already acting as public amenity space and status-boosting city embellishment; the ἄλσος added the sacred aura of a divine grove. It seems characteristic of Greek garden spaces to perform multiple functions, with different layers of meaning.

### 5.3.1: Sacred gardens: peripheral ring zone

Sacred green spaces associated with sanctuaries existed within the city and the immediate suburban area, but hard evidence for the classical period is elusive. Like all the city’s gardens, the sacred ἄλσος had long existed in the watered ring around the
city. Sophokles describes a grove at Kolonos (OK 10-40). There seems no reason to doubt the accuracy of Sophokles’ poetic description to his audience of Athenians, familiar with the site. In Sophokles’ description, there is no visible boundary, but its plantings are specified as bay, olives and grape vines - δάφνης, ἐλαίας, ἀμπέλου (14-18, Appendix 1) - cultivated plants which may well have signified a change from natural shrub and scrub cover to sacred, managed grove, thus acting as a form of boundary (Barnett 2007: 258). Sophokles remarks that the grove immediately seemed a pleasant place to sit and rest for Oidipous and Antigone, which accords with the picture of the sacred garden as a pleasant relaxation space (p. 40).

The terrain had not significantly altered when Pausanias referenced plentiful sanctuaries in the extramural deme of Kolonos Hippios (1.30.4). He makes no mention of a Eumenides’ grove, but does cite a grove of Poseidon and also an olive within other shrines (of the Muses, Hermes, Athene and Herakles). The area was well endowed with sacred spaces including groves, due to the underlying landscape. Kolonos Hippios consisted of a low hill surrounded by marshy soil, sufficiently close to the Kephisos to benefit from its water and silty soil deposits (p. 207; Figure 129).

The area’s sacred groves must have offered a green and shady contribution to the city’s sacred and amenity landscape during the Archaic and Classical periods. One specific cult associated with gardens existed in the southern, Ilissos-watered zone,
examined below. Not far away was the setting of Plato’s *Phaidros* (229a-c, 230b-c, Appendix 1), a location that was both literary and real, with trees, soft grass, sweet scent, the music of cicadas and appropriately home to a shrine of the Nymphs (Wycherley 1963: Travlos 1971: 289, 294 - fig. 382). Several sanctuaries are found on this southern periphery; given the location, some will have had gardens, but evidence is lacking.

5.3.2: Sacred gardens: Aphrodite ἐν κήποις

The tightly integrated association of Aphrodite with verdure (chapter 4.2.13-14) was exploited in a specific, apparently unique cult of Aphrodite in the Gardens, which almost certainly had two *loci* within the city. The nearest comparable site is on Cyprus, the place named Sacred Gardens (Hierokepia) dedicated to Aphrodite, in Paphos (Strabo, 14.6.3); the district still exists. Although Aphrodite’s links with Cyprus are ancient (Hesiod, *Th.* 192-200), Strabo’s late evidence is of association between the two rather than adoption of the same cult.

An inscription dated c. 426-422 (SEG 10.227, 80-81) names a sanctuary of Ἀφροδίτες ἐν Κέποις in a context of state loans; apart from this, the evidence is late (Pliny, Pausanias and Lucian125) and provokes confusion and disagreement. Pausanias 1.19.2 makes clear that the shrine described lay in the extra-mural area of the city known as The Gardens – *Kepoi* (see Figure 139, p. 226) close to the river, a fertile area providing many of the city’s gardens.

However, the ἐν κήποις shrine of Pausanias 1.27.3 (referred to in connection with the underground passage used by girls in the *Arrephoroi* rite) indicates a second sanctuary inside the city. The discovery of a sanctuary of Eros and Aphrodite on the North Face

---

124 The nearest purely Greek parallel is a reference in Athenaios (13.572f) to a sanctuary of Aphrodite in the Marsh (ἐν ἑλει) supposedly established on Samos during the fifth century by prostitutes in Perikles’ army.

of the Akropolis provided a solution; most scholars now accept Broneer’s identification as the city sanctuary (Figure 130). He further identified it as the destination of the Arrephoroi ritual\textsuperscript{126} (Broneer 1932: 50-54, Broneer 1935: 126).

![Figure 130: Sanctuary of Aphrodite and Eros, N face of Akropolis](image)

It is impossible to determine which of these shrines is the older and the name of the cult is equally difficult. The name of the suburban sanctuary could have been given because a second cult of Aphrodite en kepois, offshoot of the Akropolis one with that name, was established there. Alternatively, the name Kepoi could have been given with the adoption of the cult in Athens, the site chosen for its moist fertility, appropriate in view of the goddess’s associations. The Akropolis shrine would then have been secondary to the suburban one, like the Brauron sanctuary. External evidence does not exist to support either side. Pausanias describes a statue by Alkamenes in the suburban sanctuary (1.19.2); this fixes a date of the second half of the fifth century (assuming the statue was in its original location). The lettering on the Akropolis shrine inscriptions, one naming Eros and the other Aphrodite, is mid-fifth-

\textsuperscript{126} Pirenne-Delforge 1994: 51-52 for summary and citations.
century (Broneer 1932: 43-46); a statue of sixth-century style, possibly of Aphrodite holding an apple was discovered just below the sanctuary (Broneer 1938: 185-187).

It is very plausible that both a district and sanctuary to Aphrodite might be sited *en kepois* in the suburban zone because the landscape was rich and fertile. The word *κῆπος* is used in just this sense by Sophokles (*Frag.* 24, Appendix 1) to describe the fertile, productive land opposite Eu Boea. It seems more logical to site the primary sanctuary on fertile soil than on the rocky slopes of the Akropolis, although one of its springs is very near the site and pines and cypresses grow nearby today (Broneer 1932: 53). Despite Broneer’s assertion (Broneer 1932: 53) that some plantings would have made the Akropolis shrine appropriate to a goddess with *en kepois* attributes, the rocky nature of the Acropolis sanctuary seems inappropriate to the name as the primary site.

It is equally possible, however, that the rocky Akropolis site was the original; Greek gardening terminology is neither clear nor logical. Rosenzweig (2004: 29-44) argues that a third sanctuary may well have been associated with the *en kepois* fertility aspects of Aphrodite that were celebrated in the Akropolis sanctuary. The third potential site is Daphni, ten miles outside the city on the Eleusis road. It is physically like the Akropolis sanctuary, being rocky and open, with similar niches in the walls (Figure 131).

![Image removed for copyright reasons](image-url)

**Figure 131: Sanctuary of Aphrodite, Daphni**
The goddess is named in inscriptions and votive deposits of female genitalia, suggesting a healing function. Thus the form of worship of the goddess seems similar to that in the Akropolis shrine (pp. 218-220) and the landscape is certainly very similar. A rocky landscape does not preclude a kepos. Gardens of nymphs were normally given this designation and, although many were in watered, cool areas, nymphs of rocky landscape also had their gardens. In Vari, around 400, a sacred garden was established for the cave nymphs (IG 12784/13977, Appendix 1; Figure 132). Clearly in this steeply sloping rocky landscape, like the Akropolis and Daphni, no tall trees or lawns of soft grass are probable. However, it does support some trees and drought-tolerant shrubs, which probably fulfilled the garden aspect in such shrines.

Figure 132: Rocky, arid Vari landscape

Much of the argument about site primacy depends on the Arrephoroi connection. A different approach to the impasse of Pausanias’ grammar perhaps solves the contradictions, by suggesting that the girls’ route lay near the Akropolis shrine, rather than that the shrine was their destination (Kadletz 1982). The staircase leading down from the citadel to the Mycenaean spring begins its descent very close to the House of

---

127 Similar sacred plantings on another rocky site come from fourth-century Thessaly (SEG 1.247, 7-8, 11).
the Arrephoroi and fits the subterranean route of Pausanias 1.27.3 (Travlos 1971: 72, Broneer 1939: 428; Figure 133).  

Apart from proximity linking the Aphrodite and Eros sanctuary and the Arrephoroi rites, both sites and rituals also involved sexuality. Aphrodite and Eros are automatically linked with sex and numerous stone phalloi were found around their sanctuary (Broneer 1935: 119, 125-129, Broneer 1933: 346-347). The ‘mysterious objects’ of the rites are described by Athenaios (3.114a) as ἀνάστατος (rising, or standing up), whilst a scholion on Lucian (Deubner 1932: 10) says they were snake and phallus shaped.

128 Brulé (1987: 89-91) proposed that the cave shrine where the fountain passage exits at the foot of the rock (once identified as that of Aglauros) was the place where the Arrephoroi rites were celebrated; it is now known not to relate to Aglauros (Dontas 1983). Pirrenne-Delforge (1994: 57) suggests a dedication to Kourotrophos, whose connections with fertility accord with the mysterious objects carried by the Arrephoroi.
A later fifth-century pelike shows some phallic rite, which Broneer suggests may be linked with the Acropolis sanctuary (Broneer 1935: 132). Phalloi are ‘growing’ in a large pot into which a woman appears to sprinkle seed (Figure 134).

‘Garden’ rituals such as this are not improbable, given the stone phalloi recovered from the Akropolis sanctuary. The alabastron and sash on the wall have raised the suggestion of a domestic ritual context (Tiverios 2009: 127), but are more likely to indicate a sanctuary setting. Indeed, the suggestion was made long ago that some elements of the Adonia ritual (section 4.2.15-17) may have been adopted, such as the planting of the recovered ‘altars’ with phallic stones in the manner of the Adonis gardens (Broneer 1935: 132, f/n 2, Motte 1971: 145). Meritt concluded that both Eros’ Akropolis sanctuary festival and the Adonia were celebrated on the same day in mid-April, making a ritual link more probable (Meritt 1935: 572-575). There is sufficient similarity between the Adonis gardens and the pot-grown phalloi to indicate that the en kepois element of the Akropolis sanctuary may have consisted of container-grown phalloi, perhaps with plant material (leaves surround the base of the phalloi on the

---

129 The woman’s finger position indicates seed sowing and not the application of ‘some kind of sacred fertiliser’ (Tiverios 2009: 127). The Thesmophoria and the Haloa festivals, with agricultural resonances, are other possible ritual contexts.

130 Tiverios’ suggestion of a domestic garden wrongly assumes gardens in proximity to houses and relies upon a reference to women sacrificing in the garden in [Plato’s] Letters, which are unreliable in date, place and authorship.
pelike) or plantings in the ‘altars’ discovered by Broneer. A cup fragment (Figure 135) shows a similar scene: a woman kneels either to deposit or lift a pot of growing eyed phalloi.

Therefore, as far as the Athenian landscape is concerned, the two shrines of Aphrodite *en kepois* were sited on very different types of landscape: watered and fertile, rocky and dry. Nothing definite can be said about the nature of the gardens. However, most probably the ‘garden’ part of the Ilissos sanctuary was a meadow area, with the shade of trees - a garden in the more traditional sense like the Kolonos groves, whilst the Acropolis ‘garden’ was no more than ancient, sexually associated plantings in containers. Certainly, the garden elements on the two sites must have been very different, which argues for the *en kepois* designation as being primarily an attribute of the goddess as provider of vegetative, animal and human fertility, rather than a description of her site. Equally, whilst it is certain that both Eros and Aphrodite were worshipped at the Akropolis sanctuary, it cannot be proven that her cult title there was *en kepois*, although that is highly probable. In relation to the other types of sacred garden known, this specific cult has a direct association with women and their sexual attributes. The suburban sanctuary would, however, share the additional and probably ancient function of sacred gardens as amenity spaces, perhaps including sexual activity (section 4.2.14).
5.3.3: Sacred gardens: Hephaisteion

Although outside the period of this work, the plantings around the Hephaisteion are relevant because they provide the most definite, detailed material remains of sanctuary planting yet recovered; the techniques employed undoubtedly dated back hundreds, if not thousands, of years. This site was redeveloped in the early third century, including the formalisation of the peribolos wall and the installation of a new water system; this probably included the first plantings around the temple, although firm evidence attests two main planting periods. The earliest is row B, midway between the temple and the peribolos wall, dating from the very late Hellenistic period (Thompson 1937: 409-411; Figure 136).\textsuperscript{131} The evidence consists of ten almost complete large flower pots of two types, with basal holes (Figure 137).\textsuperscript{132}

These pots had been left in situ, most being completely undisturbed since their planting (Thompson 1937: 409). This enabled deductions to be made about horticultural techniques, focusing ideas on the original plantings, which then informed

\textsuperscript{131} Row C followed soon afterwards. D and A are even later.

\textsuperscript{132} The flower pots are catalogued in Thompson 1937: 406-408.
replanting choices. The pots were placed at the base of the pit, which was filled to the pot’s lip with a sifted soil and ash mixture.

This apparently bizarre practice of planting with pot, combined with the fact that the pots had all been broken, enabled a link to be made with passages of Cato and Pliny\textsuperscript{133} to deduce a technique of layered cuttings, which produces strongly-rooted scions for planting (Thompson 1937: 417-420). Obviously these authors post-date the late Hellenistic plantings; however, propagation by rooted cuttings was certainly practised earlier. It is attested in Theophrastos (\textit{HP} 2.1.3, 6.7.3; \textit{CP} 1.3.4, 1.4.1, 3.5.1, 3.5.3) and is frequently practised today. Newly-planted cuttings would need considerable watering. Perhaps the broken pot was retained around the root-ball, to direct water centrally around the trunk (where a shallow depression was probably maintained for the purpose). Hard potsherds would retain water longer than if it had complete freedom to spread through the soil.

Thompson’s evaluation of hole size, layering technique, soil and water conditions suggests that original plantings in row B were most probably bay, myrtle, box or small fruit trees (Thompson 1937: 422-425). It has been replanted with myrtle and pomegranate (Thompson, Griswold 1982: 12). There is evidence of gardeners’ care and concern to maintain healthy plants from the large size of some pits and the enlargement of others in row B; one hole contained two pots, indicating shrub replacement (Thompson 1937: 422). Much effort, expense and precious water must have been lavished on the garden\textsuperscript{134} which, on such an unpromising site, argues for a continued importance afforded to plantings in sacred areas. The pits display a formal regularity that was clearly designed to work in parallel with the columns of the temple.

It is probable that the greater formalisation of planting around this temple reflects influence from the regular planting practices of Persia (p. 209), with the introduction of aesthetic considerations into the traditional sacred grove. The garden’s designers

\textsuperscript{133} Cato, \textit{De Ag.} 51-52, 142; Pliny, 17.21.
\textsuperscript{134} Thompson (1937: 414) believes that it was probably known as a \textit{kepos}, based on analogy with Aphrodite \textit{en kepois}. The two sites and their associations are, however, not analogous.
chose to express the traditional sacred plantings in a way that increased the decorative effect and pleasant environment for human visitors to the temple. Shade and fragrant leaves would provide a pleasanter walk around the building, softening the harsh glare of the sun. Therefore, this garden should be considered as part of both sacred and public amenity gardens, providing in this tight urban spot a place of relaxation, in the same way as the spacious panhellenic sanctuary groves and the older, more natural groves of the city around its periphery (section 5.3.1). Like the agora plantings, sacred gardens functioned equally as pleasure gardens for mortal visitors.

5.4.1: Productive gardens: general

Productive gardens came in many forms: small private plots (for which very little evidence remains), larger privately owned or leased market gardens and (possibly the biggest contributor to feeding the city) leased temple plots used productively – a completely different type of sacred garden, discussed in section 3.3.2. Many of the private plots were outside the city, the location of others is unknown; almost all are known from horos inscriptions that provide minimal information. Epigraphic evidence from leased temple plots is scant, but offers more locational information and again indicates productive plots in the moist peripheral ring of the city.

An attempt by the city to reorganise sacred finances, beginning in 343/342, provides evidence of probably two sacred garden properties which, as they are being reorganised not established (Walbank 1983, Williams 2011), will also be relevant earlier. IG II² 1591 (part of Agora Lease L. 6, Col. II, 68-69135) refers to leased gardens in Agrai by the Ilissos - κῆπος ἐν Ἁγραίς ἠφίλισ[ω] (Walbank 1983a: 106) amended to κῆπος in (Williams 2011: 272). The deity who owned the plot is unknown. Walbank does not give a reason for the restoration of ἐν Ἁγραίς; it is presumably because the district is known to be ἠφίλιωτος (l. 69). Agrai is located south of the Ilissos, a little

135 As the line reference numbers vary in different publications, those used here are those of Lalonde, Langdon and Walbank 1991: 180-184.
downstream from the *Phaidros* sacred garden location (section 6.1.4), opposite the Kepoi district. Like Kolonos, this area is full of shrines, demonstrating the close link between watered land and the ritual landscape around the city.

From the same set of documents (*SEG* 33.167 - *Agora* Lease L. 6, Col. III, 159-160) comes probable evidence of a garden further out in the moist periurban zone, believed to belong to Artemis Brauronia;\(^{136}\) it read [Ἀρτέμιδος Βραυρωνίας? κῆπος Φαληρῶ[οί]. κῆπος is partially restored, but a garden in Phaleron is intrinsically probable; two streams from the surrounding uplands combine to form a small river debouching at the port. Xenophon (*Oik.* 19.6) refers to marshy ground (ἐλεί) there and Herodotos (5.63.4) records natural tree cover there being cleared for cavalry.

The area near Peiraeus is part of the city’s productive peripheral ring, known to have been marshy, though salty, in antiquity and indeed into relatively modern times. From here, a string of nine garden properties of an unknown deity is known from a later-fourth-century leasing document (*SEG* 33.168b, Col. II-III, 1, 6, 10, 15, 23). Although only five gardens survive, they are conveniently numbered, beginning with the fifth; the earlier four (and the name of the owner-deity) are lost. All are in the same area and, from the references to Mounykhion (part of Peiraeus), Walbank locates the gardens beside a road leading to Mounykhion (II. 6-7, 23-24); the renters come either from Peiraeus or Kerameikos (II. 12, 17, 20) which supports this location (Walbank 1983b: 185). Between entries 8 and 9 is a record of a marsh being rented (Ἐλος, l. 19), confirming the watered nature of the area and its full horticultural exploitation.

Each of these gardens is referred to as a κηπεῖον. Whilst the plural is used as an alternative for κῆπος, the singular is not recorded as an alternative for κῆπος. The word was possibly a diminutive: the fact that there are nine in the same area may well indicate that this area of moist soil was divided up into small, tightly packed patches to

\(^{136}\) This is an editorial reconstruction, since it forms part of a series with subsequent properties owned by this goddess (II. 164-165, 168-169; Walbank 1983a: 115).
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be intensively exploited for vegetable production, aimed at the voracious Athenian market. In one plot a mulberry tree was found (ἡ συκάμηνος, l. 10), so the land also supported at least this fruit and probably more.

5.4.2: Productive gardens: Kodros, Neleus and Basile

The garden for which most information is available was again near the Ilissos: within the shrine of Kodros, Neleus and Basile, recorded in a lease document (IG I2 84, part document Appendix 1), dated 418/417. The combination of cults can best be seen as some sort of heroic-kingly amalgam, with Neleus the principal figure. Evaluations have been made by Linders (1975), Wycherley (1960) and Wheeler (1887). Disputed locations of the shrine seem to have been resolved by the recovery of a horos stone reading ‘boundary of the shrine’, in situ on an ancient road and dated to mid-fifth century. This places the shrine just inside the city wall, between Travlos’ Itonian Gate XI and Halade Gate XII (Travlos 1971: 332-334; Figure 138). The fertile district of Κηποὶ (above 5.3.2) lay immediately outside the walls here and the temenos is likely to have shared these attributes (Figure 139).

Figure 138: South-eastern Athens
The decree requires the tenant to cultivate the land (ἐργάζεσθαι, l. 32), planting there no fewer than 200 young olive trees (φυτεύσαι φυτεύτερα ἔλαδον μὲ ὀλέζων ἐ διακόσια, ll. 33-34). φυτεύτερα is the word used for young, layered stock or cuttings, for example in Xenophon, Oik. 19.13, and Theophrastos, HP 2.2.4. The specification of newly propagated plants supports the interpretation of the decree as a restoration of productivity after the Peloponnesian War, particularly the sheltering of the Athenian rural population within the city’s sanctuaries and the destruction of planted land (Thucydides, 2.17.1, 2.21.2).

The site must have been surprisingly spacious for an intramural site; in addition to the specified 200, the tenant may plant more stock if he wishes (ll. 33-34). This decree is, therefore, a caveat against the perception of Athens as a place so arid that gardens were scarcely possible and does emphasise the concentration of garden plots within the watered periurban zone. Because of the Ilissos, this area of south-east Athens seems to have been the greenest area, set with gardens of all types. The garden-like
paradise of Plato's *Phaidros* (229a-c, section 6.1.4) was located here, deliberately set in a site that was green and watered.

The very tight, multi-participant complex regulation demonstrates the value attached to this land. The state, not the sanctuary, oversaw the rental and received the money (II. 6, 16-18). There were further specifications, however: the Basileos (II. 18, 22) was responsible for the sale of mud from a ditch, probably bordering the *temenos*, the revenue being paid to Neleus alone (II. 21-22). State officials fixed the contracts and the boundaries (II. 4-8). The money to enclose was originally to come from the sanctuary (II. 8-9), but an amendment placed that burden on the lessee (II. 13-14). These provisions, complete with names, sums and securities were to be written on an unknown wall (τοῖχον, II. 24-25), presumably a ἀλευκωμένος (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 47.4) and the decree itself upon a stele (II. 26-30).

The fact that even the ditch mud was sold (II. 21-22) underlines the very careful exploitation; the enclosure attests concern for demarcation and protection. Wycherley (1960: 62) notes that the ἐξοχαταλ indicates something sufficiently high or solid to deter intruders. The noun ἐξοκος is normally used for a solid wall, but can also be used for a hedge of spiky, protective species. The value of precious irrigation is shown by the clause granting the tenant control over both ditch and its rainwater (II. 34-37) within what was probably a catchment area (Wycherley 1960: 61). The sale of ditch mud implies a thorough ditching operation before leasing, to protect the newly planted land from run-off water.

Given that young olive stock will only be entering full production by the end of the period of tenancy (20 years, II. 37-38), the plot seems like the traditional, intensively managed orchard-garden, but with a newer emphasis on one specific crop, presumably because of its greater economic potential. The lessees would have to be from the wealthy elite; this was shown to be a feature of private and leased gardens in section 3.3.2. The control of such a large plot, with a long maturation period, would have been a clear status indicator, as proof of wealth. There are two further leased
temple gardens, on unknown sites in the city, which do not seem to fit the leased pattern, but where there are indications of an elite inner circle among the wealthy lessees.

The first, dating from slightly after mid-fourth century, is the endowment of a house and garden to Asklepios (IG II² 4969, Appendix 1). Demon, the property’s owner, made a condition that he should hold a priesthood. There are many questions about the nature of the cult and gift, but it is presumably a normal donation intended for leasing to gain revenue for the cult\(^\text{137}\) (Schlaifer 1943: 40-42). This interpretation would be confirmed if it is the same property referred to in Aeschines 1.12 (Schlaifer 1943: 42-43). Such identification, although unproven, would place the property in Kolonos, although Schlaifer believe that this is more likely to mean the intra-urban Agoraios, not extra-urban Hippios. If the property came equipped with a garden that was worth leasing for production, however, a location in the watered Kolonos is more probable than one within the industrial quarter of the city.

This lease strangely contains no conditions on the use of the land; these are normally found in leases of gardens for production. This is suggestive, especially as the endowment is apparently of a city house and garden together, which is a rare combination (pp. 106, 118-119). They may possibly have been separate; the wording indicating the same site (τὸν κήπον τῶν προσόντων) is a restoration (Schlaifer 1943: 39). Only one private house within the city with garden attached is recorded in literary sources (Isaios, 5.11), although here a garden was deliberately created on a demolished house plot.

Given the lack of lease conditions on crops, the garden was probably small, perhaps used for the cultivation of medicinal herbs. It is also possible that the house and garden were used to house Demon as priest, plus visitors or officials of the cult. In either event, the donor must have been a wealthy, influential individual to have owned such a prize plot and to have annexed the priesthood. The Demon lease has the

\(^{137}\) Houses were also used as a source of rental income, for example in Agora L6 above, Col. II, 71 and others in the Agora Leases.
feel of ‘insider dealing’. Lambert (1997: 222) in his evaluation of the second unusual city lease, describes such closed religious clubs as existing for the benefit of their members, who themselves benefitted from the leasing.

This second plot, recorded on SEG 24, 203 (Appendix 1), c. 330, has a garden alone leased by its orgeones, led by Kharops of Phaleron. On the basis of two later inscriptions on the same site (Travlos 1971: 573) the shrine is identified as that of a healer hero Iatros, referred to by Demosthenes (19.249). Some conditions are laid down: the lessee may build on the plot at his own expense (ll. 11-14); at the end of the lease, he may take away the roof tiles, door frames and doors (a common provision in building leases) if the lessees do not persuade him otherwise (ll. 16-23); this proviso is found elsewhere (for example, IThesp. 55, 24-26). Again, however, no provision is made to regulate tree planting or maintenance, as would certainly be expected if this were a productive orchard site like others considered in this chapter and in chapter 3.

The site of this garden is believed to lie away from the usual garden areas: in the northern section of the city, close to the shrine of Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratria (Travlos 1971: 168-169, 573), in the area of a drainage channel leading southward towards the canalised Eridanos. This may well be the water course referred to in the inscription: building is only allowed on land outside the water channel - ἐν τῶι χωρίῳ τῶι ἐξ ὕδωρ τοῦ ὄχετοῦ (ll. 15-16). This would offer the potential of water for irrigation, if the site were used as a productive space.

Paparzarkadas 2011: 191-193) translates κῆπος as orchard, but, in addition to the absence of cultivation conditions, the plot’s rental is unusually low and the period of lease a long 30 years (ll. 6-9). Given the requirement to keep the shrine pure (ll. 28-30), the garden was probably alongside the shrine, perhaps separated by the water channel of lines 15-16.

The function served by a building in the garden is unrecoverable, but it could well have been a habitable room and the same may be true of the Demon garden. There are parallels, but insecure in either reliability or location. An undatable testimonium to
Demokritos Abderita (*Testimonia, Frag*, 1, ll. 19-20, early fifth century), records that the philosopher secluded himself in a room in the garden around his house (τοῦ περικήπου δωμάτιον τι ἀποτεμόμενος κατάκλειστος ἦν); Demokritos, however, lived in Thrace, so this property is unlikely to have been in Athens; it is also a *post-eventum* report. Plato, when in Sicily in 361-60, is alleged to have lodged in the garden around the house of Dionysios ([Plato], *Epistolai*, 7.347a, 349d); but Dionysios was a Sicilian tyrant, not an Athenian religious club. Rooms around courtyards existed in Homeric epic, however, (*Od*. 1.425-427), so it is possible that the garden building of the Iatros shrine could have been used in this way. The setting of Euripides (*Electra*, 774-858) is clearly a room within a purely sacred garden acting as a venue for sacrificial feasting which offers a likely possibility for any Iatros garden building.

Some form of planting presumably existed in order to merit the term κῆπος. Both the unusual leased sacred gardens (to Demon and Iatros) were of healing cults, so perhaps medicinal herbs were grown. Yet the regulations imply that the building, not the garden, was important to the lessors, which at least requires questioning of its function. The Iatros garden might even have functioned as a sacrificial-plus-pleasure space for the benefit of the lessees and cult members alone (particularly for holding cult feasts) as might the Demon garden. In both cases, the members are likely to have been elite, or predominantly so and there is, therefore, a hint of a new type of amenity garden emerging, for a privileged few. This contrasts with the normal leased gardens, used productively, which represent the older type of intensively cultivated garden evidenced from Homeric times, though now with cultivation conditions more carefully prescribed; this expresses a determination by the state and the more socially privileged to exploit fully the fertile moist areas of the garden landscape.

The surviving evidence relates to these privileged individuals, not to the more humble, privately owned or rented productive garden of poorer citizens and metics (section 3.3.2, 3.3.4). Section 4.2.8 has drawn attention to the probable female presence in productive gardens, which should also be borne in mind. Not only would women frequently pick their own vegetables, either in their own plots or in the wild, but they
would also be the ones growing or seeking out medicinal herbs and plants for dyeing their domestic cloth (Theophrastos, *HP* 4.6.8). Therefore, resonances of both the privileged and the female will have continued to exist in Athens’ productive gardens.

5.5.1: Gardens of gymnasia and philosophy schools: the Academy

In the early fourth century, a new type of garden developed in Athens: those in which the developing philosophy schools arose and became formalised. This apparently novel institution was, in fact, a hybrid, developed from newer influences grafted onto the ancient, sanctuary-filled watered zone around the city, already mentioned as the home of many ancient shrines and groves (section 5.3.1). Unfortunately, all the literary sources for the development of gymnasia are late, but their authors did have access to earlier sources, now lost. There is also archaeological evidence; however, much of the earlier work is not properly published and almost all relates to later phases.

The area around the ancient shrine of the hero Akademos/Hekademos was chosen during Archaic times as the site for physical training. Demosthenes (24.114) depicts the three famous gymnasia of Athens as existing in Solon’s day, which seems improbably early; Delorme (1960), who has written the most detailed account of the development of gymnasia, discounts this reference. Reasonably secure is that some form of exercise area existed by the late sixth century (Delorme 1960: 36-38). Delorme’s dating relies on the Suda’s record that Hipparkhos’ wall around the Academy became proverbial for expensive projects (Appendix 1). Although this is a late, composite source, expensive display from Peisistratos’ son is very credible, as is the proverbial afterlife of such extravagance. There is some archaeological confirmation. The site, close to Kolonos Hippios, has been identified by a very late sixth-century *horos* stone recording the boundary of the Hekademeia (Travlos 1971: 42; Figure 140). The stone was sited on an undatable *peribolos* wall, which may be later than the reported wall of Hipparkhos, but is likely to enclose the same area.
Within the *peribolos*, a possibly open-air *peripatos* of Plato’s coterie lay at the northern end, with a later gymnasion to the south; the nature of Archaic and Classical exercise facilities is unknown. Whatever the later built facilities, in the Greek climate, exercise (especially running) would necessarily have taken place in naturally shaded areas. A skyphos (Figure 141) shows nude athletes or workmen, one with a pick, another with a bucket (perhaps sand), washing facilities and trees, all of which suggest the construction of a gymnasion *dromos*.

Diogenes Laertios (3.7) describes the Academy site as lying ἐν εὔσκιοις δρόμοισιν Ἑκαδῆμου θεοῦ. The noun δρόμος and adjective εὔσκιος (shadowy) underlines the link between exercise and the site’s shade. It lay close to the wandering Kephisos (pp. 207, 213), with natural tree and shrub growth. Deliberate plantings were possibly made by Hipparkhos along with the wall, and probably restored by Kimon, along with any structures, after the Persian destruction (Delorme 1960: 33, 51). Centuries later it was still famous for its ancient trees: Pliny (12.5) praised the Academy’s planes,
especially one ancient giant and Plutarch (*Sulla*, 12.3) described the ravaged site as the most wooded suburban area (δενδροφορωτάτην προαστείων). In the late fifth century, Aristophanes (*Clouds*, 1005-1008) describes races being run beneath sacred olives in the Academy. A scholion on *Frogs* (995, Appendix 1) explains Aristophanes’ phrase for ‘beyond the boundaries’ as recalling the row of olives at the end of the *dromos*. The *Clouds* citation also includes references to white reeds, smilax, white poplar, planes and elms and ἀπραγμοσύνης (below, p. 240), and to the pleasant atmosphere of the place.

Equally, it was still a sacred area, with new shrines being added. Apart from the later general evidence of Pausanias and Athenaios,¹³⁸ Pausanias (1.30.1) also describes an altar to Eros, dedicated by Charmos in the mid-sixth century, ‘in the shady boundaries of the gymnasion’ (ἐπὶ σκιεροίς τέρμασι γυμνασίου). There was an altar to Hermes; a poem recording its dedication (Anakreon, *Epig.* 6.144), located it in the Academy. The Academy site, extra-mural and therefore more spacious, was exploited in other ways: parts of the site were occupied for military training. In 405 the Spartans camped in the grounds and further troop activity was recorded for 370 (Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.8, 6.5.49). Doubtless there were many more, albeit unrecorded.

The Academy was, therefore, plentifully used: there were sacred groves, exercise areas and troop assemblies, as well as productive gardens. Additionally, it became attractive to the Socratic philosophers. From the fourth century, they found this the ideal venue for their form of mental exercise, creating their own space in the ‘garden’ of the Academy, adding a new function to this multi-level site. Diogenes Laertios (3.7) reports of Plato that:

> Having returned to Athens, he lived in the Academy, which is a gymnasion outside the walls, in a grove named after a certain hero Hecademus,
> (trans. Hicks, 1972)

¹³⁸ Pausanias 1.30.2, Athenaios 13.609d. A scholion on *OK* 56 describes other shrines.
Undoubtedly, the cool and shady environment, with easy access to paths for walking and talking was the prime reason for Plato’s choice. Another is likely to have been the regular presence of young men to engage in discussion and disputation. The mental and the physical were, in any event, aspects of the same training. Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* of Socrates (1.2.4, 1.2.19, 1.2.23, 1.3.5, 2.1.20 etc.) emphasises the physical and mental: bodily strength and sound judgement attained through philosophy, both part of the ideal citizen’s education. Possibly Socrates preceded Plato on the site. Diogenes Laertios (3.6) described Plato as a pupil of Socrates although adds the characteristic rider φασίν. Uncertainly reliable is Xenophon’s description of Socrates spending his morning in the τοὺς περιπάτους καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια (*Mem.* 1.1.10), presumably those of the Academy; there is nothing improbable in this scenario.

Although the physical exercise facilities had been increasingly used by a wider social group with the arrival of the democracy (Fisher 1998), the philosophical school must only have been a possibility for citizens sufficiently wealthy to allow leisure to their young men, thus carrying elite associations.

What became known as Plato’s Academy garden (meaning the developing ‘school’ and the place in which it operated) is nowhere described, but is most likely to have been a park-like area, with plentiful trees, around the *peripatos*, little different from the rest of the Academy area. Delorme (1960: 334-335) thinks it possible that the name of the later Peripatetic philosophers derives from these ‘walks in the park’ rather than from a habit of strolling around a *peripatos*.¹³⁹ A philosophy ‘school’ would need considerable lengths of path running beneath the trees and these would have required regular maintenance to keep paths clear of superfluous growth and the trees from encroaching.¹⁴⁰

---

¹³⁹ He bases this on an inscription from Pergamon referring to teaching within a *peripatos*, but this example seems remote and does not indicate a garden setting. Teaching in a ‘garden’ space is well-attested and he also cites the gymnasium and *peripatoi* of the notorious ship of Hieron in Sicily (Athenaios, 5.207d). Here, however, κηποί are described as being in the area (ἐν οίς), not being equalled to it, so this attractive theory rests unproven.

¹⁴⁰ See p. 238 for evidence of maintenance in Theophrastos’ garden.
The hydria in Figure 142 offers a further clue. It shows athletes showering after exercise, which may indicate some built facilities at that date (or reflect the Kerameikos baths). Two athletes are washing beneath the panther-head spouts of a small fountain-house, but the garden interest lies outside. On each side, two men are talking, whilst their clothes and aryballoi hang on convenient trees. These trees are clearly trained cultivars, rather than the specimens characteristic of a park. Again they have been top-grafted (section 2.1.4) and appear to be olives (possibly fruit trees), with the ‘generic’ branches seen within the female fountain-house scenes (section 4.2.5-6).
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**Figure 142: Athenian bf hydria, 550-500**

The normal caveats on the reading of vase iconography must equally be applied here: we cannot be sure it represents a real gymnasion bathing scene, nor that the existing associations of fruiting with the κῆπος were not a conceptual contribution, but this is less probable as men are shown. It opens the possibility that the garden of the Academy also grew productively; indeed, logic would suggest it was a probability. No cultivable land in Athens was neglected and, with large numbers attending the gymnasion and the philosophy school, the demand for food in the area would certainly exist. Productive trees and, indeed, harvesting of at least wild vegetable plants within the Academy are a strong probability.

There is also the question of Plato’s personal garden. Whilst the sources for this are all very late, they are multiple and all record slightly different aspects, as if recording handed-down versions from varying sources. Diogenes Laertios (3.5, reporting the
Hellenistic Alexander Polyhistor) says that, although Plato first worked in the Academy, he later taught in a garden at Kolonos (εἶτα ἐν τῷ κήπῳ τῷ παρὰ τὸν Κολωνόν). Presumably, given the closeness of Kolonos to the Academy, this is the same garden recorded in Diogenes Laertios (3.20) as bought for Plato: κηπίδιον αὔτῷ τὸ ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ πρώισθαι. Yet another late source, Plutarch (Mor. 603b) says that Plato’s dwelling was a little plot of land (χωρίδιον) in the Academy, where he made a garden, presumably the same site. Reference is also found from Xenokrates (Frag. 11, in Aelian, Varia Historia, 3.19), where an irritated, elderly Plato goes off to philosophise in his garden. If he studied and taught in this garden, then it must have been designed to have the same park-like aspect as the Academy, probably on a smaller scale. The orator Hypereides, in a tantalisingly fragmentary passage dated c. 323 (In Dem., Frag. 6.26) relates that a previous overseer of the Academy gymnasion had taken a spade (σκαφεῖον) from the palaistra into his own garden nearby and used it. This fragment adds to the picture of an area that continued to be rich in gardens of all types.

5.5.2: Gardens of gymnasia and philosophy schools: Lykeion and Kynosarges

The early Hellenistic traveller Heraklides Kritikos\(^{141}\) comments that all three gymnasia had a thick cover of trees and grass. Thus the two other Classical gymnasia and their philosophers’ gardens shared the Academy’s landscape, but in the southern area of the city. Much less is known about them.\(^{142}\) Again, they were both located alongside sanctuaries: the Lykeion to Apollo Lykeios (Pausanias 1.19.3, scholion on Demosthenes, 24.114, Plutarch, Mor. 724c) and the Kynosarges to Herakles (Herodotos, 5.63.4, 6.116.1, Pausanias, 1.19.3, Plutarch, Them. 1.2). Both developed on large open spaces, which continued to exist alongside buildings and dromoi. The open ground is evidenced by Aristophanes (Peace, 354-356 and scholion on 356, Appendix 1) which cite the use of the Lykeion grounds for military training in the late fifth century. Xenophon (Hipparkh. 3.6) records cavalry manoeuvres there about fifty

\(^{141}\) In Dikaiaerkhos, Geographi Graeci Minores: 1.1.
\(^{142}\) For their early history, see (Delorme 1960: 42-49, 54-61. They existed in the fifth-century in some form and may date back earlier.
years later and military assemblies in or close by (Xenophon, *Hell. 1.1.33, 2.4.27*).
Riding also took place on the Kynosarges grounds (*Andocides, On the Mysteries, 61*).
On these moist areas, trees would have grown naturally and the development into park-like areas with paths is almost certain.

The location of both these gymnasia parks is fairly reliably identified. Pausanias (1.19.2-3) mentions the Kynosarges, then the Lykeion, directly after the *Kepoi* district.
On the basis of inscriptive evidence and archaeological remains, Travlos (1971: 340, 345; fig. 379) places the Lykeion just outside the southern city wall on land running down to the Ilissos, a level site for riding and racing along the *dromoi*. This accords with Strabo (9.1.19) who places it near the Gates of Diokhares and a κατηγορία (either the fountain of Panops or springs supplying the Eridanos) and with Plato (*Lysis, 203a*).
Travlos (*loc. cit.*) locates the Kynosarges opposite *Kepoi* and the shrine of Neleus (section 5.4.2), on the south bank of the Ilissos, just south-west of Agrai. Pseudo-Plato, *Axiokhos, 364a* (Hershbell, 1981) places it near the Kallirhoë (see Figure 139, p. 226).

Trees would have been the most important feature on both sites, in both gymnasia and the later philosophy schools (Aristotle at the Lykeion, c. 334, Antisthenes in the early fourth century at the Kynosarges). Plutarch (*Mor. 841d*) records that the orator Lykourgos planted trees in the gymnasion he had constructed - the Lykeion.
Theophrastos, Aristotle’s successor, was impressed by the vast root system of a plane growing by a water channel there (*HP 1.7.1*). Plutarch (*Mor. 635b*) also distinguishes between the Lykeion’s κήπος and περίπατος and he certainly had earlier texts at his disposal.

Just as Plato’s own garden eventually became the location of his school, Theophrastos’ personal garden (*ἰδιων κήπον*, Diogenes Laertios, 5.39) came to house the Peripatetics at the end of the fourth century. Theophrastos’ will (Diogenes Laertios 5.51-52) includes provision for rebuilding the Mouseion, believed to have been damaged by military activity in the early third century, and the *horoi* of this Mouseion have been identified (Figure 143), providing independent evidence. The garden lay
north of the Lykeion, near the Gate of Diokhares (Vanderpool 1953-1954; Figure 139, p. 226).
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Figure 143: Horos of Museion, Theophrastos' garden

The will states that the Mouseion had a small colonnade (στωίδιον, also to be repaired) and statues in the garden, as well as shady walks and paths; these are not mentioned but must be inferred, and areas growing plants for scientific study and/or consumption are possible. Theophrastos bequeathed this garden and its houses as a communal philosophers’ home (5.52-53). The will also gives a unique hint of the care and maintenance these ‘philosophy gardens’ must have required. The occupiers and Pompyllos (a manumitted slave) were responsible for overall supervision of both buildings and garden. Two further slaves, Manes and Kallias, were manumitted on condition that they stay four years working (συνεργασαμένους) in the garden. This adds to other evidence (p. 113) that gardeners were often manumitted slaves.
5.5.3: Gardens of gymnasia and philosophy schools: the word κῆπος

Given the late dating of sources for the gardens of the philosophy schools, it is impossible to know whether the word κῆπος was used from the beginning, or whether the name developed with the places themselves. It is, in any event, interesting to consider why this particular word was selected to describe the type of landscape that we would call a park, because it illuminates the Greek understanding of the word.

One possibility is that, once Plato had transferred his teaching to his private garden, the name of his piece of ground became attached to the school, thence to the other Schools. A second possibility can be found in a fragment of Sophokles (Frag. 24, Appendix 1), which uses κῆπος as a metaphor for fertile productive land in general (p. 216). Perhaps, therefore, the philosophy ‘gardens’ gained their name purely because of the nature of the moist, fertile landscape. The Athenian Kepoi suburb lay in the south of the city, close to the Lykeion and Kynosarges, in a situation similar to that of the Academy in the north-west, suggesting that this more metaphorical explanation may be relevant.

A third potential reason for the designation κῆπος is as a metaphor for a life of studious retreat. Several sources indicate that philosophers were felt to belong in gardens. The undatable testimonium to the philosopher Demokritos (pp. 229-230) says that, being φιλόπονος, he secluded himself in a separate room in (probably) a colonnade around his garden (τοῦ περικήπου δωμάτιον). Apart from the Xenokrates reference to Plato retreating ἐν τῷ κῆπῳ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφεῖ (p. 236), as late as Plutarch (Mor. 789b) philosophers and gardens (here Epicurean) were closely associated (η τινα τῶν ἐκ τοῦ κῆπου φιλοσόφων). In the late fourth century, the Academy’s head, Polemo, withdrew to the Academy’s garden, with his students huddled around him (Diogenes Laertios 4.19); the participle (ἐκπεπατηκώς) seems to define him as a philosopher by his garden walking. At the same time, the philosopher Timon was a garden-lover, and extremely uninvolved with public life, as if
It were a logical corollary (φιλόσοφος καὶ φιλόκηπος ἴν σφόδρα καὶ ἰδιοπράγμων, Diogenes Laertios 9.112).

This interesting characteristic contrasts with the publicly over-occupied citizen who displayed πολυπραγμοσύνη, which in Perikles’ day had been a virtue (Thucydides 2.40.2). It is probably only coincidence that ἀπραγμοσύνη was the name of a weed growing in the Academy (scholia on Aristophanes, Clouds, 1007, Appendix 1). By the changed political times of Plato and later philosophers, being ἰδιοπράγμων was probably defensible, even commendable; it is not the idleness of ἀπραγμοσύνη, but a focus on personal study in a more individualistic age. If the garden had been associated earlier with private retreat, a green ‘ivory tower’, then that would be an interesting additional metaphorical resonance of the word.

There are some hints that Plato himself thought κῆποι, gymnasia areas and philosophy were long associated, presumably because of the mental training. Imagining the world of ancient Athens, he linked gymnasia and gardens in the same location (Kritias, 112c, 117c). In a complex analogy between good husbandry and good literary and philosophical art, Plato refers to a highly metaphorical Garden of Letters - τοὺς μὲν ἐν γράμμασι κήπους (Phaidros, 276d). This may indicate an existing conceptual link between the horticultural and the literary, but may also be back-projection.

There is a fourth, perhaps a most persuasive reason, for the designation of the park-like philosophy gardens as κῆποι and one that would establish the use of this word ab initio. This is the question of inspiration. There is a close connection between the κῆπος and divine inspiration, attested from the Shrine of the Nymphs at Vari, where the priest of the cult, Arkhedemos, described himself as ὁ νυμφόληπτος, a state explored by Connor (1988, IG I² 784/1³ 977). Plato describes the same state in Phaidros: seeking inspiration, ‘Socrates’ chose the specific garden locus and was rewarded by divine fluency (ἐὔφοια, 238c-d, 241e). The riverine site was acting in
exactly the same way as the Academy ‘garden’, although the nymphic site was targeted also for the specific forthcoming dialogue.

In 245a Plato describes inspired possession and frenzy specifically coming from the Muses (ἀπὸ Μοῦσῶν κατοικωχή τε καὶ μανία, also 265b). In Ion 533e-534-c, he depicts poetry pouring forth under divine possession. The resulting honeyed lyrics are gathered from the sweet springs of the Muses’ gardens (ἀπὸ κρηνῶν μελιρρύτων ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων). Although Plato himself may have placed more faith in philosophy than poetic inspiration, the venue might equally inspire him to the former. Both Plato and Theophrastos established Mouseia in their ‘philosophy gardens’ (Diogenes Laertios, 4.1, 5.51), no doubt in the hope of precisely this reward. An interesting citation from the Middle Comedy poet, Machon (Frag. 18, 402-407, Appendix 1) tells of a meeting with Euripides in an unspecified garden. Hanging from his belt was a writing tablet and stylus, which strongly suggests that he was in the garden hoping for inspiration. Therefore, of all the factors that might have contributed to the designation of the philosophy gardens as κῆποι, despite appearing more akin to ἄλση, the link with inspired speech and words seems to be the strongest, with the other interpretations contributing to this multi-layered word. In this case, the park-like spaces were probably κῆποι from their very beginning.

Some aspects of these κῆποι were uncharacteristic for Greece, representing an additional feature of the Persian influence already seen in the plantings of Kimon and the Hephaisteion (sections 5.2.1. 5.3.3). Xenophon is the first Greek author to describe the παράδεισοι. Whilst it is clear that these park-gardens fulfilled many functions, three features specifically recall the Greek ‘philosophy gardens’. The first is the emphasis on plentiful fine trees, described in Oikonomikos. In a highly literary ‘conversation’ about estate management, ‘Socrates’ is told that the παράδεισοι must be supplied with fine trees (4.14). Further, what the visiting Lysander admired in Kyros’ παράδεισος at Sardis was their straight and regular layout, which seemed beautiful to him; the words used are ἰσοῦ, ὀρθοὶ, στίχοι (4.21).
The second relevant feature is the use of the παράδεισοι as military assembly grounds. In *Anabasis*, Kyros reviews his Greek mercenaries in a παράδεισος (1.2.9); later, they camped near a thickly wooded one (2.4.14) and the Persian army in another (2.4.16). Although the Academy ‘garden’ would have been naturally tree-covered long before Plato, it is highly probable that descriptions of the παράδεισοι plantings influenced subsequent layouts, with alignments influenced by the Persian model. Delorme (1960: 37, 42, 46) notes that earlier strong traditions link the gymnasia with the Peisistratids, who were very likely to be familiar with the παράδεισοι. These factors give clues that the plantings and paths within the gymnasia and Schools’ gardens are likely to have been much altered from the natural state, with aesthetic considerations applied and the site reorganised into straight alleys of trees and paths. Probably the imaginative reconstruction of the Academy garden by Barbiè du Bocage (Figure 144) is not far from the truth, albeit the shape of the perimeter wall and location of surviving buildings were then uncertain.

Thirdly, it is relevant that the tomb of Kyros lies within the παράδεισος at Pasargadae, planted with trees exactly as Plato described the tombs of his ‘Examiners’ (Arrian, *Ana.* 6.29.4, 143 *Laws,* 247e). The tomb has been archaeologically recovered (Stronach 1964). Plato’s decision to be buried within the Academy garden was almost

143 Arrian’s account is very late, but derives from Aristobulos’ eye-witness account; he saw the site in the company of Alexander the Great.
certainly inspired by the Persian prototype; he was followed by Theophrastos (and no
doubt many others) within the gardens of their Schools (Diogenes Laertios, 3.41, 5.53).
According to Plutarch, the orator Lykourgos was also buried in the garden of the
philosopher Melanthios (Mor. 842e). All are likely to have been marked by small
groves and the imported Persian practice of garden tombs would have added to the
long-existing sacred connotations of the site.

As in the examples of the agora plantings and the older elite orchards of chapter 3,
however, on Greek soil the latest waves of influence from further east were not
adopted in original form. Aspects were appropriated and transformed into the native
mentalité and socio-political environment. It was the idea of park-like spaces for
walking, talking and thinking that was attractive to the Socratic philosophers. Yet the
venue was no longer a private, elite estate, but the city’s age-old watered zone, long
filled with sanctuaries and productive gardens. Nor was the space to be enjoyed by
one man and his coterie, but had a wider and more public use, although still for the
more leisured classes. Equally, the function of the ‘philosophy gardens’ was very
different: no longer for private enjoyment alone, but for mental exercise and the
education of Athens’ leading citizens.

Therefore, the ‘philosophy gardens’ were a combination of native elements and
outside ideas about the planning and use of garden spaces, an attachment of new
functions onto old, to create a new sort of garden. It was one where the older elite
association were certainly present, but diluted to a considerable degree and where the
space served the additional function of an amenity space, or pleasure garden.

5.6: Domestic plantings

The limited evidence available shows that houses with gardens attached, such as are
part of normal experience in the modern western world and in a Roman urban
environment, were unusual in ancient Greece, depending on area (Carroll-Spillecke
1989, Carroll-Spillecke 1992, Osborne 1992a). In Athens, they appear to have been
extremely rare, no doubt due to the physical background. The house-garden pattern seems more common elsewhere in the Greek world, such as Tegea (Osborne 1992a: 377-778, *Sylloge*³, 306).

So far, no domestic garden in the city has been archaeologically recovered. The material remains of houses that have been excavated are slight and often under-reported, but the tightly packed houses, affording no space for gardens, do not seem essentially different from those of better excavated sites, such as Olynthos or Halieis.¹⁴⁴ The courtyards of all these houses have consistently failed to yield evidence for garden use. This does not mean that they were devoid of greenery for which evidence does not survive, or has not yet been recovered. Much of this section is, therefore, speculative, opening up possibilities; arguments from probability, mentioned in section 4.1.1, are relevant also here.

The courtyard of any Greek house is an interesting, multi-functional space (section 4.2.1-2): it can be used for industrial working, ritual, washing, food storage, processing and preparation. In this latter role it would function as a garden: in any traditional society, the garden is where the messy preparatory stages of turning plants and animals into food take place. There is no doubt that much of this took place in the courtyards of Athenian houses, with material being brought in from plots on the edges of the city or from the market.

Inherent probability, evidence from all southern European societies and flower pots in domestic contexts suggest that courtyards were also planted spaces. The question of gender segregation within Greek, especially Athenian, houses is much debated, especially because of the very limited space. Studies of the household (Nevett 2010: esp. chapter 3, 1999: 156-157, Morgan 2010: 168, also 121) argue for a more flexible interpretation of rooms and courtyard, with multiple functions occurring within a single space, using some form of screening. Insight about how these spaces were used can come from anthropological parallels (for example, Walker 1993: 81-91). Plants

¹⁴⁴ See Nevett 1999, Morgan 2010, Jones 1975 for surveys of domestic sites.
would be ideal for this function, particularly in association with courtyards or doorways. Nevett (1999: 68-69), considering mostly the Olynthian evidence, emphasises the courtyard’s dominating role in accessing different parts of the house. She argues that courtyards and the columned areas (*pastas, prostas* and the later, more luxurious peristyles) seem to have made up a unified space, used by women. This is based upon a similarity of material remains associated with female labour, such as loom-weights, storage vessels and cisterns. The ‘transverse hall’ behind the columns, light and airy, shady in summer, is particularly associated with food preparation and weaving (Ault 2000: 489). This area is relevant to gender separation for it would provide a semi-screened vantage point and place for retreat when necessary. Shrubby plants as well as textiles could have helped to screen and shade (Morgan 2010: 121); planted in large pots, they would allow flexibility of location; climbing plants like vines were perhaps directly planted. The *pastas* area were mostly on the north side of the court (Ault 2000: 488); thus deciduous vines would afford maximum shade in summer and light in winter.

Athenian houses are not as regular as those in well-excavated sites like Olynthos and Halieis, but potential plant sites alongside small columned spaces around the courtyard do occur, although they do not show the transverse hall pattern. In the fifth-century phase of house C in the industrial district alongside the Great Drain, access from the entrance passage to the court and further rooms is clearly essential, but the separation of passage from court is uncertain (Figure 145). Both a wall or a portico and column, as restored by Jones, are possible. In the latter case, women could work in the more easterly part of the court, unseen by visitors to the rooms at the end of the corridor, being screened by shrubby or climbing plants in large pots in strategic places, including the column.

![Figure 145: House C, 5th cent, industrial district](image-url)
A classical house near North East Gate VII (6 Aristeides Street), has a double colonnade (probably partially supporting access to an upper floor) in front of an identified *andron* (Jones 1975: 93-95; Figure 146). A possibility is climbing plants in large pots against these columns, adding fresh greenery, even fruit, shading the *andron* entrance and helping to conceal women’s movements in the south and east areas of the courtyard.

![Figure 146: House at 6 Aristeides St.](image)

The north-east complex of the mid-fifth century block on the north slope of the Areopagos has a room facing east to the courtyard, which is closed only by a single column (Jones 1975: 80-82; Figure 147). It is thus acting like a transverse passage room: a secluded but light working space and one where column-climbing or shrubby plants grown in large pots would help screen the room from the court. Also, the courtyard has a rectangular pit, which could have housed a directly planted shrub or small tree that would cut off the large room behind it to the south. This may have functioned as a space used by women (although the restricted light levels preclude much work). Lying to the south of the court, it would have provided shaded courtyard work space to the north, west and east. A similar pit is found obliquely in front of the household door in the south-east complex and a third at an imprecise site in the same roadway.
However, the function of these pits is contested. They have been interpreted as cess pits (Thompson 1959: 101, Jones 1975: 82, Owens 1983: 47), particularly the one on the street. Ault (1999) identified such *koprones* in houses A, 7 and D at Halieis, arguing that *koprones* were pits for all kinds of rubbish as well as manure, accounting for the large numbers of pottery and tile pieces found as pit fill. The depth and capacity of the Halieis pits (1.00-1.5 m) is slightly larger than the Athenian examples (Hoepfner, Schwandner 1994: 97 for Olynthos). No interpretation of these pits is without problems: if they are *koprones*, then the absence of considerable organic material and their location is surprising: in the Athenian example, it is inconveniently in front of the main house door rather than further along the wall. In the Halieis examples, they lie within the court and, in House D, the proposed *kopron* takes up approximately a quarter of that tiny area. In all cases, it seems self-defeating to keep rubbish and manure within the busy domestic court, taking space and attracting flies, and more logical to cart it outside the property. Storage pits are a further possibility here. Equally, if they are planting pits again the shortage of organic material is relevant, unless the rubbish was depoited much later, when the tree and the organic material
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145 There is, however, some evidence for this in a citation of Eubulos in Athenaios, 10.417d.
had disappeared. Their size also seems excessive and their stone lining strange for planting purposes, although the latter does recall the planting within broken flower pots at the Hephaisteion (section 5.3.3) and paving might prevent root damage to nearby walls. Planting for a small, shade-giving tree or vine should not be excluded, especially in the Athenian door-framing case; the pit is oblique to the door, ideal for a vine trained up the right hand side. Vase paintings such as Figures 14 and 15 (p. 35) showing Herakles relaxing under a shady vine, and a trained olive bower, show that such features existed and were appreciated as cool, leafy retreats.

Flower pots are certainly known and pots of herbs, flowers and small shrubs must have been common everywhere; they are referred to by Theophrastos. Unfortunately the evidence is slight from Athens, where intensive occupation layers have militated against the survival of material remains. Several flower pots have been found at Olynthos, subject to a relatively sudden abandonment and destruction in 348, which left far larger quantities of material remains. Flower pots are certainly known in Athens from the later Hephaisteion plantings (section 5.3.3) and ones similar to the Olynthian examples must have existed during the Classical period.

The Hephaisteion and Olynthian pots have a variety of shapes and sizes, shown on Tables 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reference no.</th>
<th>height</th>
<th>rim dimension</th>
<th>Thompson’s class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5a</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>between A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5b</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10a</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10b</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11/P6978</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>between A and B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Hephaisteion flower pots (Thompson 1937: 404-409)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ref. no.</th>
<th>height</th>
<th>top dia.</th>
<th>base dia.</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>shape</th>
<th>suggested use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>medium-large pot, perhaps flower pot, from Villa of Good Fortune</td>
<td>deep rather than wide; slight taper</td>
<td>small shrub, cuttings or herbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>small pot, probably a flower pot, small hole in bottom, from west slope of East Spur Hill</td>
<td>squat</td>
<td>seed sowing, seedlings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>large pot with hole in bottom, from House of Many Colours, room a</td>
<td>squat</td>
<td>possibly small shrub, cuttings or herbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>small, rough flower pot, cup moulded onto plate, from House of Many Colours, room a,</td>
<td>almost as wide as deep; wider at base than top</td>
<td>seed sowing, seedlings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>large pot, very roughly made, hole on side, from House B-VI-9, room g</td>
<td>squat</td>
<td>small shrub, cuttings or herbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>large flower pot, very roughly made, hole in bottom, from House B-VI-9, room h</td>
<td>squarish shape</td>
<td>small shrub, like myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>large flower pot, hole in bottom, from House B-VI-9, room j</td>
<td>squat</td>
<td>small shrub, like myrtle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Olynthos flower pots (Robinson 1950: 415-417, plates 22, 250-252; Robinson and Graham 1938: 55-63)

As the Hephaisteion ones housed young shrubs, they help to interpret the domestic Olynthian examples. Suggestions have been made for their use; four or five are of a comparable size to the Hephaisteion ones (Figure 137, p. 221) and thus appropriate
for small shrubs. The Hephaisteion pots have similar proportions to modern pots, but several Olynthian examples are wider, but shallower than is normal today, which could indicate seedling production or young cuttings (Figure 148).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images removed for copyright reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 148: Flower pots, Olynthos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their discovery sites are interesting, with the caveat that items may have been displaced from their original location. The recovered pots come from three houses, which may mean that they were particularly used in those properties. However, other large containers were used for planting: lebes gamikoi, a loutrophoros, half amphorae and other shapes are shown in vase paintings of wedding vessels and the Adonia (sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.15) and there is every reason to assume that they were used on other occasions.

Room a of the House of Many Colours (pots 1037 and 1038) seems to have worked with room b as a functional combined workroom, with similar flooring, pottery and loom-weights in both areas (Robinson 1946: 183-206, pl. 158). The quantity of pottery and loom-weights and the position of room a behind, and entered by, the pastas indicate a female work or storage space. The flower pots are suitable for a small shrub or culinary herbs and for seed sowing, which seems appropriate.

House B-VI-9 provided three pots: 1040 (room g), 1041 (room h), 1042 (room j) (Robinson 1946: 146-155, pl. 124). Of these, g was a separate shop; the function of h is unknown, but it was entered through e, which is an extension of the pastas; j was probably a workroom. Pots 1041 and 1042 seem likely to be associated with female
labour and may have housed a small myrtle or similar. On the other hand, h would be too dark for a shrub to grow, but it could have been brought into the room from the courtyard to cut branches for use in ritual; the court would provide plenty of light. Pot 1035, appropriate for a small shrub or herbs, came from an unknown location in The Villa of Good Fortune.

Reber raises a further possibility about the use of potted plants, using evidence from a house at Eretria, Euboea. Two large circular holes appear in the stylobate blocks in the peristyle court of the House of Mosaics, dating from the second quarter of the fourth century (Reber 2010: 9-14, Ducrey, Metzger, Reber 1993: 32, 38-39). The holes’ diameter is large: 50 cm; wells have been precluded (Figures 149, 150). He suggests that they might have housed large pots of flowers or herbs and cites the Hephasteion example. If he is correct, this would be a fascinating addition to our knowledge of potted growing. However, the size of the pots would be considerably larger than any recovered so far and would have contained sizeable shrubs or trees, rather than flowers or herbs; these would make an attractive addition to the courtyard. However, no such evidence has yet been recovered from Athens and the suggestion cannot be proven.

Image removed for copyright reasons

Figure 149: Peristyle court, House of Mosaics, Eretria

The diagonal wall, running NNW-SSE and ending on the western cavity belongs to a different building phase (Ducrey, Metzger, Reber 1993: 40-41, figs. 25, 39).
Potted cultivation in a Mediterranean climate requires plentiful water, no doubt recycled from used kitchen supplies, making the association with female work space in the House of Many Colours and House B-VI-9 unsurprising. Equally, tending the pots was almost certainly a female occupation. A few pots are appropriate for growing a small myrtle, much used in ritual decoration, again a female preserve (section 4.2.1). There is no reason to believe that Athens was fundamentally different from Olynthos and every reason to believe that pots of greenery were found within many Athenian homes, serving practical horticultural and decorative functions, plus the provision of screening and shade. They would also contribute to a pleasurable domestic environment, particularly for its female inhabitants.

5.7: Natural gardens and water-gathering

Apart from these domestic plantings, other garden spaces of the city would have been enjoyed by both genders, albeit at different times or occasions: some women worked in productive gardens (section 4.2.8) and they were found in many sanctuary gardens (sections 4.2.9-14). Other garden spaces, however, were exclusively male, especially the ‘philosophy gardens’, at least until the time of Epikouros. Although female traders
existed, the _agora_ was essentially a male space. Notably, the ‘philosophy gardens’ and the _agora_ were prestigious civic spaces.

In chapter 4, women were shown to be linked with natural gardens – vegetation growing spontaneously around any natural moisture, creating a gentler, shadier and cooler environment. They were clearly the most ancient type of green space, and in almost all traditional societies, were spaces predominantly associated with women. They were probably not called κῆποι, but may be considered ‘gardens’ in a less formal sense; plant management was necessarily involved and the harvesting of branches for ritual or practical use. Further, there can be little doubt that such natural green spaces were valued by Athens’ women as pleasurable amenity spaces to linger and talk – a female equivalent of the stately and more prestigious _agora_ planes, thus performing a function of ‘the garden’. There is, therefore, a gendered difference in the experience of ‘garden’ spaces. The sites themselves have already been examined in chapter 4; this section examines the spatial relationship of these female-associated natural gardens with the city.

Because of the karst geology, most of the city’s springs cluster around the Akropolis; the conjunction of the two for sustaining life and defence caused the concentration of the early city on and around this rock (Figure 151). Some of the springs were gradually formalised into fountains; many wells and cisterns were also sunk in this area. Particularly important was the famous Klepsydra and others to the north-west with a further cluster to the south-east (Crouch 1993: 255-277). All of these would have been accompanied by forms of natural growth from ground and spilled water and were female-associated areas (sections 4.2.5-6, especially for plantings reflected in vase paintings).
Women would also have been ritually present there, because older cave-shrines and the cult of Aphrodite *en kepois* were located along the same north-western edge of the Akropolis (section 5.3.2). Caves were traditionally linked with nymphs, adding further female resonance. Because of proximity, water-gathering and ritual functions took place in the same area, peripheral to the important shrines on the rock above and the grand western entry. The rock would help to screen and shadow women as they drew their domestic water - largely from the Klepsydra Spring, as would plantings nourished by the natural water. If approached from the north, away from the western Akropolis entrance, they would border the area of public activity. The Sacred Spring and other springs on the southern-eastern slope, although more exposed, would have gained some shade and screening from natural plant growth and been equally peripheral to the Akropolis public spaces and the fifth-century theatre building; the auditorium faces away from the water-gathering zone. Tree growth still surrounds the citadel today.

A more formalised water provision, which interestingly echoes this spatial pattern, began with the construction of the South-East Fountain-House at the very edge of the agora (sections 4.2.5-6). The area has a high water table and may earlier have provided a natural spring (Thucydides 2.15.5; American School of Classical Studies at
The building was probably the euergetistic act of a Peisistratid tyrant; the material evidence suggests a date of c. 532-520 (Thompson 1956: 52, Camp 1986: 42-44). It had a porticoed central section with water chambers at each end. The remains are insufficient to determine how the water was accessed, but it may have been via a parapet from the atrium to the western basin and by water jets at the eastern basin (Arvanitis 2008: 164-165, Glaser 2000: 422, Tölle-Kastenbein 1994: 73). Aqueduct feed pipes and overflow drains have been recovered. Provision was increased by the building of the South-West Fountain-House in the third quarter of the fourth century (Camp 1986: 156-157; Figure 152).

Inspiration for this civic amenity originated in the developed water technologies of the east (Crouch 1993: 318). Other Greek tyrants (Theagenes in Megara, Periander in Corinth and Polykrates in Samos) provided similar public water facilities during the Archaic period. Peisistratos was part of the proxenia network and his sons spent time in the Persian court (Herodotos, 6.94.1, 7.6.2). The animal head spouts depicted on vase paintings reflecting the fountain-house also demonstrate the appropriation of eastern ideas. They are almost identical to the animal heads on seventh century

---

147 For a summary of the difficulties involved in the identification of the spring, see Owens 1982.
Corinthian orientalising ware, including the lions’ heads in profile and the panthers in frontal view; sixth-century bronze lion heads were found in situ in Corinth’s Sacred Spring (Crouch 1993: 131; Figure 153).

There are obvious elite influences on the fountain-house provision and its technologies, which antedate, but link with, the agora and Academy plantings. The location of the fountain-house is interesting, however, in specifically Greek terms. This formalised provision in the agora echoes the peripheral location of the Akropolis water supply. Foxhall (2013: 504-505, Foxhall, Neher 2011: 506,) has noted the deliberate location of the South-East Fountain-House on the very edge of the agora; this includes the city’s women in the developing public spaces, whilst simultaneously keeping them at the margins. Whilst the older water provision around the Akropolis would obviously derive from nature rather than human disposition, it seems likely that the fountain-house location was more targeted. In view of the similar peripheral location, it is possible that the agora edge was selected in recognition that the Akropolis system worked to separate male and female space, although the recorded ideology dates to the later years of the developing democracy. Whilst there may have been an original spring on the site of the South-East Fountain-House to inspire location, there was no potential precedent for the South-West facility. The northern line of the aqueduct bringing water from the Ilissos could have terminated anywhere within the agora, leaving any original spring as an additional supply (see Tölle-Kastenbein 1994: back plans).
Restored plans of the fountain-house show the entrance on the *agora* side. However, the fragmentary nature of the remains make it impossible to determine whether it was entered from the *agora* or from the street along its southern boundary.\textsuperscript{148} The long, trailing branches present in many fountain-house scenes probably represent natural foliage, nourished by seepage from joints and accidental spills, though some may have been planted deliberately to interrupt sight-lines. Branches would help screen women approaching from the street and either entering directly or slipping up the passage to the side. It is possible that the southern street might have been considered ‘female’ appropriate space, as it was outside the *agora* itself.

Therefore, the physically peripheral location of the natural gardens associated with women’s water-gathering echoed their conceptual peripheral status and aided perceptions of their public ‘invisibility’. Many other public spaces, planted by nature and associated with women and discussed in chapter 4 are peripherally located, which makes their location relevant to a consideration of how these public spaces were negotiated in the face of idealised Athenian male views of women’s activity.

5.8.1: Negotiating spaces: female friendship, strategies and variables

The contradictory nature of the sources on women’s public visibility was referred to in section 4.1.1. Created by males, they have little to do with the reality of women’s lives and the older, outdated dichotomy between male and female, public and private, is no longer appropriate. Modern studies take a more subtle and sensitive approach to the complex question of gender and space (for example: Foxhall, Neher 2011, Nevett 2011, Trümper 2012).

Chapter 4 examined the spaces that women inhabited, including the public, city spaces of sanctuaries, the Kerameikos, fountain-houses and orchard gardens, but did not consider how these public spaces were negotiated in the face of idealised Athenian

\textsuperscript{148} Foxhall, pers. comm. 2013.
male views of women’s activity, which is examined below. Bathing spaces were mentioned as a courtyard activity and will be considered here.

A black-figure amphora (Figure 123, p. 203) shows two women seated facing each other and talking in a lively fashion. They are seated on two decorated blocks, which may be altars, under a fruiting tree. The latter may be only a conceptual addition, but given both tree and potential altars, a sanctuary site is more probable than a domestic courtyard. This scene seems to take the women’s friendship as its subject. Strong probability alone suggests that friendships were highly important to women, especially after their marriage and separation from their natal family, which must often have been traumatic. In such circumstances, any marginalised group will seek comfort and support wherever it can be found; the same marginalisation ensures that such friendships will not be recorded in written sources. Vase paintings are a less formal medium and one created by, and for, a wider social spectrum; perhaps this accounts for the fact that women together are more widely represented.

Vase paintings certainly uphold the idea of female friendships and, therefore, support the fact that women did move around the city far more than has been acknowledged. This probably extended across social strata, at least in certain venues like the fountain-houses: slave, metic, or citizen women - their separation from the male sphere is likely to have drawn them together in their own.

Petersen (1997), who has examined images of women from the female viewpoint, especially friendships, points out that women shown occupied with gender-appropriate tasks, such as weaving, are frequently shown together and in eye contact. They are in a domestic environment, but some were probably visiting the houses or courtyards of others; she particularly cites a lekythos (Figure 154) where pairs of women work together on the manifold wool-working tasks (Petersen 1997: 52-53).

---

The context of the scene is irrecoverable, but the artist is unlikely to misrepresent the practical details of the scene.  

Women are also shown interacting in public spaces, such as the sanctuaries. There can be no doubt that such occasions offered enjoyable socialisation time, free from male-imposed restrictions. Sanctuaries were, of course, appropriate public spaces for women, although the opportunities afforded for non-ritual activities are not recorded. Petersen also cites images of women clearly interacting in the more open and civic spaces of the fountain houses, such as the image on the hydria (Figure 155) where four of the five women are talking and gesticulating (Petersen 1997: 42, fig. 3).

All of these scenes clearly show women who talk and enjoy themselves whilst engaged in gender-appropriate tasks. Perhaps it is significant that they all pre-date the strictest
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150 Sequential actions by fewer women are possible, but hairstyles of at least two are individual. Foxhall (2012: 194-206) examines girls’ apprenticeship with women in wool-working tasks, their continued association and how these may be traced through the materiality of loom-weights.
regulation of women’s visibility during the developed Athenian democracy. Earlier funerary scenes equally show women together, such as the plaque (Figure 49, p. 131), where two women share the task of tending the corpse; also the kantharos (Figure 156), where two women face each other, mourning together during the funerary procession.

It may be significant that the women at the tomb scenes on white-ground lekythoi, dating from the latter half of the fifth century, tend far more to show single women as if emphasising only their ritual engagement. Other scenes showing women becoming more domestically focused may reflect changing ideas about representing women at this period (Lewis 2002: 74, 149, 211). It would be very unwise to assume from this that female friendships withered away in the face of male disapproval, in obedience to the ideology. Equally improbable is that women stopped visiting public places appropriate to their gender. What is inherently probable is that they used and adapted strategies enabling them both to visit their spaces and to socialise whilst there.

It is known that a woman’s age was one factor in the male need to control her public appearances (Demand 1994: 27-29). Once past her childbearing years, a woman’s kyrios need no longer fear that promiscuity might introduce a cuckoo into the oikos. Therefore, older women were freer to move about the city acting, as did metic slaves, as proxies for younger women. Lysias (1.8), On the Murder of Eratosthenes, shows the household’s servant girl used as messenger and intermediary for the errant wife and an older woman moving freely to meet and warn her husband of her conduct (1.15-
Demand (1994: 28) wonders whether the ‘bad press’ given to older women in comedy might be due to their ability to evade control. Lysias 1 also shows why that control was felt necessary: Eratosthenes met the errant wife when she appeared publicly at her mother-in-law’s funeral (1.8).

Therefore, blanket statements about the public exclusion of women are already subject to qualification. The ideology required only that citizen women be excluded; non-Athenian women were far freer. A number of other factors are now being recognised. Foxhall (Foxhall, Neher 2011: 494-498) focuses on variables in the type of city space and how it was used by women, variables also of time and season, class and behaviour and urban/rural environment, none of these being fixed, but interacting and changing constantly. Nevett (2011: 578, 578-589) examines the contexts of women’s public appearances and variables of time, socio-economic status and age/stage, emphasising the cyclical nature of their movements. Trümper (2012: 292), stresses their clothing, deportment and behaviour, the manner, route and speed of their gait being significant. Circulation habits would have been important factors and the ways in which women interact (or do not) with the buildings and people around them. It seems likely that variables would have included whether the woman was alone, or in a group, or perhaps accompanied by servants or slaves. In Figure 79, (p. 152) two slaves in a fountain-house scene were tentatively identified by their simple loincloths; if so, they may have been there as both porters and chaperones taking a risk.

Through adjustments in these mutable factors, women would have found ways of negotiating many of the city’s public spaces. Since they certainly visited female-associated spaces, it is equally certain that they moved through the city to get there. A

151 Foxhall (Foxhall, Neher 2011: 496-497) also emphasises the different expectations of female behaviour in a rural environment and this needs underlining. The fact that our sources are resolutely urban skews perceptions. Rural women’s lives were freer, because they were less publicly observed and observable. Demosthenes, himself defending a client against charges that his mother was not of citizen birth because she was publicly visible (57.30-36), records elsewhere a friendship between a pair of mothers who were country neighbours (ἅμα μὲν ἀμφοτέρων οἰκουσῶν ἐν ἀγρῷ καὶ γειτνιωσάν, 55.23).
woman who walks, veiled and bodily enveloped by clothing, with eyes fixed down on
the track, paying no attention to her surroundings, with a soft tread and with
purposeful but not pacey gait, by back tracks away from the more public and busy
streets, at a time of day when most males were working in fields or workshops, is
unlikely to attract attention or opprobrium.

Trümper (2012: 297) makes a behavioural contrast between males who stood,
lingered, talked in public and moved about, and women who were only passing
through. This makes an important differentiation between real, physical space and
conceptual space. If women were mobile, with modest behaviour then, although they
were physically inhabiting the space, conceptually they could be considered absent, on
their way to a female-appropriate destination and not pausing in male-appropriate
spaces. Such mental adjustments would have been essential so that life and work
could be managed. Inevitably, such conceptual adaptability would not find its way into
written sources, lest it be thought to compromise the ideology.

Further, the sets of strategies adopted to enable a visit to the Kerameikos, the
fountain-house, a sanctuary or the house of a friend would all have differed. Nevett
(2011: 579-582) suggests that micro-neighbourhoods might have worked as
intermediate zones, permitting a host of localised domestic friendships within close
proximity to home. When more public spaces were involved, significant factors would
have been the location of each destination in relation to the woman’s home, the
centre of the city or its periphery and the routes available to travel from A to B. In
addition to these spatial factors, temporal and seasonal factors would equally operate.
If more were known about the temporal organisation of the Athenian citizen’s day,
more could be deduced about his wife’s movements. The male working day would be
longer at certain times of year than others, particularly during harvest. Such periods
would extend the hours available to women to move about and, in any event, summer
is likely to have seen a greater female activity than winter, as women seized their
opportunities to extend social time around their allotted tasks.
Lloyd Llewellyn Jones (2003, particularly chapter 7) has examined the role of veiling in making a woman invisible in public areas or before unrelated males. He believes that, as the tortoise carries its own sheltering house, so the veil acted as a portable version of domestic space, sufficiently enclosing to allow women to move in a wider, public environment. Plants, especially trees, probably served as an additional layer of ‘veiling’, indicated by their frequent depiction with women on vase imagery. It might be argued that the trees represent conceptual associations, not reality. Yet such links would not have developed in the first place had trees and plants not been found in female spaces. Given that many of the trees are deciduous fruiting species and that many ‘generic’ branches appear also to be deciduous, it is likely that this screening function operated more during the spring-autumn months.

Many of the fountain-house vases show long, wavy ‘generic’ branches, flourishing on the moisture (chapter 4.2.5-6); in Figure 72 (p. 145) the women carry their own bunch of ‘generic’ branches. Equally, the fruiting trees of the orchard vases (chapter 4.2.7-8) could have helped screen the women from public gaze. Trees in the cemetery scenes (section 4.2.3) probably served both as places for hanging ritual offerings and a screening function. Screening trees would have been important in Artemis’ rituals to hide both girls and rites (sections 4.2.11-12) and were also probably used as screens within the home (section 5.6.). The presence of trees is particularly marked in sanctuary scenes (sections 4.2.9-13). Such ephemeral evidence would not find its way into the written sources.

5.8.2: Negotiating spaces: the peripheral areas

It was noted at the opening of this chapter that the city’s gardens and green spaces were located on the urban periphery, in a borderline zone between city and countryside, land that was tamed, agricultural, watered, close at hand and precious. Chapter 4 showed how these spaces were particularly associated with women, and the fact that they were marginal to the centre will have played a role in reducing women’s visibility.
The peripheral area of the Kerameikos, the Academy and the roads leading to them from the Dipylon and Sacred Gates (Figure 157) is, however, a prime example of the complexities of gendered spatial negotiation, as the area also contained spaces of heavy male presence, because of the baths, the pottery industry and the prostitutes (Davidson 2011: 604). Presumably the ‘good’ wives of citizens would also have wished to separate themselves from their less fortunate sisters, causing a further complication.

Initally, a potential spatial separation seems possible. The road from the Dipylon Gate to the very masculine Academy and its garden could be seen as paralleled by the Sacred Way, passing through the feminine zone of the Kerameikos, using different gates. The cemetery was not, however, confined to this western route. The ‘male’
Academy road had burials of important individuals on either side from the sixth century onwards, eventually becoming the state burial zone for distinguished citizens and war dead (Travlos 1971: 300). Although women’s role in funerals was discouraged under the democracy, it could not be excluded, so women must also have had a legitimate presence along this road, although less than along the Sacred Way where ordinary, family tombs were sited. Further, the female zone of the shrine of Artemis, Kalliste and Ariste was located on the western side of the Academy road. Equally, the Sacred Way was the route by which the procession left Athens for Eleusis for celebration of the Mysteries, in which both men and women were involved. A second road to the Academy for wheeled traffic led directly off the Sacred Way (Travlos 1971: 318-319).

Building Z, at least in its third phase (c. 320) and possibly earlier, housed prostitutes (Glazebrook 2011: 39-41, Knigge, 1991: 88-94). It lay between the Sacred Gate and the City Wall (Figure 158). Access was by a narrow lane off the Sacred Way. Therefore women of all types and men must have used the same road and both genders must have used the Sacred Gate.

Image removed for copyright reasons

Figure 158: City wall around Dipylon Gates

The factors of time of day, tracks chosen and general deportment referred to above must have operated constantly in this zone, also screening trees and plants. Travlos (1971: 159) notes that the Sacred Gate is at the lowest point of the city on the
Eridanos, where it leaves the city and, during the fifth century, running alongside the Sacred Way (Figure 159). The moisture would have encouraged plant growth.

Figure 159: Varying courses of the Eridanos over time

To the south and south-east of the city, on the Ilissos, a spatial separation of spaces that were exclusive to either gender was equally impossible. The male space of the Kynosarges gymnasium and its garden and the female spaces of the shrines of Aphrodite en kepois and Artemis Agrotera were in close proximity (Figure 139, p. 226). A little further north, also peripherally located between city walls and river, lay the Lykeion gymnasium and its gardens. Also in this zone was the spring Kallirhoe, Athens’ principal water source before construction of the South-East Fountain-House; it long continued in use. The spring occupies the same type of location as the Akropolis springs and the agora fountain-houses - just on the boundary of the main area. The spring was important in marriage ritual, therefore saw a large female presence; yet close to the spring was the male zone of the tanners.

Quite how gendered practices and expectations were worked out in these complex zones is unrecoverable. There may well have been tracks that were gendered by custom and expectation, but time of day is likely to have been critical. The fact that the areas were watered makes it probable that naturally-growing trees and other

---

152 The names of ancient springs and fountain houses are so disputed by scholars trying to match ancient sources with material remains that identification is impossible; Travlos’ identification has been used here (Travlos 1971: 204).
greenery helped to screen passing women and, in the Kerameikos, keep citizen wives from the prostitutes along the Eridanos (Eubolos, *Frag.* 84, Appendix 1). The *Vitex agnus-castus* grew along Athens rivers then as now (Plato, *Phaidros* 230b) - a plant heavily associated with women. Used in ritual and basket making, it probably included a sheltering function.

5.8.3: Negotiating spaces: women’s bathing

Gendered space is also relevant to bathing. All the known city baths of the fifth and fourth centuries were situated in the same peripheral location, immediately extramural (Figure 160). In the Ilissos area, a bath is known to have existed in 418/417 by the Kodros, Neleus and Basile shrine (*IG I²* 84, 36-37), located by Travlos outside gate XI (Figure 139, p. 226). In the Kerameikos area, the Dipylon baths stood just outside gate IV from some time in the fifth century.

Evidence is that such baths were for male use, although it is possible that temporal organization allowed female access (see Trümper 2012: 300-302 for models of
separated bathing). What little evidence there is suggests that women’s bathing was, at least in the Classical period, less formal. This comes from vase paintings and is ambiguous. Interpretations have ranged from straightforward reading of such scenes as depicting lived reality, now seen as far too simplistic, to a reading that views images of women bathing as fictitious, voyeuristic images unrelated to women’s real lives (Stähli 2013).

Images of women bathing or washing during the Classical period largely depict the *louteria* that are the focus of Stähli’s article and there can be little doubt that women’s washing was largely done within a domestic context, probably in the courtyard, at specific times of day when privacy could be assured.

More interesting scenes show a naturalistic background with trees, suggesting the use of natural water resources for female bathing during the warmer months in areas away from public gaze, screened by trees and rushes. The naturally watered areas around the city perimeters would be ideal, away from, and contrasting with, the central, male-focused areas of the city. Equally, bathing in such spaces fits with the overall association of women with green and marginal spaces, examined in chapter 4 and above. Such natural bathing facilities were sometimes associated with sanctuaries. Those of Artemis and Aphrodite (sections 4.2.11-14) come naturally to mind, especially because seclusion for races and dances and purification rituals was important. A cup (Figure 162) has both a tree and a column, which might indicate such a setting. Although the satyr on the base supports Stähli’s reading (2013: 11-21) of these images as conceptual creations, it seems likely that the artist would locate his visualisations in areas characteristically associated with women.

---

153 For example, Bérard (1989: 92-93) accepts that, because the accoutrements of male gymnasia and post-exercise bathing or a formal fountain-house are sometimes shown, then this relates to a parallel, realistic context of post-exercise ablutions.
A sanctuary of Aphrodite is a probable context for the scene on a lekythos (Figure 162) by the Meidias Painter. One woman is bathing near two young olives, aided by an Eros. The scene is undoubtedly romanticised and eroticised, but as Aphrodite is closely linked with verdure (sections 4.2.13-14), women engaged in her rituals probably took advantage of the natural water for purificatory bathing in a protected site. Havelock (1995: 24) comments that Aphrodite was particularly associated with bathing.

The Kallirhoë spring and fountain on the Ilissos might also have been used for ablutions. Women are shown on a late sixth-century amphora (Figure 163), showering under animal-head fountain-house spouts. Such a scene may have been purely voyeuristic (Stähli 2013: 17-18); the presence of a young male warrior on the other side of the vessel (Lenormant, de Witte 1857: 151) may hint at a potential watcher.
Sheer practicality, however, suggests that an efficient water supply system would be fully exploited, rather than being used only for drawing water.

Other parts of secluded river banks are even more likely to have been used. An amphora of c. 520 (Figure 164) shows a fascinating scene, where the relationship of reality to artistic imagination is impossible to establish. The scene seems to be set within the seclusion of a rocky riverine grotto.

An older view that interprets this as a realistic, planned exercise space, with constructed diving platform and full accoutrements of a male gymnasium (Bérard
1989: 93) is unacceptable; it is a most unusual scene. It should not, however, be rejected as merely voyeuristic. Petersen (1997: 58) draws attention to the illusion of freedom from city life, arguing that the scene is intended for voyeuristic, male, symposion gazing. It is almost certain that ideological references to the sporting of wild nymphs are there, perhaps specifically to an imaginative reconstruction of Nausikaa and her maidens (Odyssey, 6, 85-109). However, the image of Dionysos on the reverse may indicate a sanctuary rather than a symposion setting; Dionysos is linked with free revelry. Lewis (2002: 43) notes that paintings showing aspects of Dionysiac ritual often occur in Etruscan cemeteries, where this vase was found and also the occurrence of themes with a sexual element in black-figure ritual scenes, often Dionysiac (Lewis 1997: 150-151). Dionysos was also linked with the afterlife (sections 4.2.9-10), so there may be resonances of a visualised paradisiacal existence.

It is improbable, however, that the artist would paint women enjoying the river space if it were not something he found imaginable, even if in more rural areas outside the city. Both this vase and the amphora of Figure 163 antedate the developed ideology on female seclusion. In fact, bathing al fresco amidst greenery somewhere in quiet peripheral areas is likely to echo a lived experience, perhaps more common in the past, or enjoyed rarely and seasonally.

5.9.1: Conclusion

Despite the rhetoric, ‘decent’ citizen women moved within the city on their gender-appropriate tasks, using numerous strategies to make themselves conceptually invisible. The trees and greenery shown growing around ‘female spaces’ may well have been an iconographical signifier of ‘appropriate’ location. The physical association of women with these peripheral areas aided their public ‘invisibility’ and supported their conceptual marginalisation. Women are reared within the constraints felt appropriate by their societies and learn instinctively to work within them. Therefore, the women of Athens are likely to have exploited every opportunity to gather together in friendship and conversation, enjoying some level of freedom and relaxation. The role of these
watered, naturally planted spaces as amenity ‘gardens’ for a wide spectrum of the female population has not been appreciated, because they went unrecorded. Their emphasis in this chapter helps to balance the more male, prestigious and recorded cityscape.

To a lesser extent, the male, more prestigious, green amenity spaces of the agora’s shady walkways and the shady cool of the gymnasion gardens have also, until now, failed to receive the attention they deserve. Summary comparisons, like that of Dikaiarkhos at the head of this chapter, give a false impression. Certainly the Theban landscape was more naturally endowed. Yet all the green spaces described in this chapter show that the city of Athens invested in its gardens and green spaces and that they were far more widespread and important in the overall landscape than has been assumed. The city was, in fact, far from dry and sterile. The approximate location of the gardens cited in this chapter are shown in Figure 165 (p. 287), but it is important to realise that these record only the ones for which evidence survives; the majority no longer have any record.

The conceptual resonances that surround the word κῆπος, established in chapters 2-4, are also detectable in many of the city’s real gardens. Elite associations are found in the agora and Academy plantings, in the ‘philosophy gardens’ and in the elite lessees of temple productive plots. Unsurprisingly, these gardens and plantings were prestigious places.

Qualities of care, concern and value, first detectable in the Homeric orchard-gardens, continued to be attached to the real gardens of the city. This is detectable in the tight regulation of productive leased temple plots, such as Kodros, Neleus and Basile; this care would have extended to secular gardens, but evidence is lacking. Irrigation was a major feature of that care and demarcation is also important; these are reflected in the location of the city’s most prestigious agricultural exploitation on its most precious, irrigated and protectable land. This leads to an interesting contradiction: the peripheral was, in fact, central, for the intensive economic exploitation of, and
investment in, the watered lands situated on the periphery of the city played an essential role in feeding its citizens.

A shifting of emphasis and influence is detectable over time. The ancient sanctuary gardens, productive plots and natural gardens around water sources remained, but gardens also reflected newer waves of influence. Civic euergetistic plantings seem to have adopted some of the more aesthetically pleasing and prestigious formalised designs of eastern practice, also seen in the later Hephaisteion plantings. A greater market orientation seems indicated by the tight regulation of productive sanctuary plots.

It is clear that Athenian gardens functioned on multiple levels, both conceptually and in reality; additional functions accrued with time. The wide metaphorical possibilities of the word κῆπος was discussed in section 5.5.3 in relation to the ‘philosophy gardens’, which provide an example of changing function in the real world. On a site where the ‘garden’ originated in a hero’s sanctuary, areas were demarcated to provide exercise for the body and later for the mind, being used to train the city’s more affluent citizens for their role. The natural site would always have acted informally as an amenity garden for the city, but the ‘philosophy gardens’ formalised this role; educative discussion is more pleasant in a shaded, cooler and softer environment than the inner city afforded. Similarly, productive temple sites such as Kodros, Neleus and Basile acted as sacred plots, revenue generating land, investment opportunities and, no doubt, sources of prestige for lessees. Natural gardens acted as female work spaces, but also as amenity spaces and sources of plants, branches, withies, etc. for domestic use.

In direct contrast with modern experience, with the exception of privately owned market plots, for which we have little evidence and of domestic potted plantings, the green spaces were not privately but publicly owned, by either state or gods. This is a further demonstration of the fact that, although gardens responded to waves of external influence, they were much altered in the process, being particularly less
associated with individual privilege and more accessible to a wider social class, adapted to Greek political, social and religious realities.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

‘Ancient Greek communities inhabited three landscapes: the natural, the human, and the imagined . . . These three landscapes coexisted and merged with one another.’

(Cole 2004: 7-8)

6.1.1: Introduction

This first detailed examination of what the garden was in ancient Greece, and the different levels at which it functioned, has exemplified the use of the garden as a symbolic tool (Osborne 1992a: 374). It has shown that the garden expresses mythical and societal ideas about a specific and precious part of the landscape, where the natural, the human and the imagined cannot be separated.

6.1.2: Κήπος: a word of multiple interpretations and functions

This symbolic value probably owes much to the multi-layered nature of garden spaces. This work has shown the word Κήπος to be complex, with many overtones; it is slippery and apparently illogical, both in the concepts it embodies and its application to real plots on the ground. From the fleeting references in the sources, gardens, as recorded by some Greeks, in some areas, could be any of the following:

- places producing fruit and vegetables;
- sites of physical toil, with sophisticated horticultural technology;
- pieces of private land rented as market-gardens;
- part of a citizen’s land allocation;
- small private plots;
- pieces of revenue-generating leased temple land;

154 These examples were gathered from the two original databases detailing the use of the word Κήπος in literature and epigraphy. These databases, unfortunately, proved too large to include with this study.
• real estate used as legal security;
• shady and beautiful spaces for gods and mortals to enjoy;
• places which nymphs inhabited;
• sites of sacrifice - which may provide branches for ritual use;
• spaces associated with women and sexual encounter;
• places to rest when sick or hung over;
• places to walk when talking or seeking inspiration;
• sites where roses grew;
• pot-planted, short-lived mini-gardens;
• outdoor places with guest rooms attached;
• the name of a place or district;
• a metaphorical application to land that is especially fertile or to the corpus of the written word (the ‘Garden of Letters’);
• green and watered natural spaces, for it is clear that they functioned as ‘gardens’, especially for women and should, therefore, be considered within their society’s conception of ‘the garden’.

The already multivalent nature of ‘the garden’ was increased because, more frequently than not, a Greek garden served more than one purpose. The ‘philosophy gardens’ (5.5.1-3) were a prime example. They housed ritual and sacred activities, acting also as prestigious burial sites; their gymnasia and environs were places of physical and mental exercise, but also of retreat, quiet contemplation and of divine inspiration; also, no doubt, of pleasure and relaxation. The riverine ‘garden’ spaces of Phaidros (section 6.1.4) shared many of these functions. The prestigious agora plantings served an important amenity function as well as boosting Athens’ appearance and city status, whilst the natural watered spaces of the landscape provided less prestigious work and relaxation spaces for women.

The multiple resonances of the word κῆπος largely explain why it is so difficult to define - a difficulty increased by our overall ignorance of the specific name applied to any plot of land on the ground; only a minority have secure nomenclature. These do
not always seem logical to modern eyes: in *IG* 1^2^ 784/1^3^ 977 (p. 217), for example, the association with nymphs determined the word, despite the unpromising landscape. Because of these factors and because naturally watered spaces seem to function in the same way as more formal gardens, it has been necessary to consider these together; the word κῆπος alone cannot encompass all the associations of garden spaces.

6.1.3: Κῆπος: a landscape on the periphery

Despite the multi-levelled nature of ‘the garden’, this research has identified several key themes of garden spaces, the first being its physical and conceptual peripheral status. Chapter 5 particularly noted the location of most of Athens’ gardens on the periphery of the city (or peripheral locations within the city). This runs counter to our modern perceptions of the garden as primarily a private space attached to domestic housing, which have largely derived from the gardens of more affluent, urban Romans. It is clear that, when thinking about the garden in ancient Greece, we need to avoid this latter-day personal and individual perspective. This study has shown that the gardens of Athens at least were far more public than private and this was not restricted to the obviously public amenity spaces of the city. A major part of the city’s green spaces were the sanctuary gardens of divinities, generally accessible to all. Our contemporary use of public open spaces, such as parks, cemeteries and commemorative gardens (p. 1), many of which have a religious or quasi-religious resonance, seem the closest modern parallel to the ancient Greek use of such spaces.

Gardens occupy a unique place in Greek (particularly Athenian) conceptualisations of landscape. They physically straddled the boundary between inner, built landscape and outer farmed land, which made them the most privileged and cherished part of the landscape, hugging the walls of the city and closest to the best resources of water, manure, labour and protection. This peripheral location related also to the perceived location of the garden between the urban and urbane world and the increasingly wild and unpredictable world of nature (section 1.1.3).
The physical and conceptual peripheral location of Athens’ garden spaces made them places that counter many rigid categorisations of modern scholarship. They were both ‘in’ and ‘out’, ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’, ‘urban’ and ‘rural’. They occupied the real and perceived borders between public, male inner cityscape and outer, more female-appropriate zones, neatly reversing the normal perceptions of ‘outer’ male space and ‘inner’ female zones, thus denying rigid ideas about a strictly gendered cityscape.

Therefore, they played an essential part in female spatial negotiation of the city and our understanding of it. Certainly women’s domestic world was ‘inner’ and ‘private’, but garden spaces show that they must also have been relatively ‘outer’ and ‘public’. They indicate that public, but more peripheral cemeteries, sanctuaries, fountain-houses and orchards shared a degree of the perceived propriety and safety that accrued to domestic space. This study has proposed that trees and plants in vase imagery may well have acted as a signifier of this, acting in the same way as wool-making equipment to designate ‘appropriate’ female activity. The fluid and ‘slippery’ concept of the κῆπος, including the natural garden, helped to make it a space of physical and imaginative adaptability, whilst its adaptability helped form the fluidity of the concept itself.

6.1.4: Κῆπος: the conceptual and the real landscape

The physical borderline zone of garden spaces is equally applicable to its conceptual form. The constant and reinforcing interaction between the conceptual and the real is a further key finding of this research, which is exemplified in the setting of Plato’s Phaidros (229a-c, 230b-c, Appendix 1). This riverine garden area is certainly real - part of the southern watered ring of the city, home to many of its gardens. The shrines of Boreas and Artemis Agrotera mentioned by Plato as being on opposite sides of the river (229b-c) have been archaeologically identified, as has the shrine of the Nymphs and Acheloōs (229b-c; Figure 165, p. 287). The Vitex agnus castus or chaste tree (ἄγνος, 230b) grows freely there today. The area may very well have been described as a κῆπος, particularly because of its associations with nymphs.
Literary construction, however, based upon conceptual associations, plays a major role in the passage: the location is specifically chosen for a highly-rhetorical discussion of love. It is a ‘female’ landscape. The references are many: this green, riverine area is suitable for young girls (κόραι) to play by, and the site of Boreas’ abduction of the nymph Oreithyia (229b). The shrine of the Nymphs and Acheloös is a further reminder of these sexually enticing Nature deities. The site is full of sensual perceptions of sight, sound and perfume; the perfect (πάγκος) grass is emphasised (230b-c). The site is both physical location and a conceptual picture of an ideal site for seduction, in a natural sacred zone. It is a *topos* like that of the Meidias Painter’s adoption of the garden to express ideas about paradise (sections 2.2.4, 2.3.1).

This location was characteristically physically peripheral to the city. Conceptually, it was a borderline zone between the real and the imagined, the city and the countryside, land and water, and above all, between male and female, a space that again denies rigid polarisations. It exemplifies the role of the garden in negotiating gendered space: a legitimate place for women - as girls playing, as *parthenoi* and wives gathering flowers and branches of the chaste tree used in ritual, medication and basketry, and performing rituals at the several shrines. But equally, it was a place where men could walk and talk and thus also a characteristic place of risk for women. Women were associated with just such natural ‘gardens’ in real life and from just such locations they were abducted in myth and reality (sections 2.1.3, 4.2. 6, 4.2.12).

The allure of such a privileged, cherished, even luxurious site is clear in *Phaidros* (230b-c); it inherits the ambivalence of the Sirens’ flowery meadow (pp. 35-37). Therein lay its danger, both for the women who frequented it and the men who might be enticed by it, exemplifying the slippery nature of the concept of the garden (section 6.1.2). The conceptual and the real interacted over the centuries and the key associations outlined above were always present. There were, however, some adjustments over time.
Firstly, additional physical usages might be found, demonstrated in the ‘philosophy gardens’ in particular, or in a more rectilinear planting style (‘philosophy gardens’ and Hephaisteion). Similarly and secondly the garden was newly co-opted in the fifth century to take on a new metaphorical usage, expressing evolving ideas about the afterlife and a paradisiacal expectation for all men in more democratic and war-weary times.

Thirdly, democratic political changes made elite lifestyles less acceptable to the majority. This is reflected in Theophrastos’ Man of Bad Taste and Isaio’s bad guardian (Char. 20.9; Isaio 5.11); the privileged individualism of both is expressed through their gardens. Demosthenes 53.15-16 (pp. 120-122), Kimon’s orchard (pp. 207-208) and the Kodros shrine (IG 12 84) show that ornamental productive orchards continued. The Demosthenes passage and Thucydides 2.62.3 (pp. 123-124) demonstrate that the word κῆπος might be ‘deselected’ and why: its associations could so easily be employed as a rhetorical and political tool. This potential for selective vocabulary is a further reason why the word κῆπος alone is insufficient for a study of ‘the garden’ in ancient Greece.

6.2.1: Κῆπος: resonances of meanings: care and value

Reference has already been made to the garden as a ‘field of care’ (Tuan 1974: 241), expressing a second key theme highlighted by this work. The care expended on gardens is constantly evidenced, defining the garden more than the crops grown. The ἀκρόδρυα or top fruits are, however, consistently the most important crop; ἀκρόδρυα need particularly attentive care. The care embodied by Laërtes is associated with vocabulary such as κουροτρόφος (section 3.1.5) and later expressed in the specific verb κηπεύω (Euripides, Hipp. 78) or φιτυποίμην (Aeschylus, Eum. 911), both implying nurturing tender care, equally to plants or men.

Demarcation and irrigation are also aspects of care, creating fertility. Fertility is the primary characteristic of the paradigmatic first garden of Alkinoös, reflected in
Sophokles’ fertile ‘garden’ opposite Euboea (Frag. 24, p. 216, 239) and Pindar (P. 9.5-55), where Zeus’ garden was set in the most fertile location of the North African plain (p. 30). Protective and delineating boundaries are frequent from Homer (section 3.1.4) to the formal or informal boundaries of sacred groves (section 2.1.4). Water recurs as a theme from the garden of Alkinoös, through Hippolytos’ meadow (Hipp. 78) to the works of Plato (Laws, 8.845d) and throughout Theophrastos.

The economic value of intensively worked food-productive gardens underlies this care. In a landscape offering few places where soil and water are suitable for intensive horticultural exploitation, those that existed would have been a priceless and fully exploited resource. This leads to an interesting contradiction: the peripheral in reality central, for the full exploitation of, and investment in, the watered lands on the periphery of the city played an essential role in feeding Athens’ citizens and thus underpinning the polis. The assiduity of care recorded for leased temple plots (such as IG II² 2494 or IG i² 84, sections 3.3.2, 5.4.2) reflects this land value for Athens and the concern of the city fully to exploit it. So too do the nine tiny garden plots in Mounykhion (pp. 224-225), which were probably multi-cropped for vegetables as parodied by Aristophanes (Frag. 581, p. 118, Appendix 1).

Land value also relates to the multiple usage of so many gardens: what little prime land there was had to be used to full potential whilst also being cherished. Land value accounts also for the noted absence of the pleasure garden in Greece. Although there are gardens created and protected for divine pleasure, none are known for humans. Instead, any garden seems to have been to some extent a ‘pleasure’ garden, with sanctuary gardens acting as the most significant public or private amenity or pleasure space as did ornamental orchards for the elite. In fact, because of its inherent value, any garden, even a humble vegetable plot, probably always implied some element of luxury. Even today, many rural Greek women gather vegetable matter from the wild (Halstead 2014: 235); to have a carefully tended and fertile plot specifically for vegetables and the odd fruit tree is likely to have carried connotations of privilege (p. 118).
6.2.2: Κῆπος: Resonances of meanings: privilege

The care and cherishing which valuable garden land received may be an additional reason why the taint of suspicious luxury hung over the word κῆπος; associations with privilege and prestige are a third key association of garden spaces established by this work. The majority of gardens in literature between Homer and Aristophanes belong to deities or heroic figures, embodied and repeated in myth. Alkinoös’ garden was paradigmatic also as the rightful landed endowment of a good and divinely approved ruler.

Such ideas in the conceptual landscape were reinforced by new influences from further East. The eastern influence on formal Greek gardens has hitherto not been recognised and is a further insight of this research; it suggests a further denial of rigid and rhetorical polarisations in Greek society, in this case Greek versus Oriental.

Over time, there were waves of appropriation derived from the east, reinforcing ideas about prestige. Chapter 3 has argued for a Near Eastern, specifically Assyrian, origin for the Homeric orchard-garden, which would add a gloss of the luxurious, this being reinforced by knowledge of sybaritic royal and elite Persian paradeisoi in the fifth century, with their rectangular plantings. The urban plantings of Kimon, with formalised, grand, green spaces enhancing the city landscape and the gardens of philosophers (sections 5.2.1, 5.5.1-3) are clear examples. παράδεισιοι were not adopted directly, but aspects of them were characteristically introduced and altered to Greek realities.

Underlying conceptualisations of landscape and society may well have encouraged the appropriation of eastern ideas about garden spaces. Reference has already been made (pp. 6-7, 161-2) to the Greek conceptualisation of landscape as a series of concentric circles, with the most ‘tame’ garden spaces closest to the city. Greek authors (such as Herodotos, 9.121; p. 117) clearly perceived ‘Asia’ itself as a tame landscape, its agriculture being as pampered and privileged as any garden. The Hippocratic Corpus (Aër. 12.1-7) characterised the Asian land and consequently its people as the ‘most
tame’ - ἡμερεωτέον. Theophrastos (for example, *HP* 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.2.2, *CP* 1.15.2) frequently uses ἡμερος (tame, gentle, cultivated), particularly to contrast with the wild, savage or uncultivated (ἀγριος). Although ‘Asia’ had vast tracts of ‘tamed’ agricultural land, Greece had far more limited resources and the ‘most tamed’ areas were gardens and not the wider agricultural landscape. The same ideas, however, about the influence of landscape on its population applied: in the same phrase and in logical corollary, ‘Hippocrates’ describes both Asiatic landscape and people as tamed. It follows, therefore, that, although Greek authors used this correspondence to define ‘Asia’ as ‘the other’, the same aura of luxury and softness gathered around their own pampered κηπος. To those wishing to enhance personal or civic status, the appropriation of garden ideas from Persia could only have enhanced that prestige. This resonance of ‘the luxurious’ may partially explain the silence of literary sources on rural affairs, traditionally attributed to the overwhelming focus of attention on sophisticated urban life (p.15).

6.2.3: Κηπος: resonances of meaning – women

At the same time, other green city spaces were less prestigious and account for the third key association of the garden established by this study. The physical fertility of the garden was linked conceptually with the presence of women. Imaginative and real seductions in fertile green spaces are common, from Pindar’s location of Apollo’s seduction in a fertile garden (Pindar, *P.* 9.53) to the frequent background of fruiting branches in the fountain-house vases, which can include males lying in wait (section 4.2.6).

Ideas about female fertility were almost certainly part of this conceptual linking of women, plants and fruit. However, chapter 4 of this work has argued that the basis of the association lay in the physical presence of women in watered, green spaces in the real world. Almost all traditional female tasks involve water, starting with its procurement, usually in open places, again in a borderline zone between female-appropriate and public spaces; this involved a physical element of risk, especially for
vulnerable *parthenoi* (section 4.2.12). This association was then picked up by early poets and mythographers, who depicted women in ‘garden’ spaces, demonstrating the constant interaction between the physical and the conceptual landscape in ideas about the κῆπος.

6.3: Kêpos: a wider view

The conclusion of this study shows that brief, earlier treatments do not adequately reflect the spectrum of the Greek garden in reality, concept or function. The leased temple plots that Grimal discounted (p. 2) were certainly *kepoi* in Greek terms – perhaps the most essential productive ones. The gardens of Carroll’s neat compartmentalisation into different types (p. 5) were actually complex and multi-layered in function. Gleason (2013: 2) is right in stating that the Greeks established ‘a set of values’ that are still relevant today, especially in their rhetorical value. Yet, although Greek authors overtly opposed Greek and Persian garden practices and values, the simple versus the luxurious (Gleason 2013: 2), as with other oppositions (pp. 278, 279, 282), the garden defies such simple polarisations and the reality was far more complex. Not only were there regular appropriations from the more eastern world that were converted to Greek needs, but the word κῆπος itself held connotations of eastern privilege and luxury.

This research has developed ideas about gendered field/garden labour (Krasilnikoff 2000: 178-179, Betancourt 2007: 23), making a specifically Greek contribution to sociological and anthropological studies on the same topic (Burton, White 1984, Murdock, Provost 1973, Scheidel 1995, 1996). It contributes to the emerging discipline of garden history and archaeology and to the debate about the relative contributions of reality and imagination in vase paintings of women.

It has added significantly to our understanding of one specific part of the under-researched ancient Greek landscape and how its vocabulary worked. It also redresses an imbalance in perceptions about the Athenian cityscape, by underlining the
importance of softer, unbuilt spaces and how these were a significant part of both πόλις and χώρα (p. 7, section 6.1.3). Therefore, it benefits all researchers into ancient Greek society, enhancing general comprehension of the mental concepts of those who used garden spaces, thus enabling a greater sensitivity to its societal resonances; the latter may especially help translators. Morwood’s rendering of οἶκοι and κῆποι as ‘house’ and ‘gardens’ (Elektra, 774-810) fails to convey the meaning of the words in that specific context and summons an anachronistic image. οἶκοι here would be a building or room for sacrificial feasting and the κῆποι a watered, rocky natural landscape. Again, function is more significant than word.

In particular, this study illuminates how tensions between democracy and privilege, Greece and the east, and between gendered expectations and practices interacted in one small part of the Greek landscape and how the city and its hinterland interacted. Such insights are more illuminating than practical details of garden plot size or relative value and in this way, the ‘disadvantage’ of having sources that are largely rhetorical is turned to advantage.

This study is potentially of interest to researchers in archaeology, history, socio-economic and gender studies, palaeobotany, epigraphy, art history and oriental studies who, having a far greater knowledge of their own specific disciplines than is possible in a general practitioner, could support, develop or refute its conclusions to advance knowledge. Great interest and benefit would derive from archaeologically recovered garden plots, to give a practical balance to the weight of rhetorical evidence, focused on meaning, in this study. There is a particular need for more attention to rural housing, particularly outside Attica; the sources compel a focus on Athens which may well be atypical for Greece. Excavation and survey in poleis across Greece, together with their rural hinterland, complete with palaeobotanical research, would enable an evidence-based examination of the spatial relations between house, court, storage and processing areas, and in-field (potentially garden) plots. A further and similarly broad-based study examining the gardens of the Hellenistic world and the transition to the Roman styles would be beneficial. This would show the extent to
which ancient Greek practices and attitudes were, or were not, transmitted to future societies.

The garden is, of course, still a valued space. We continue to use the word as a metaphorical tool and, if true gardeners, to practise the focused and constant care of a Laërtes. Unlike ancient Greek society, ours has the expectation that such a privileged space is available to most ordinary people if they wish. It demonstrates the wealth of our society and landscape that the garden is no longer considered an ornament of wealth (Thucydides 2.62.3), but a private amenity space for all.

Perhaps this is, unadvisedly, taken for granted. The ancient Greek cherishing and frugal use of water resources and fertile land in garden spaces (where even mud from a ditch was recycled, p. 227) has a great deal to teach modern societies. It is a model of sustainable living without waste, but with careful harnessing of increasingly limited and precious resources, whilst also using the space to maximum advantage. The garden still carries a symbolic load and, in the case of the ancient Greek garden, it is of working with nature to sustain its bounties.
Figure 165: Locations of Athenian gardens referred to in Chapter 5

1. Academy and Plato’s garden
2. Kolonos groves and possibly the leased garden of Demon
3. Kerameikos green area
4. Iatros leased garden
5. Hephaisteion and agora trees (irrigated), fountain-house green area
6. Lykeion garden and garden of Theophrastos
7. Phaidros location, shrine of Pan, Acheloös and the Nymphs
8. Leased gardens in Agrai
9. Kynosarges garden
10. 200 olives garden, shrine of Kodros, Neleus and Basile
11. Kepoi district
12. Leased garden in Phaleron
13. 9 leased gardens near Mounykhion, Peiraeus
Appendix 1: Textual References
Pherekydes says that when Hera married Zeus and the gods were bringing her gifts, Ge came bearing golden apples. When Hera saw them she marvelled and said that they would be planted in the garden of the gods that was next to Atlas.

The first lines are translated in section 2.1.3. The remaining lines are:

but for me
love rests at no season: like the Thracian north wind
blazing with lightning rushing from the Cyprian
with parching fits of madness, dark and shameless,
it powerfully shakes my heart from the roots.
..ανοθεν κατιου[σ-]
δευρυμμεκρητεσιτ[.]ο[ ] ναυον (1)
άγνον οπται] χαφιεν μεν άλος
μαλίαν], βώμοι δ' ἐνι θυμάμε-
νοι [λ[Iβανώτω]<ι>-

ἐν δ' ύδωρ ψύχων κελάδει δ' ύσωουν (5)
μαλίνων, βρόδοισι δ' παις ο χώρος
ἐσκίαστ', αἰθυσσομένων δὲ φύλλων
κώμα καταψιον:

ἐν δὲ λείμων ἱππόβοτος τέθαλε
τωτ ...(.ριννοις ἂνθεσιν, αἱ <δ> ἀηται (10)
μέλλιχα πν[έοισιν [ ]

ἔνθα δὴ σὺ συ.αν ἐλοισα Κύπρι
χρυσαίσιν ἐν κυλίκεσσιν ἀβρώς
<ὁ>μ<με>μείχενιν θαλίαισι νέκταρ (15)
οἰνοχόεισα

In this place you Kypris taking up
in gold cups delicately
nectar mingled with festivities:
pour.
(trans. Carson 2002) The remainder of the English text is in section 2.1.3.

page 34, 97, 186: Sappho, Frag. 105a (Carson)

οἴον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἐρεύθεται ἄκρωι ἐπ' ύσωι,
ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀκροτάτωι, λελάθοντο δὲ μαλαγρότις·
οὖ μάν ἐκλελάθοντ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐδύνατ' ἐπίκεσθαι

English translation is in section 4.2.13.
page 36: Bakkylides, *Frag. 12* (Irigoin)

Εὐφώτην τὴν Φοίνικος Ζεὺς θεασάμενος ἐν τινι λειμῶνι μετὰ Νυμφῶν ἀνθή ἀναλέγουσαν ἡράσθη

Zeus saw Europa, the daughter of Phoenix, in a meadow gathering flowers with her Nymphs and passionately desired her.

---

page 56: Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 326-327 (Oxford)

ἔλθὲ τόνδ᾽ ἀνὰ λειμῶνα χορεύσων, ὡσίους ἔς θιασώτας

Come dancing to this meadow, to your hallowed revelling worshippers.

---


χωρῶμεν ἐς πολυρρόδους λειμῶνας ἀνθεμώδεις (449-450)

Let us go forward to the flowery meadows, full of roses.

---

page 57: Sappho, *Frag. 94*, ll. 24-29 (Carson)

κωὔτε τις [ ύ]τε τι

ἱρον οὔδε’ ψ[ ]

ἐπλετ’ ὑπ[θεν ἄμ]μες ἀπέσκομεν,

οὐκ ἄλσος [ ] ρος

]ψοφος

]...οἰδιαι

and neither any [ ] nor any

holy place nor

was there from which we were absent

no grove [ ] no dance

] no sound

[ ]


---

page 58: Orphic tablet A4 (Edmonds)

Ἀλλ’ ὑπόταν ψυχή προλίπη φᾶος ἀελίοιο

dεξιῶν *Ε.Θ.IΑΣ* δ’ ἔξι<έ>ναι πεφυλαγμένον εὗ μάλα πάντα·
But when the soul leaves the light of the sun, 
go straight to the right, having kept watch on all things very well. 
Hail you having experienced the experience you had not experienced before. 
A god you have become from a man. A kid you fell into milk. 
Hail, make your way to the right, 
the sacred meadows and groves of Phereseopheia. 
(trans. Edmonds 2011)

page 59: Orphic tablet B3 (Edmonds)

I am parched with thirst and I perish. But give me to drink from the everflowing spring on the right, where the cypress is. 
(trans. Edmonds 2011)

References first cited in Chapter 3

pages 70-74: Homer, Odyssey, 7.112-132 (Teubner)

English translations in 3.1.2

έκτοσθεν δ’ αὐλής μέγας ὀξικατός ἄγχι θυράων 
tetraγυνος· περι δ’ ἔρικος ἑλήλαται ἀμφοτέρωθεν. 
ἐνθα δὲ δένδρα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεθάοντα, 
ὀγχναι καὶ ῥοϊαι καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι (115) 
sυκέαι τε γλυκεραὶ καὶ ἐλαῖαι τηλεθόωσαι. 
tῶν οὔ ποτε καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ’ ἀπολείπει 
χείματος οὐδὲ θέρευς, ἐπετήσιος· ἀλλὰ μάλ’ αἰεὶ 
ζεφυρίη πνείουσα τὰ μὲν φύει, ἄλλα δὲ πέσσει. 
ὀγχνη ἐπ’ ὀγχνη γηράσκει, μῆλον δ’ ἐπὶ μήλῳ, (120) 
αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ σταφυλῇ σταφυλῆ, σύκον δ’ ἐπὶ σύκῳ.
ἔνθα δὲ οἱ πολύκαρπος ἀλῳὴ ἐφρίζονται, τῆς ἔτερον τέρσεται ἠελίῳ, ἑτέρας δὲ τρυγοῦσιν, ἀλλας δὲ τραπέουσι πάροιθε δὲ τ’ ὅμφακες εἰσιν (125) ἀνθος ἀφιεῖσαι, ἕτεραι δὲ τραπέουσι πάροιθε δὲ τ’ ὅμφακες εἰσιν. ἔνθα δὲ κοσμητὰ πρασιάς παρὰ νείατον ὄρχον παντοῖαι πεφύασιν, ἐπηετανὸν γανόωσι. ἐν δὲ δύω κρῆνας ἑτέρωθεν ὑπ' αὐλῆς οὐδὸν πρὸς δόμον ὑψηλόν, ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται. τοῖ’ ἀρ’ ἐν Ἀλκινόοιο θεῶν ἔσαν ἀγλαὰ δώρα.

Homer, Odyssey, 24.220-234, 241-247, 256-257 (Teubner)

............................................ αὐτάρ Ὀδυσσεύς (220) ἄσσον ἐν πολυκάρπῳ ἀλῳής πειρητίζων. οὐδ’ εὗρεν Δολίον, μέγαν ὄρχατον ἐσκαταβάνων, οὐδέ τίνα δμώων οὐδ’ υἱῶν· ἀλλ’ ἄρα τοῖ γε αἰμασίας λέξοντες ἀλῳῆς ἔμμεναι ἔρκος ὄχοντ’, αὐτάρ ὁ τοῖσι γέρων ὁδὸν ἡγεμόνευε. (225) τὸν δ’ οἶον πατέρ’ εὗρεν εὐκτιμένη ἐν ἀλῳή, λιστρεύοντα φυτόν· ὑπτόωντα δὲ ἐστο χιτώνα, ὃμπτόν ἀεικέλιον, περὶ δὲ κνήμησι βοείας κνημίδας ὁπτάς δέδετο, γραπτῆς ἀλεείνων, χειβίδας τ’ ἐπί χερσὶ βάτων ἐνεκ’ αὐτάρ ὑπέρθεν (230) αἰγείην κυνέην κεφαλὴ ἔχε, πένθος ἀέξουν. τὸν δ’ ἐστὶν ὡς οὖν ἐνόησε πολύτλας δίος Ὀδυσσεύς γήραϊ τειρόμενον, μέγα δὲ φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα, στὰς ἀρ’ υπὸ βλωθῆν ὅχην κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβε. ..........................................................

tà φρονόντων ιθὺς κίεν αὐτοῦ δίος Ὀδυσσεύς. ἡ τοι ο νέν κατέχων κεφαλὴν φυτόν ἀμφελάχαινε- τὸν δὲ παριστάμενος προσεφώνεε φαιδίμος νίος· ὃ γέρον, οὐκ ἄδαημονι σ’ ἔχει ἀμφιπολεύειν ὄρχατον, ἀλλ’ εὗ τοι κυμηὴ ἔχει, οὐδέ τι πάμπαν, (245) οὐ φυτόν, οὐ συκή, οὐκ ἀμπελος, οὐ μὲν ἐλαίη,
οὐκ ὄγχνη, οὐ πρασιή τοι ἄνευ κομιδῆς κατὰ κῆπον.

…………………………

ἀλλ’ ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον· 256
tεὖ δμώς εἰς ἄνδρῶν; τεῦ δ’ ὀρχατον ἀμφιπολεύεις;

Homer, Odyssey, 24. 336-344 (Teubner)
ei δ’ ἄγε τοι καὶ δένδρε’ εὐκτιμένην κατ’ ἀλφήν 336
eῖπω, ἢ μοὶ ποτ’ ἐδωκας, ἡγὼ δ’ ἦτευν σε ἕκαστα
παιδνὸς ἐὼς, κατὰ κῆπον ἑπιστόμενος· διὰ δ’ αὐτῶν
ἀκνεύμεσθα, σὺ δ’ ἀνόμασας καὶ ἐειπες ἕκαστα.
δρχνας μοι δώκας τρεισκαίδεκα καὶ δέκα μηλέας, (340)
sυνεκας τεσσαράκοντ’ ὀρχους δ’ μοι ἀδ’ ὀνόμηνας
dὼςειν πεντήκοντα, διατρύγιος δ’ ἕκαστος
ηης; ἐνθα δ’ ἀνὰ σταφυλαι παντοίαι ἔασιν,
ὁπότε δὴ Δίως ἁραι ἐπιβρίσειαν ὑπερθεν.”

page 92, 100: Letter of Dareios to Gadatas, Magnesia 109 (Meiggs & Lewis)

α.1 βασιλεὺς [βα]σιλέ-
ων Δαρείος ὁ Ὑσ-
tάσπεω Γαδάται
δούλωι τάδε λέγε[ι]

5 πυνθάνομαι σε τῶν
ἐμών ἐπιταγμάτων
οὐ κατὰ πάντα πει-
θαρχεῖν ὃτι μὲν γὰ[ρ]
[τ]ὴν ἐμὴν ἐκπονεῖς

10 [γ]ῆν, τοὺς πέραν Εὐ-
[φ]όματον καρποὺς ἐπ[ι]
tά κάτω τῆς Ἀσίας μέ-
[γ]η καταφυτεύων, ἐπαι-
[v]ῶ σὴν πρόθεσιν και

15 [δ]ιὰ ταῦτα σοὶ κείσεται
Thus said Darius, king of kings, to Gadatas his servant:

It is known to me that you have not obeyed me in all that I have commanded you

Because you have laboured on my land

and removed and planted the fruits of Over-the-River upon the lower parts of Yavan

I praise your purpose and on this account good will is laid up for you in the house of the king.

But now because you have destroyed the law concerning my gods

I will make you taste my wronged anger if you do not change.

For you imposed tribute on the sacred gardeners of Resheph

and told them to till an unsanctified place

and you did not remember the thought of my ancestors concerning the god who spoke all truth to the Persians.

(trans. Lane Fox 2006)

Streams of water (as numerous) as the stars of heaven flow in the pleasure garden.
Pomegranates which like grape vines ... in the garden ... (I) Ashur-nasir-apli, in the delightful garden pick the fruit ......

[The tenant] shall garden assiduously and shall irrigate with the water flowing from the .......... into the water channel/pipe, nothing preventing him from watering his own land with this water.
The trees present are to be thriving, both olives and figs and the other tip fruit trees. If [they are] not, he himself [must] certainly grow new ones from the old, and prune them properly.

Within the sanctuary enclosure he may not till nor cut the cultivated trees nor make use of nor manure another tree.

When he leaves the sanctuary (> when his tenancy expires) the tenant shall cultivate half of the garden ......... and half of the vegetables and half (of the land) shall be left dry .............

[It is necessary for] he who is managing the land (> tenant) to sacrifice two oxen, prime specimens from the stock of those born each year.

page 113: Arkhippos, *Frag. 44* (Kock)

σκαφεύσι κηπωροίσι τοῖς τ’ ὀνηλάταις,
καὶ ταῖς γυναιξὶ προσέτι ταῖς ποαστρίαις

For diggers, gardeners and donkey drivers, and for the women who cut herbs.

page 113: Philyllios, *Poleis, Frag. 14* (Kock)

ἀνθρακοπώλης, κοσκινοποιός , κηπεύς, κουφεύς

clean-coal merchant, sieve maker, gardener, barber,

page 113: Aristophanes, *Frag. 697* (Henderson)

ὡστ’ ἀνακύπτων καὶ κατακύπτων τοῦ σχήματος οὖνεκα τούδε κηλώνειον τοῖς κηπουροῖς.

Then swinging up and swinging down in this posture of a well-beam for gardeners. (trans. Henderson, 2007)

page 118: Aristophanes, *Frag. 581* (Henderson)

(A) ὁφεὶ δὲ χειμῶνος μέσου σικυούς, Βότρυς, ὀπώραν,
στεφάνους ἰῶν, < (B) οἴμαι δὲ καὶ > κονιορτόν ἐκτυφλοῦντα.
(A) αὐτὸς δ’ ἀνήρ πωλεῖ κίχλας, ἀπίους, σχαδόνας, ἐλάας,
πῦν, χόρια, χελιδόνας, τέττιας, ἔμβρυεια.
ὑρίσους δ’ ἴδοις ἂν νειφομένους σύκων ὁμοῦ ταῖς γογγυλίσιν ἄρούσιν. ἀστ’ οὐκετ’ οὐδεὶς οὐδ’ ὅτιν’ ἐστι τούνιαυτοῦ.
(A) < αἴρ οὐ > μέγιστον ἄγαθόν, εἶπερ ἐστὶ δι’ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἢ τις ἐπιθυμεῖ λαβεῖν; (B) κακόν μὲν οὖν μέγιστον εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἄρ’ οὐκ ἀν ἐπεθύμουν οὐδ’ ἄν ἐδαπανώντο. ἐγὼ δὲ τούτ’ ὁλίγον χρόνον χρῆσας ἀφειλόμην ἃν.
(A) κἀγαγε ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεισι δρῶ ταῦτα πλὴν Ἀθηνῶν; τούτῳς δ’ υπάρχει ταῦτ’, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς θεοὺς σέβουσιν.
(B) ἀπέλαυσαν ἄρα σέβοντες ὑμᾶς, ὡς σὺ φῄς,
(A) τῇ τῇ;
(B) Ἀἴγυπτον αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν πεποίηκας ἀντ’ Ἀθηνῶν

(A) In midwinter you’ll see cucumbers and the fruit of the vine and crowns of violets.
(B) And blinding clouds of dust I think.
(A) One and the same man sells thrushes, pears, honeycombs, olives, beestings, haggis, swallows, crickets, fetal meat;
and you’d see baskets with figs and myrtle-sprays even when it snows.
(B) Then they sow the pumpkins together with the turnips, so that no one knows what time of year it is.
(A) Well, isn’t it fine indeed if, at any time of the year, you can get what your heart desires?
(B) In fact there’s nothing worse: if they couldn’t get it, they’d not want it, and so they’d save their money.
I’d lend them this stuff for a little while, then take it all away.
(A) I’d do just that with every city, with the sole exception of Athens:
They have all these things because they revere the gods.
(B) They’ve done well, then, by revering you as you say.
(A) What do you mean?
(B) You’ve changed their city from Athens into Egypt.
(trans. Henderson 2007)

pages 120 and 181: Xenophon, Anabasis, 5.3.7-13 (Brownson & Dillery)

(7) ἐπεὶ δ’ ἠφευγεν ὁ Ξενοφῶν, κατοικοῦντος ἢδη αὐτοῦ ἐν Σκιλλούντι υπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οἰκισθέντος παρὰ τὴν Ὁλυμπίαν ἀφικνεῖται
In the time of Xenophon’s exile and while he was living at Scillus, near Olympia, where he had been established as a colonist by the Lacedaemonians, Megabyzus came to Olympia to attend the games and returned to him his deposit. Upon receiving it, Xenophon bought a plot of ground for the goddess in a place which Apollo’s oracle appointed. As it chanced, there flowed through the plot a river named Selinus; and at Ephesus likewise a Selinus river flows past the temple of Artemis. In both streams, moreover, there are fish and mussels, while in the plot at Scillus there is hunting of all manner of beasts of the chase. Here Xenophon built an altar and a temple with the sacred money, and from that time forth he would every year take the tithe of the...
products of the land in their season and offer sacrifice to the goddess, all the citizens and the men and women of the neighborhood taking part in the festival. And the goddess would provide for the banqueters barley meal and loaves of bread, wine and sweetmeats, and a portion of the sacrificial victims from the sacred herd as well as of the victims taken in the chase. For Xenophon’s sons and the sons of the other citizens used to have a hunting expedition at the time of the festival, and any grown men who so wished would join them; and they captured their game partly from the sacred precinct itself and partly from Mount Pholoe – boars and gazelles and stags.

The place is situated on the road which leads from Lacedaemon to Olympia, and is about twenty stadia from the temple of Zeus at Olympia. Within the sacred precinct there is meadowland and tree-covered hills, suited for the rearing of swine, goats, cattle and horses, so that even the draught animals which bring people to the festival have their feast also. Immediately surrounding the temple is a grove of cultivated trees, producing all sorts of dessert fruits in their season. The temple itself is like the one at Ephesus, although small as compared with great, and the image of the goddess, although cypress wood as compared with gold, is like the Ephesian image. Beside the temple stands a tablet with this inscription: THE PLACE IS SACRED TO ARTEMIS. HE WHO HOLDS IT AND ENJOYS ITS FRUITS MUST OFFER THE TITHE EVERY YEAR IN SACRIFICE, AND FROM THE REMAINDER MUST KEEP THE TEMPLE IN REPAIR. IF ANY ONE LEAVE THESE THINGS UNDONE, THE GODDESS WILL LOOK TO IT.


page 120: Demosthenes, 53.15-16 (Murray)

(15) ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸ χωρίον τῆς νυκτός, ὅσα ἐνῆν φυτὰ ἀκροδρύων γενναίων ἐμβεβλημένα καὶ τὰς ἀναδενδράδας ἐξέκοψε, καὶ φυτευτήρια ἑλαῶν περιστοίχων κατέκλασεν, οὕτω δεινῶς ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλον ἡμέρας διαθεῖεν.
(16) πρὸς δὲ τούτοις μεθ’ ἡμέραν παιδάριον ἀστὸν εἰσπέμψαντες διὰ τὸ γείτονές τε ἐναι καὶ ὁμορον τὸ χωρίον, ἐκέλευον τὴν ῥοδωνιάν βλαστάνουσαν ἐκτίλλειν, ἵν’, εἰ καταλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἐγὼ προς ὅργῃ δήσαιμι ἢ κατάξαιμι ὡς δοῦλον ὄντα, γραφήν με γράψαιντο ὕβρεως.

He, however, came to my farm by night, cut off all the choice fruit-grafts that were there, and the tree-vines as well, and broke down the nursery-beds of olive-trees set in rows round about, making worse havoc than enemies in war would have done. More than this, as they were neighbours and my farm adjoined theirs, they sent into it in the daytime a young boy who was an Athenian, and put him up to plucking off the flowers from my rose-bed, in order that, if I caught him and in a fit of anger put him in
bonds or struck him, assuming him to be a slave, they might bring against me an indictment for assault.
(trans. Murray 1939)

**page 122: Diodoros Sikulus, 14.80.2 (Oldfather)**

ἐπελθὼν δὲ τὴν χώραν μέχρι Σάρεων ἐφθείρε τοὺς τε κήπους καὶ τὸν παράδεισον τοῦ Τισσαφέρνους, φυτοίς καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοίς πολυτελῶς πεφιλοτεχνημένον εἰς τρυφήν καὶ τὴν ἐν εἰρήνῃ τῶν ἁγαθῶν ἀπόλαυσιν.

[Agesilaüs] He overran the countryside as far as Sardis and ravaged the orchards and the pleasure-park belonging to Tissaphernes, which had been artistically laid out at great expense with plants and all other things that contribute to luxury and the enjoyment in peace of the good things of life.
(trans. Oldfather 1967)

**page 122: Athenaios, 12.515e, citing Klearchos (Gulick)**

Κλέαρχος δ’ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ περὶ Βίων “Ἀυδοί,” φησίν, “διὰ τρυφῆν παραδέισους κατασκευασάμενοι καὶ κηπαίους αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαντες ἐσκιατροφοῦντο, τρυφερῶτερον ἦγησάμενοι τὸ μηδ’ ὅλως αὐτοῖς ἐπιπίπτειν τὰς τοῦ ἡλίου αὑγάς”.

And Clearchus in the fourth book of his Lives says: “The Lydians in their luxury laid out parks, making them like gardens, and so lived in the shade, because they thought it more luxurious not to have the rays of the sun fall upon them at all”.
(trans. Gulick 1933/1943)

**page 122: Athenaios, 12.542a, citing Silenos of Kalacte and Kallias (Gulick)**

Σιληνὸς δ’ ὁ Καλακτῖνος ἐν τρίτῳ Σικελικῶν περὶ Συρακούσας φησίν κήπον εἶναι πολυτελῶς κατασκευασμένον ὅν καλεῖσθαι Μῦθον, ἐν ὧν χρηματίζειν Ἴρωνα τὸν βασιλέα.

Silenus of Calacte in the third book of his History of Sicily, says that in the neighbourhood of Syracuse there is a garden magnificently constructed which is called the “Word”; in it Hieron the king held audience.
(trans. Gulick 1933/1943)
Theopompus, speaking of Philip, says: “And two days later he arrived at Onocarsis, an estate in Thrace which included a very beautifully planted grove and one well adapted for a pleasant sojourn, especially during the summer season. In fact it had been one of the favourite resorts of Cotys, who, more than any other king that had arisen in Thrace, directed his career towards the enjoyment of pleasures and luxuries, and as he went about the country, wherever he discovered places shaded with trees and watered with running streams, he turned these into banqueting-places; (trans. Gulick 1933/1943)

On the level of the uppermost gangway there were a gymnasium and promenades built on a scale proportionate to the size of the ship; in these were garden-beds of every sort, luxuriant with plants of marvellous growth, and watered by lead tiles hidden from sight; then there were bowers of white ivy and grape-vines, the roots of which got their nourishment in casks filled with earth, and receiving the same irrigation as the garden-beds. These bowers shaded the promenades. (trans. Gulick 1928)
Aristoxenus, the Cyrenaic philosopher, practised literally the system of philosophy which arose in his country, and from him a kind of ham specially prepared is called Aristoxenus; in his excess of luxury he used to water the lettuce in his garden at evening with wine and honey, and taking them up in the morning used to say that they were blanched cakes produced by the earth for him.

(trans. Gulick 1927/1951)

This power of yours is something in an altogether different category from all the advantages of houses or of cultivated land. You may think that when you lose them you have suffered a great loss, but in fact you should not take things so hardly; you should weigh them in the balance with the real source of your power and see that, in comparison, they are no more to be valued than gardens and other elegances that go with wealth.


References first cited in Chapter 4

pages 132, 185: Sappho, Frag. 30, ll. 2-5 (Carson)
φας ἱοκόλπω.

girls
all night long
might sing of the love between you and the bride
with violets in her lap.

**Pages 132, 185: Sappho, Frag. 103, ll. 1-4 (Carson)**

[ἐν τὸ γὰρ ἐννέπετε ἦ προβῆ]
[ατὰ τὰν εὔποδα νῦμφαν []
[τὰ παιδὰ Κρονίδα τὰν ἱοκ[ολπ]ον []
[τὸ ὠργ-cert θεμένα τὰν ἱοκ[ολπ]ῶς ἀ]

)yes tell
)the bride with beautiful feet
)child of Kronos with violets in her lap
)setting aside anger the one with violets in her lap

**Page 134, 189: Sappho: Frag. 94, ll. 12-17 (Carson)**

[πὸλλοις γὰρ στεφάνιοις ἱων
καὶ βρ[όδων ... ]κίων τ’ ὑμοι
κα.. [ πὸρ εμοι περ<ε>θήκα<ο>]

καὶ πόλλας ὑπα.θύμιας
πλέκ.τας ἀμφ’ ἀ.πάλαι δέραι
ἀνθέων ἐ[ ]πεποημέναις.

For many crowns of violets
and roses
) at my side you put on

and many woven garlands
made of flowers
around your soft throat.
page 134: Sappho: *Frag.* 122 (Carson)

ἄνθε’ ἀμέργοισαν παῖδ’ ἀγαν ἀπάλαν

gathering flowers so very delicate a girl

page 134: Sappho: *Frag.* 125 (Carson)

αὐταφόρα ἐστεφανοπλόκην

I used to weave crowns.

page 134: Sappho: *Frag.* 81 (Carson)

σὺ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὦ Δίκα, π.ἔφθες.θ’ ἐράτοις φόβαισιν ὅρυκακες ἄνήτω συν<α>.ἐ.φ.αις.ἀ’ ἀπάλαισι χέροιν· εὐάνθεα γὰρ πέλεται καὶ Χάριτες μάκαιρα<ι> μάλλον προτερην, ἀστεφανώτοισι δ’ ἀπυστρέφονται.

But you, O Dika, bind your hair with lovely crowns, tying stems of anise together in your soft hands. For the blessed Graces prefer to look on one who wears flowers and turn away from those without a crown.


τὴν δ’ ἐκ μελίσσης· τὴν τις εὐτυχεὶ λαβῶν· κείνη γὰρ οἰη μῶμος οὐ προσιζάνει, θάλλει δ’ υπ’ αὐτῆς κἀπαέξεται βίος, φίλη δὲ σὺν φιλέοντι γηράσκει πόσει τεκοῦσα καλὸν κὠνομάκλυτον γένος. κἀριπρεπὴς μὲν ἐν γυναιξὶ γίνεται πάσηισι, θείη δ’ ἀμφιδέδρομεν χάρις. οὐδ’ ἐν γυναιξίν ἤδεται καθημένη ὀκου λέγουσιν ἀφροδισίους λόγους. τοῖς γυναῖκας ἀνδράσιν χαρίζεται
Zeus tás árístas kai polυφραδεστάτας.

One from a bee: he’s lucky who gets her,
For she’s the only one on whom no blame
Alights. Wealth grows and prospers at her hands
Bound in affection with her husband she
Grows old, her children handsome and esteemed.
Among all women she stands out; a charm
Divine surrounds her. She does not enjoy
Sitting with women when they talk of sex.
Of all the wives that Zeus bestows on men,
This kind’s the finest and most sensible.
(trans. West, 1994)

page 161: Demosthenes, 47.52-53 (Murray)

(52) Ὁ δὲ Θεόφημος ἀντὶ τοῦ τὴν καταδίκην ἀπολαβεῖν ἀκολουθήσας ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν, ἐλθὼν μου τὰ πρόβατα λαμβάνει ποιμαίνομενα πεντηκοντα μαλακὰ καὶ τὸν ποιμένα μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀκόλουθα τῇ ποίμνῃ, ἐπειτα παῖδα διάκονον ὑδρίαν χαλκῆν ἀποφέροντα ἀλλοτρίαν ἠτημένην, πολλοῦ ἀξίαν. καὶ ταῦτα ἔχουσιν οὐκ ἔξηκεσεν
(53) αὐτοῖς· ἀλλ’ ἔπεισελθόντες εἰς τὸ χωρίον (γεωργῶ δὲ πρὸς τῷ ἱπποδρόμῳ, καὶ οἰκῶ ἐνταῦθ’ ἐκ μειρακίου) πρῶτον μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ᾖξαν, ὡς δὲ οὗτοι διαφεύγουσιν αὐτούς καὶ άλλος άλλη ἀπεχώρησαν, ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ ἐκβαλόντες τὴν θύραν τὴν ἑτ’ τὸν κήπον φέρουσαν (Εὔεργός τε οὐτοσι ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ Θεοφήμου καὶ Μνησίβουλος ὁ κηδεστὴς αὐτοῦ, οῖς οὐδεμίαν ἄκακαν ὠψιν ἐπιστήκεν αὐτοῦς ἀπτεσθαι τὸν ἐμὸν οὐδενὸς) εἰσελθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν γυναῖκά μου καὶ τὰ παιδία ἔξεφορήσαντο ὡσ’ ἐτὶ ὑπόλοιπά μοι

(52) Theophemus, however, instead of going with me to the bank and receiving the amount of his judgement, went and seized fifty soft-wooled sheep of mine that were grazing and with them the shepherd and all that belonged to the flock, and also a serving-boy who was carrying back a bronze pitcher of great value which was not ours, but had been borrowed. And they were not content with having these,
(53) but went on to my farm (I have a piece of land near the Hippodrome, and have lived there since my boyhood), and first they made a rush to seize the household slaves, but since these escaped them and got off one here and another there, they went to the house and bursting open the gate which led into the garden (these were
this man Evergus, the brother of Theophemus, and Mnesibulus, his brother-in-law, who had won no judgement against me, and who had no right to touch anything that was mine) – these men, I say, entered into the presence of my wife and children and carried off all the furniture that was still left in the house.
(trans. Murray 1939)

page 177: Euripides, Hippolytos, 73-81 (Oxford)

σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου λειμῶνος, ὦ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω, ἐνθ’ οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιόι φέρβειν βοτὰ οὔτ’ ἠλθέ πὼ σίδηρος, ἀλλ’ ἀκηράτον μέλισσα λειμῶν’ ἥρινη διέρχεται,
Αἰδὼς δὲ ποταμίαι κηπεύει δρόσους, ὥσις διδακτόν μηδὲν ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληχεν ἐς τὰ πάντ’ ἀεί, τούτοις δρέπεσθαι, τοῖς κακοίσι δ’ οὐ θέμις.

My mistress Artemis, I bring you this woven garland which I have made for you from the virgin meadow where no shepherd thinks it right to graze his flock, where no scythe has ever come, but in the spring the bee flies through its virgin greenery. Reverence tends it with water from the rivers, so that those for whom virtue in all things has not had its everlasting place assigned by teaching but by nature can pick the flowers there – but it is not proper for base men to do so.
(trans. Morwood 1997)

page 179: Anakreon, Frag. 3 (Page)

γουνοῦμαι σ’ ἐλαφηβόλε
Ξανθῆ παί Διός ἄγριων
δέσποιν’ Αρτεμὶ θηρῶν·
ἡ κοῦ νῦν ἐπὶ Ληθαίου
dίνησι θρασυκαρδίων
ἀνδρῶν ἐσκατορᾶς πόλιν
χαίρουσ’, οὐ γὰρ ἀνημέρους
ποιμαίνεις πολύτας.

Shooter of deer, I supplicate you,
Artemis, Zeus’s fair-haired daughter,
mistress of beasts of the wild.

Now by the waters of Lethaeus
you must be looking down with pleasure
on a city of men bold-hearted:
they are no wild and untamed people
that you have for your flock.
(trans. West 1994)

page 180: Theognis, Elegiai, 1, ll. 261-266 (Young/Diehl)

West includes these lines under the Anonymous Theognidea, collected around Theognis’ name from the sixth century.

Her mum and dad must like their wine well
cooled: she comes
so often to the well, and draws, and cries –
the well by which I took her round the waist, and kissed her on the neck, while prettily she squealed.
(trans. West 1994)

page 182: Euripides, Iphigenia in Tauris, 1143-1152 (Oxford)

If only I could take my place in choruses where once
as a girl at illustrious weddings, 
whirling my foot beside +my dear 
mother's age-mates’ companies+, 
in rivalry of grace 
and luxurious finery, 
rousing myself for the contest I threw about me 
richly worked robes and tresses 
darkening my cheeks! 
(trans. Cropp 2000)
... I, poor wretch, live with the lot of a rustic, longing to hear the assembly being summoned, Agesilaidas, and the council: the property in possession of which my father and my father’s father have grown old among these mutually destructive citizens, from it I have been driven, an exile at the back of beyond, and like Onomacles I settled here alone in the wolf-thickets (?) (leaving the?) war ... for to get rid of strife against ... is not ... to the precinct of the blessed gods ... treading on the black earth; ... meetings themselves I dwell, keeping my feet out of trouble, where Lesbian women with trailing robes go to and fro being judged for beauty, and around rings the marvellous sound of the sacred yearly shout of women; from many (troubles) when will the Olympian gods (free me)?
(trans. Campbell 1982)

page 187, Anakreon, Frag. 72 (Page)

πῶλε Θηρική, τι δή με
λοξόν ὑμμασι βλέπουσα
νηλέως φεύγεις, δοκείς δὲ
μ’ οὐδὲν εἰδέναι σοφὸν;
ἰσθι τοι, καλῶς μὲν ἀν τοι
τὸν χαλινὸν ἐμβάλοιμι,
ηνίας δ’ ἔχων στρέφοιμί
σ’ ἀμφι τέρματα δρόμου –
νῦν δὲ λειμώνας τε βόσκεαι
κοῦφα τε σκιρτῶσα παίζεις,
δεξιὸν γὰρ ἱπποπείρην
οὐκ ἔχεις ἐπεμβάτην.

Thracian filly, why do you look at me from the corner of your eye and flee stubbornly from me, supposing that I have no skill?
Let me tell you, I could neatly put the bridle on you and with the reins in my hand wheel you round the turnpost of the race-course; instead, you graze in the meadows and frisk and frolic lightly, since you have no skilled horseman to ride you.
(trans. Campbell 1988)

page 187, Anakreon, Frag. 1 (Page)

οὐδὲ ... [ . ] σ. φ. α. [ ... ] .. [
φοβερὰς δ’ ἔχεις πρὸς ἄλλωι
φρένας, ὥς καλλιπρός παιδιών· ὦ in Campbell
καὶ σε δοκεῖ μεν ἐν [ν] δόμοις in Campbell
πυκνώς ἔχουσα [μή]τηρ at end in Campbell
άτταλλειν· σι[ .] [ .... ] ... [ ...
τὰς υακιν[θίας ἄρ]οφρας
[να Κύπρις ἐκ λεπάδων
..... ] ]α[ς κατέδησεν ἵππους·
..... ] δ’ ἐν μέσῳ κατήξας in Campbell
..... ]ωι δι’ ἄσσα πολλοὶ
πολιητέων φρένας ἐπτοέαται
λεωφόρ’ Ἔροτ[ί]μη,

... nor ... but you have a timid heart as well, you lovely-faced boy, and (your mother)
thinks that she tends you (at home), keeping a firm hold on you;
(but you escaped to?) the fields of hyacinth, where Cyprian Aphrodite tied
her (lovely?) horses freed from the yoke; and you darted down in the midst
of (throng?), so that many of the citizens have found their hearts fluttering.
(trans. Campbell 1988)

page 187: Theognis, Elegiae, 2, ll. 1249-1252 (Young/Diehl)

Παῖ, σὺ μὲν αὖτος ἱππός, ἐπεὶ κριθῶν ἐκορέσθης,
ἀὖθις ἐπὶ σταθμοὺς ἠλύθες ἡνίοχόν
ποθῶν ἀγαθὸν λειμῶνά καλόν
κρήνην τε ψυχρὴν ἄλσεά τε σκιερά
(translation: Gerber, 1999)

Boy, you’re just like a horse; when you got your fill of barley,
you came back to my stable, longing for your skilled charioteer,
lovely meadow, cool spring water and shady groves.

pages 187, 283 and passim: Plato, Phaidros, 229a-c, 230b-c (Oxford)

229(a) ΣΩ· Δεῦρ’ ἐκτραπόμενοι κατὰ τὸν Ἰλισὸν ὁμομεν, εἶτα
ὅπου ἀν δόξη ἐν ἰσυχίᾳ καθωμομέθα.
ΦΑΙ· Εἰς καὶρόν, ὡς οὐκετε, ἀνυπόδητος ἂν ἐτυχον· σὺ
μὲν γὰρ δὴ ἄει. ὡς στον οὖν ἡμιν κατὰ τὸ ὑδάτινον βρέχομεσι
tους πόδας ιέναι, καὶ οὐκ ἄνδρες, ἀλλας τε και τήνε τὴν
ὥραν τοῦ ἔτους τε καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας.
ΣΩ· Πρόαγε δή, καὶ σκόπει ἂμα ὅπου καθιζῃσόμεθα.
ΦΑΙ· Οράς οὖν ἐκείνη τὴν ύψηλοτάτην πλάτανον;
ΣΩ· Τί μήν;
(b) ΦΑΙ· Εκεί σκιά τ’ ἐστίν καὶ πνεῦμα μέτριον, καὶ πόσα καθίζεσθαι ἢ ἂν βουλώμεθα κατακλινῆναι.
ΣΩ· Πρόαγοις ἄν.
ΦΑΙ· Εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Σώκρατες, τί μήν;
ΣΩ· Προάγοις ἄν.
ΦΑΙ· Εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐκ ἐνθένδε μέντοι ποθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰλισοῦ λέγεται ὁ Βορέας τὴν Ὠρείθυιαν ἁρπάσαι;
ΣΩ· Λέγεται γάρ.
ΦΑΙ· Αὐτὸν ἐνθένδε; χαρίεντα γοῦν καὶ καθαρὰ καὶ διαφανῆ τὰ υδάτια φαίνεται, καὶ ἐπιτήδεια κόραις παίζειν παρ' αὐτά.
(c) ΣΩ· Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ κάτωθεν ὅσον δύ' ἢ τρία στάδια, ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἐν Ἄγρας διαβαίνομεν· καί ποῦ τίς ἐστι βωμὸς αὐτόθι Βορέου.
ΦΑΙ· Οὐ πάντως νενόηκα· ἀλλ' εἰπὲ πρὸς Διός, ὦ Σώκρατες, τίς ἄν αὐτὸ διαβαίνομεν· καὶ ποῦ τίς ἐστι βωμὸς αὐτόθι Βορέου.
ΦΑΙ· Οὐ πάντως νενόηκα· ἀλλ' εἰπὲ πρὸς Διός, ὦ Σώκρατες, σὺ τούτῳ τὸ μυθολόγημα πείθη ἀληθές εἰναι; (5)
ΣΩ· Αὐτὸ εἰ ἀπιστοῖν, ἄσπερ οἱ σοφοί, οὐκ ἂν ἄτοπος εἴην, εἴτε σοφιζόμενος φαίην αὐτήν πνεῦμα Βορέου κατὰ τῶν πλησίον πετρῶν σὺν Φαρμακείᾳ παίζουσαν ἄσσαι, καὶ .....
Socrates
Lead the way.

Phaedrus
Tell me, Socrates, is it not from some place along here by the Ilissus that Boreas is said to have carried off Oreithyia?

Socrates
Yes, that is the story.

Phaedrus
Well, is it from here? The streamlet looks very pretty and pure and clear and fit for girls to play by.

(229c) Socrates
No, the place is about two or three furlongs farther down, where you cross over to the precinct of Agra; and there is an altar of Boreas somewhere thereabouts.

Phaedrus
I have never noticed it. But, for Heaven's sake, Socrates, tell me; do you believe this tale is true?

Socrates
If I disbelieved, as the wise men do, I should not be extraordinary; then I might give a rational explanation, that a blast of Boreas, the north wind, pushed her off the neighboring rocks as she was playing with Pharmacea, and ......

230(b) Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν αὐτό. ΣΩ· Νὴ τὴν Ἥραν, καλὴ γε ἡ καταγωγή. ἥ τε γὰρ πλάτανος αὐτή μάλ’ ἀμφιλαφής τε καὶ υψηλή, τοῦ τε ἄγνου τὸ ύψος καὶ τὸ σύσκιον πάγκαλον, καὶ ὡς ἀκμὴν ἦχε θές ἄνθης, ὡς ἄν εὐαιστήτων παρέχεται ποῆμα τόπον· ἢ τε αὐτὴ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῆς πλατάνου ῥεῖ μάλα ψυχροῦ ὕδατος, ὡστε γε τῷ ποδὶ τεκμήρασθαι. Νυμφών τε τῶν κορῶν καὶ Ἀχελὼν, τεφρόν ἀπὸ τῶν κορῶν τε καὶ ἀγαλμάτων ἐοίκεν εἶναι. (c) εἰ δ᾿ αὐτῷ βούλετο, τὸ εὐπνοι ὑπὸ τὸ τόπου ἀγαπητόν καὶ σφόδρα ἔδω, Θερινόν τε καὶ λιγυρὸν ύπηρχει τῷ τῶν τεττίγων χορῷ. Πάντων δὲ κομψότατον τὸ τῆς πόας, ὅτι ἔν ἡρέμω προσάνεται ἰκανὴ πέφυκε κατακλινέντει τὴν κεφαλὴν παγκάλως ἔχειν. ὡστε ἄριστα σοι ἐξενάγηται, ὡ φίλε Φαίδρε.

Phaedrus
Yes, this is it.

Socrates
By Hera, it is a charming resting place. For this plane tree is very spreading and lofty, and the tall and shady willow is very beautiful, and it is in full bloom, so as to make the
place most fragrant; then, too, the spring is very pretty as it flows under the plane
tree, and its water is very cool, to judge by my foot. And it seems to be a sacred place
of some nymphs and of Achelous, judging by
(230c) the figurines and statues. Then again, if you please, how lovely and perfectly
charming the breeziness of the place is! and it resounds with the shrill summer music
of the chorus of cicadas. But the most delightful thing of all is the grass, as it grows on
the gentle slope, thick enough to be just right when you lay your head on it. So you
have guided the stranger most excellently, dear Phaedrus.
(trans. Fowler 1925)

page 188: Aristophanes, *Frag.* 664 (Henderson)

ἀλλὰ τὸ στρόφιον λυθὲν
tὰ κάρυα μου ἐξέπιπτεν

my brassiere unfastened,
out fell my nuts
(trans. Henderson 2007)

page 188: Anakreon, *Frag.* 87 (Page)

κνυζή τις ἡδή καὶ πέπειρα γίνομαι
σήν διὰ μαργοσύνην

Already I am becoming a wrinkled old thing,
over-ripe fruit, thanks to your lust.
(trans. Campbell 1988)

page 188: Euripides, *Cyclops,* 168-172 (Oxford)

ὡς ὦς γε πίνων μὴ γέγηθε μαίνεται·
ἦν ἐστὶ τοιτί τ’ ὀρθὸν ἔξανιστάναι
μαστοῦ τε δραγμὸς καὶ παρεσκευασμένου· (170)
ψαῦσαι χεροῖν λειμῶνος ὀρχηστύς θ’ ἀμα
cakówn te lήṣtis,

The man who doesn’t love a drink has got a few
screws loose: one swig and look! Your stick stands up,
your hand gets deep in cleavage and you start
the breaststroke towards her burning bush,
you’re dancing with the Nereids, nary a care
in the world.
(trans. Mchugh 2001)

page 188: Arkhilokhos, *Frag.* S478a, ll. 21-24 (Page)

θριγκοῦ δ’ ἐνερθε καὶ πυλέων ύποφ,
μή τι μέγαιρε, φίλη:
σχήσω γάρ ἐς ποηθόρους
κήπους, τὸ δὴ νῦν γνώθι:

But, my dear, do not begrudge my … under the coping and the gates.
For I shall steer towards the grassy garden; be sure now of this.
(trans. Gerber 1999)

page 188: Arkhilokhos, *Frag.* 331 (West)

συκῆ πετραίη πολλὰς βόσκουσα κορώνας,
εὐήθης ξείνων δέκτρια Πασιφίλη

Like a fig tree on rocky ground that feeds many crows,
good-natured Pasiphile takes on strangers.
(trans. Gerber 1999)


... μὴ δείσῃς· ἐξείργασαι γὰρ πάγκαλόν τι χρήμα,
οἶνον ἥδη τίς σοι τῶν πάπποτο ........... οὐδεὶς τῶν
κατὰ χειρὰν πονηθέντων, τὴν σεαυτοῦ ἐταίραν ἱδρύσας
ἐν τεμένει. μέση γάρ ἐστι ἡ Ἠσία [ἐπὶ] τῆς σῆς Ἀφροδίτης
καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτος ἄμα τοῦ σοῦ. μὴ ἄρεσθης δὲ μοι
τῆς τιμῆς· οἱ γάρ ἡμᾶς χειραμάτων ἐπανοῷσι Πραξι-
τέλη, καὶ ὅτι τῆς σῆς τέχνης γέγονα οὐκ ἀδοξοῦσί με
Θεσπιεῖς μέσην κείσθαι θεών. ἐν ἔτι τῃ δωρεά λείπει,
ἔλθειν σε πρός ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν τῷ τεμένει μετ’ ἄλληλων
κατακλινώμεν. οὐ μιανοῦμεν γὰρ τοὺς θεους οὐς αὐτοὶ
πεποιήκαμεν. ἔρρωσο.
Have no fear! For who else in mankind ever accomplished a wonderful thing such as this? Nobody! From the toils of your hands you have set up a statue of your companion in a sacred precinct; for I stand in the middle, in front of me Aphrodite and Eros, both yours. Don’t begrudge me the honour. For those who see me praise Praxiteles, and because I originate from your art the people of Thespiae don’t think me unworthy of being placed between gods. One thing is still missing from your gift: that you come to me so that we may lie down with each other in the sacred precinct. We shall not defile the gods which we ourselves have created. Farewell.

(trans. Granholm 2012)

---

page 190: Sappho, Frag. 140 (Carson)

Κατθνάσκει, Κυθέρη', ἀβρος Ἀδώνις· τί κε θείμεν; καττύπτεσθε, χόραι, καὶ κατερείκεσθε χίτωνας.

delicate Adonis is dying Kythereia, what should we do? strike yourselves maidens and tear your garments.

---

page 190: Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 387-398 (Oxford)

ΠΡΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ: ἀφ’ ἐξέλαμψε τῶν γυναικῶν ἡ τρυφή χὼ τυμπανισμός χοί πυκνοὶ Σαβάζιοι, ὁ τ’ Ἀδωνιασμός οὗτος οὐπτ᾽ τῶν τεγῶν, οὐ ’γω ποτ’ ἤν ἤκουον ἐν τῇ κλησίᾳ; ἐλεγε ὁ μὴ ὥρασι μὲν Δημόστρατος πλεῖν εἰς Σικελίαν, ἡ γυνὴ δ’ ὀρχουμένη ἄιαὶ Ἀδωνιν’ φησίν, ὁ δὲ Δημόστρατος ἐλεγεν ὑπλίτας καταλέγειν Ζακυνθίων· ἡ δ’ ὑποπεπωκυῖ’ ἡ γυνὴ ’πὶ τοῦ τέγους κόπτεσθ’ Ἀδώνιν’ φησίν· ὁ δ’ ἐβιάζετο, ὁ θεοῖσιν ἐχθρὸς καὶ μιαρὸς Χολοζύγης. τοιαῦτ’ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἀκολαστ’ ἄσματα.

Magistrate: So the women’s depravity burst into flame again: beating drums, chanting ‘Sabazios!’; worshipping Adonis on the rooftops. I heard it all once before while sitting in Assembly. Demosthenes (bad luck to him!) was moving that we send an armada to Sicily, while his wife was dancing and yelling ‘Poor young Adonis!’.

Then Demosthenes moved that we sign up some Zakynthian infantry,
but his wife up on the roof was getting drunk and going
‘Beat your breast for Adonis!’ But he just went on making his motions,
that godforsaken, disgusting Baron Bluster!
From women, I say, you get this kind of riotous extravagance!
(trans. Henderson 1996)

page 191: Menander, Samia, 35-46 (Oxford)

[ φιλανθρώπως δὲ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς
Σαμίαν διέκειθ’ ἢ τῆς κόρης μήτηρ, τὰ τε
πλεῖστ’ ἢν παρ’ αὐταῖς ἦδε, καὶ πάλιν ποτὲ
αὐταῖ παρ’ ἡμῖν. ἐξ ἀγροῦ δὴ καταδραμὼν
ὡς ἐτυ]χ[ὲ] γ’ εἰς Αδώνι’ αὐτὰς κατέλαβον
συνηγμένας ἐνθάδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ τινων
ἄλλων γυναικῶν· τῆς δ’ ἑορτῆς παιδιὰν
πολλὴν ἔχοσθε ὑπὸ εἰκός, συμπαρὼν
ἐγινόμην οἶμοι θεατῆς· ἀγρυπνίαν
ὁ θόρυβος αὐτῶν ἐνεπόει γάρ μοι τινά·
ἐπὶ τὸ τέγος κήπους
[ἐπαννύχιζον]
[ἐσκεδασμέναι.

] the girl’s mother got on well
With father’s [Samian] lady friend; she spent
[A lot of time] with them, and [they] in turn
With us. Well, [as it happened?], I had rushed
Back from the farm, and found them [gathered] in
Our house here for the Adonis revels, with
Some [other] women. Naturally the rites
Proved [lots of] fun, and being there with them –
Oh dear! I turned spectator, for [the] noise
They made kept me awake. They carried plants
Up [to] the roof, they [danced], they had an all
Night party – spread all through the house.
(trans. Sandbach 1972)

page 191: scholion on Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 389-9 (Holwerda)

ὁ τ’ Ἀδωνιασμός: ἑορτὴν γὰρ ἐπετέλουν τῷ Ἀδωνίδι αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ κύπους
τινὰς εἰς τὰ δώματα ἀνέφερον. τινὲς δὲ ἐκ τοῦτον τὸ δράμα Ἀδωνιαζούσας
The women celebrated a festival to Adonis and carried gardens up to their housetops. Because of this, some incorrectly recorded the play as *Adoniozousai*. The women celebrated with many practices that were neither public nor disciplined.

---

**References first cited in Chapter 5**

**Page 204: Heraklides Kritikos, *Periegesis in Dikaiarkhos, Geographi Graeci Minores*: 1.12 9 (Teubner)**

κάθυδρος πάσα, χλωρά τε καὶ γεωλόφος, κηπεύματα ἅχουσα πλείστα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι πόλεως. Καὶ γὰρ ποταμοί ἰέοντος δὲ αὐτῆς δῦο, τὸ ὑποκείμενον τῇ πόλει πεδίον πάν ἄρδευοντες.

The land is well watered, green and covered with hills, and has the largest number of gardens of any city in Greece. Two rivers flow through the land and water the whole of the plain below the city.

(trans. Austin 1981)

---

155 *De facto, The Impotents.*
He was also the first to embellish the city with the so-called cultivated and refined haunts, which would before long become so extremely popular. He planted plane trees in the city square, and transformed the Academy from a dry, unirrigated spot into a well-watered grove, which he equipped with obstacle-free racing-tracks and shady walks.

(trans. Waterfield 1998)

Now Lysander admired the beauty of the trees in it [the paradeisos], the accuracy of the spacing, the straightness of the rows, the regularity of the angles and the multitude of the sweet scents that clung round them as they walked.

(trans. Marchant 1923)

A gentle grove surrounds with signs of worship to be revered, laurels entwined with wool and the tree of the suppliant olive.


πάτερ ταλαίπωρ’ Οἰδίπους, πύργοι μὲν οἱ
πόλιν στέφουσιν, ὡς ἀπ’ ὄμμάτων, πρόσω-
χώρος δ’ ὄν ἱερός, ὡς σάφ’ εἰκάσαι, βρύων
dάφνης, ἑλαίας, ἀμπέλου· πυκνόπτεροι δ’
eἰσω κατ’ αὐτὸν εὐστομούσ’ ἀηδόνες·

Father, old and broken Oedipus, the towers
crowning the city, so far as I can see,
are still a good way off, but this is holy ground,
you can sense it clearly. Why, it’s bursting
with laurel, olives, grapes, and deep in its heart,
listen ….. nightingales, the rustle of wings –
they’re breaking into song.
(trans. Fagles 1982/1984)

---

**pages 218, 240: Sophokles, Frag. 24 (Lloyd-Jones)**

έμοι μὲν ἀκτὰς ὀρισεν μολεῖν πατήρ,
πρεσβεία νείμας τήσε γῆς ..... Λύκω
τὸν ἀντίπλευρον κήπον Εὔβοιας νέμει,
Νίσω δὲ τὴν ομαυλὸν ἐξαιρεῖ χθόνα
Σκάπτωνος ἀκτῆς· τῆς δὲ γῆς τὸ πρὸς νότον
ὁ σκληρὸς οὐτος καὶ γίγαντας ἔκτρεφων
ἐίληχε Πάλλας.

My father decided that I should go to the coast, assigning to me the chief position in
this land ..... To Lycus he assigned the garden on the side opposite Euboea; and for
Nisus he chose out the neighbouring country of Sciron’s shore; and the southern part
of this land fell to the hard man, who brings up giants, Pallas.
(trans. Lloyd-Jones 1996)

---

**page 220: IG I² 784/I³ 977**

Ἀρχέδαμος ὁ Θεραῖος κἀπον Νῦ-
μφαις ἐφύτευσεν.

Arkhedamos the Theran planted a garden for the Nymphs.
Let him deposit the money in the ninth prytany with the receivers, of Kodros and Neleus and Basile at his own expense. Whatever for twenty years according to the specifications. The lessee shall fence in the sanctuary and the official sellers lease the sacred precinct of Neleus and Basile to the king.

Adosios proposed: in other respects in accordance with the Council’s proposal, but let the king and the official sellers lease the sacred precinct of Neleus and Basile for twenty years according to the specifications. The lessee shall fence in the sanctuary of Kodros and Neleus and Basile at his own expense. Whatever 15) rent the sacred precinct may produce in each year, let him deposit the money in the ninth prytany with the receivers,
and let the receivers hand it over to the treasurers of the Other Gods according to the law. If the king, or anyone else of those instructed about these matters in the prytany of Aigeis, does not carry out the things decreed, 20) let him be liable to a fine of 10,000 drachmas. The purchaser of the mud shall remove it from the ditch during this very Council after paying to Neleus the price at which he made the purchase. Let the king erase the name of the purchaser of the mud once he has paid the fee. Let the king write up instead on the wall the name of the lessee of the sacred precinct and for how much he has rented it 25) and the names of the guarantors in accordance with the law that concerns the sacred precincts. So that anyone who wishes may be able to know, let the secretary of the Council inscribe this decree on a stone stele and place it in the Neleion next to the railings. Let the payment officers give the money to this end. The king shall lease the sacred precinct of Neleus and of Basile on the following terms: 30) that the lessee fence in the sanctuary of Kodros and Neleus and Basile according to the specifications during the term of the Council that is about to enter office, and that he work the sacred precinct of Neleus and Basile on the following terms: that he plant young sprouts of olive trees, no fewer than 200, and more if he wishes; that the lessee have control of the ditch and the water from Zeus, 35) as much as flows in between the Dionysion and the gates whence the initiates march out to the sea, and as much as flows in between the public building and the gates leading out to the bath of Isthmonikos; lease it for twenty years. (trans. Papazarkadas 2014; https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGI3/84)

page 228: IGI² 4969, ll. 3-7

(1) [ὁ  θεὸς ἔχρησεν τῶι δήμωι τῶι Αθην[αίων ἀναθείναι] [τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν Δήμωνος καὶ τὸν κῆ[πον τὸν προσόντα] τῶι Ασκληπιῶι καὶ αὐτὸν Δήμωνα [ἱερέα εἶναι αὐτοῦ]. ἱερεύς Δήμων Δημομέλους Παιαν[ιεὺς ἀνέθηκε] (5) καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τὸν κηπὸν προσ[τάξαντος τοῦ θεοῦ] καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Αθηναίων δόν[τος ἱερέα εἶναι]
The god proclaimed to the Athenian people that they should dedicate the house of Demon and the garden belonging to it to Asklepios and that Demon should be priest of it. Priest Demon son of Demon of Paian has consecrated both the house and the garden as the god commanded and the Athenian people have granted him the priesthood of Asklepios according to the oracle.

Page 229: SEG 24, 203

θεοί.
κατὰ τ[άδ]ε ἐμίσθωσεν
Χάροψ [Φ]αληρεὺς καὶ ο-
ι ὀργ[εύων] τοῦ ἡρώω
5 τὸν [κηπί]ον Ὑρασῳβούλ-
ωι Α[λωπε]κηθεῖν εἰκοσι
δραχμῶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτό
ἐκάστου ἐτη τριάκον-
τὰ οποδιδόναι δὲ τὴν
10 μίσθωσιν ἐν τῷ Ὑραγ-
ηλιῶν ἐνοικοδομεῖ-
σθαι δὲ Ὑρασοῦ βουλον
ἐάν τι βουλήται τοῖς
αὐτοῦ τελέσσαι ἐν τῶι
15 χωρίω τῷ ἐξω τοῦ ὑ-
ετοῦ ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐν ἀ-
εὶ ὁ χρόνος τῆς μισθω-
σεως ἀπιέναι Ὑραγη-
ουλον λαβοντα τὸν κέ-
20 ρομον καὶ τὰ ξύλα καὶ
τὰ θυρώματα, ἀμὴ τι
αὐτοῦ πειθεὶς Χάροψ
καὶ οἱ ὀργεύωνς στή-
σαι δὲ στήλην Ὑρασοῦ-
25 βολον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀντ-
ίγραψα τῶν δὲ τῶν συν-
In accordance with these [regulations] Kharops Phalereos and the cult members leased out the garden belonging to shrine of the Hero to Thrasuboulos from Alopeke for twenty drakhmi each year for 30 years. The rent to be paid in Thargelion. Thrasuboulos can build in it if he wishes at his own expense on the land that is outside the water channel. When the time of the tenancy has expired, Thrasuboulos [can] take away the the tiling and the door frames and the doors if Kharops and the orgeones do not persuade him [otherwise]. Thrasuboulos is to erect a stele in the shrine inscribed with a copy of these terms. Time: Nikodrates’ magistracy. The sanctuary is to be kept pure.

page 232: Suda, T733

Τὸ Ἰππάρχου τειχίον: Ἰππάρχος ὁ Πεισιστράτου περὶ τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν τείχος ὕκοδόμησε, πολλὰ ἀναγκάσας ἀναλώσαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δαπανηρῶν πραγμάτων ὥσπερ εἰρηται.

Hipparkhos the son of Peisistratos built a wall round the Academy, having compelled the Athenians to spend a great deal [on it]. And this gave rise to the proverb in reference to expensive projects.

(http://www.stoa.org/sol-bin/search.pl?search_method=QUERY&login=guest&enlogin=5205644463c5610cb6c99782577802ad&page_num=1&user_list=LIST&searchstr=Hipparchos+wall&field=any&num_per_page=25&db=REAL)

page 233: scholion on Aristophanes, Frogs 995(b) (Holwerda)

ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ τόπου οὗ ἔτελείτο ὁ δρόμος, ἔλαιαι στοιχηδὸν ἴσταντο, οὕτως κατάντημα τοῦ δρόμου. οὕδεις ἐπέκεινα τοῦτων ἔχωρε. ὡστες οὖν πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἐπραττέ τι, ἐλεγον ὡς “ἐκτὸς τῶν ἐλαίων φέρεται”. ἐπεκράτησεν οὖν εἰς παροιμίαν.

At the place where the race-track ends, olives stand in a row, these being the end of the race-track. No-one goes beyond these. So, they say that whoever does something beyond what is necessary ‘is being carried outside the olives’. Thus it has managed to pass into a proverb.
Before their military campaigns, some of their musters took place in the Lykeion, because it lay alongside the city and produced more warlike men.

Apragmosune is a plant that Aristophanes the scholar says grows in the Academy.

Apragmosune is a flowering species, a type which smells completely and unfailingly sweet. Or "Apragmosune" is equivalent to "not polypragmosune".

They say that Lais, the Corinthian courtesan, once saw Euripides in a garden, with his writing-tablet and stilus hanging to his belt. 'O poet,' said she, 'answer, what did you mean when you wrote in a tragedy, “To perdition, you perpetrator of foul deeds?”' (trans. Gulick 1937/1950)
ἐν λεπτοτοις ὄφεσιν ἐστώσας, οίας
Ἡριδάνος ἁγνοῖς ὑδασι κηπεύει κόρας,
παρ’ ὄν βεβαίως ἀσφαλῶς τ’ ἔξεστι σοι
μικροὶ πρίασθαι κέρματος τὴν ἱδονήν;

Or don’t you know Love’s well-trained steeds as I know,
Those sweet-singing decoy-birds of the rhino,
Who stand in fine-spun shifts and serried ranks
As fair as those who line the garden banks
Of pure Eridanus, all more than willing
To give you pleasure safely for a shilling?
(trans. Edmonds 1959)
Appendix 2: Homeric References
κήπος

μήκων δ’ ὡς ἐτέρωσε κάρη βάλεν, ἢ τ’ ἐνι κήπῳ / καρπῶ βασιλεμένη νοτησί τε εἰαινήσειν / ὡς ἐτέρωσ’ ἤµυσε κάρη πηλήκει βαρυνθέν.

He bent dropping his head to one side, as a garden poppy bends beneath the weight of its yield and the rains of springtime; so his head bent slack to one side beneath the helm's weight.\textsuperscript{156}

He bent dropping his head to one side, as a garden poppy bends beneath the weight of its yield and the rains of springtime; so his head bent slack to one side beneath the helm's weight.\textsuperscript{156}

as a man running a channel from a spring of dark water guides the run of the water among his plants and his gardens with a mattock in his hand and knocks down the blocks in the channel; in the rush of the water all the pebbles beneath are torn loose from place, and the water that has been dripping suddenly jets on in a steep place and goes too fast even for the man who guides it; so ...

as a man running a channel from a spring of dark water guides the run of the water among his plants and his gardens with a mattock in his hand and knocks down the blocks in the channel; in the rush of the water all the pebbles beneath are torn loose from place, and the water that has been dripping suddenly jets on in a steep place and goes too fast even for the man who guides it; so ...

‘let someone make her way quickly and summon the old man Dolios, my own servant, whom my father gave me to have as I came here, and he keeps an orchard full of trees for me,’\textsuperscript{157}

‘let someone make her way quickly and summon the old man Dolios, my own servant, whom my father gave me to have as I came here, and he keeps an orchard full of trees for me,’\textsuperscript{157}

and there two springs distribute water, one through all the garden space, and one on the other side jets out by the courtyard door, and the lofty house, where townspeople come for their water.

and there two springs distribute water, one through all the garden space, and one on the other side jets out by the courtyard door, and the lofty house, where townspeople come for their water.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{156} Translations: Lattimore 1951/1961. \\
\textsuperscript{157} Translations: Lattimore 1975/1999.
\end{flushright}
Odyssey, 24.245-247, part of description of garden of Laërtes, emphasising care

αλλ’ ευ τοι κομιδή ἐχει, οὐδέ τι πάμπαν, / οὐ φυτόν, οὐ συκή, οὐκ ἀμπελος, οὐ μὲν ἐλαιη, / οὐκ ὄχυρη, οὐ πρασίη τοι ἀνευ κομιδῆς κατὰ κήπον.

‘everything is well cared for, and there is never a plant, neither fig tree nor yet grapevine nor olive nor pear tree nor leek bed uncared for in your garden.’

Odyssey, 24.337-343, reminiscence of childhood garden of Odysseus, linking garden inheritance with his identification as Laërtes’ son with right to rule

ἐγὼ δ’ ήτευν σε ἐκαστα / παιδνός ἐων, κατὰ κήπον ἐπισπόμενος· διὰ δ’ αὐτών / ἰκνεύμεσθα, σὐ δ’ ἀνόμασα καὶ ἐειπες ἐκαστα. / ὄγχας μοι δώκας τρειςκαίδεκα καὶ δέκα μηλέας, / συκέας τεσσαράκοντ’ ὄχυρους δὲ μοι ἄλθ’ ὄνομημας / δώσειν πεντήκοντα, διατρύγιος δὲ ἐκαστος ἠην.

‘I asked of you each one, when I was a child, following you through the garden. We went among the trees and you named them all and told me what each one was, and you gave me 13 pear trees, and 10 apple trees, and 40 fig trees; and so also you named the 50 vines you would give.’

Ὀρχατος

ναιε δὲ δῶμα / ἀφνειων βιότοιο, ἀλις δὲ οἱ ἦσαν ἄρουραι / πυροφόροι, πολλοὶ δὲ φυτών ἦσαν ὄρχατοι ἀμφίς, / πολλὰ δὲ οἱ πρόβατ’ ἐσκε.

[Oineus] established a house rich in substance, and plenty of wheat-grown acres were his, with many orchards of fruit trees circled about him, and many herds were his.

Odyssey, 7.112-115, part of description of garden of Alkinos, emphasising its quality and value

ἐκτοσθεν δ’ αὐλῆς μέγας ὄρχατος ἄγχι θυράων / τετάγανος· περὶ δ’ ἔρκος ἐλήλαται ἀμφιτέρωθεν. / ἐνθα δὲ δένδρα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τῆλεθάοντα, / ὄγχαι καὶ ὁιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι

On the outside of the courtyard and next the doors is his orchard, a great one, four land measures, with a fence driven all around it, and there is the place where his fruit trees are grown tall and flourishing,
He did not find either Dolios, as he came into the great orchard, nor any of his thralls, nor his sons, for all these had gone off to gather stones and make them into a wall retaining the orchard (aloe), and the old man had guided them on their errand.

‘Old sir, there is in you no lack of expertness in tending your orchard; everything is well cared for, and there is never a plant, neither fig tree nor yet grapevine nor olive nor pear tree nor leek bed un cared for in your garden (kpos).’

‘But come now, tell me this and give me an accurate answer. What man’s thrall are you? Whose orchard are you labouring?’

‘but let us go to the house which lies here next to the orchard, for there I sent Telemachos on ahead,’

[Diomedes] went storming up the plain like a winter-swollen river in spate that scatters the dikes in its running current, one that the strong-compacted dikes can contain no longer, neither the mound ed banks of the blossoming vineyards hold it rising suddenly as (cont.)
so contrasting his destructive force with the productive norms of society

ἐλθόντ' ἐξαπίνης ὅτ' ἐπιβρίσῃ Διός ὀμβρός, / πολλὰ δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔργα κατήριπε κάλ' αἰζηῶν.

Zeus’ rain makes heavy water and many lovely works of the young men crumble beneath it.

Iliad, 9.533-534, paradigmatic story designed to persuade Akhilles to re-enter the fighting by reminding him of divine retribution for wrong actions

καὶ γὰρ τοῖς κακῶν χρυσόθρονον Ἀρτεμίς ἔρρησεν / χωσαμένη, ὦ οἱ οὐ τιθαλύσια γουνῶ ἀλωῆς / Οἰνεὺς ἔρξε,

For Artemis, she of the golden chair, had driven this evil upon them, angered that Oineus had not given the pride of the orchards to her, the first fruits;

Iliad, 9.538-542, continuation of paradigmatic story in embassy to Akhilles, intended to demonstrate to him the consequences of not accepting gifts and returning to fight

ἡ δὲ χολωσαμένη διὸν γένος Ἰσχέαωρα / ὄρσεν ἐπ' χλούνην σὺν ἀγίον ἀργυρόντα, / ὡς κακὰ πόλλ' ἐρδεσκεν ἔθων Οἰνῆος ἀλωῆν; / πολλὰ δ' ὑγεπέλυμνα χαμαὶ βάλε δένδρα ἀλωῆς τῶν ἄρτα / τῆς ἐπικλημένης ἄγριον ἄργιδοντα, / ὁς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρωσεν ἔπι τῆς νᾶς τῆς Σταθής γουνῶ ἀλωῆς / ὡς γουνῶ ἀλωῆς ὄρσεν ἔρξε, ἐκατέρῳ καλλ' αἰζηῶν.

the Lady of Arrows sent upon them the fierce wild boar with the shining teeth, who after the way of his kind did much evil to the orchards of Oineus. For he ripped up whole tall trees from the ground, and scattered them headlong, roots and all, even to the very flowers of the orchard.

Iliad, 18.54-57, simile where Thetis laments the death of Akhilles, emphasising the loss in war of something precious and valued

𐍜 μοι ἐγὼ δειλή, ὦ μοι δυσαριστοτόκεια, / ἡ τ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ τέκον υἱόν ἄμυμονα τε κρατερόν τε, / ἐξοχὸν ἡμόν. ὡ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἐρνεῖ ἴσος, / τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ ἂρισταὶ φυτὸν ὄχ γουνῶ ἀλωῆς ἄρματο τε, / ἐπεὶ ἄρ ὡς δώκε γενέσθαι τε τραφ-ἐμεν τε / ἐξοχὸν ἡμόν, ὡ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἐρνεῖ ἴσος, / τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ ἂρισταὶ φυτὸν ὄχ γουνῶ ἀλωῆς.

‘Ah me, my sorrow, the bitterness in this best of child-bearing, since I gave birth to a son who was without fault and powerful, conspicuous among heroes; and he shot up like a young tree and I nurtured him, like a tree grown in the pride of the orchard.’

Iliad, 18.435-438, reprise of Thetis’ simile lamenting death of Akhilles

 StartTime: 18.435

υἱὸν ἐπεὶ μοι δώκε γενέσθαι τε τραφ-ἐμεν τε / ἐξοχὸν ἡμόν, ὡ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἐρνεῖ ἴσος, / τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ ἂρισταὶ φυτὸν ὄχ γουνῶ ἀλωῆς

‘For since he has given me a son to bear and to raise up and he shot up like a young tree, I nurtured him, like a tree grown in the pride of the orchard.’

EndTime: 18.438
Iliad, 18.561-563, *ekphrasis* of the Shield of Akhilles, part of the contrast of the city at war and at peace

ἐν δ’ ἐτίθησε σταφυλῆσι / μέγα βοίθουσαν ἀλωήν / καλὴν χρυσεῖν, μέλανες / ἀνὰ βότρυες ἦσαν· / ἑστήκει δὲ κάμαξι / διαμπερὲς ἀργυρέῃσιν.

He made on it a great vineyard heavy with clusters, lovely and in gold, but the grapes upon it were darkened and the vines themselves stood out through poles of silver.

Iliad, 18.565-566, continuation of *ekphrasis* of the Shield of Akhilles

μία δ’ οἴη ἀταρπίτος ἦν / ἑτ’ αὐτίν, / τῇ νίσοντο φορθὲς ὀτε τρυγόων ἀλωήν.

and there was only one path to the vineyard, and along it ran the grape-bearers for the vineyard's stripping.

Iliad, 21.35-38, part of transition between *aristeia* of Akhilles and his single combat with Lykaion; back story highlights someone Akhilles' wronged, by snatching him from his father's domain

Λυκάονι, τόν ὃ ποτ’ αὐτός ἦγε λαβὼν ἐκ πατρὸς ἀλωῆς ὑπ’ ἐθέλοντα / ἐννύχιος προμολόν· ὃ δ’ ἐγείνεν ὦξεῖ χαλκῷ / τάμιν νέους ὀρπηκας, ἵν’ ἀρματος ἀντυγες εἰεν.

[Lykaon,] one whom he himself had taken before and led him unwillingly from his father's gardens on a night foray. He with the sharp bronze was cutting young branches from a fig tree, so that they could make him rails for a chariot,

Iliad, 21.75-77, continuation of above, emphasising Lykaion's suppliant and xenia status, ignored by Akhilles

ἀντί τοι εἰμ’ ἱκέταο, / διοτρεφές, αἰδοίοιο· / παρ’ γὰρ σοὶ πρώτῳ / πασάμην Δημήτερος / ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μ’ εἰλὲς ἐὐκτιμένη ἐν ἀλωῇ.

‘I am in the place, illustrious, of a suppliant who must be honoured, for you were the first beside whom I tasted the yield of Demeter on that day you captured me in the strong-laid garden’

Iliad, 21.345-348, simile in transition passage, relating an aspect of war to the productive norms of peace, the surging river dried like the crops ready for harvest

πάν δ’ ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, / σχῆτο δ’ ἀγλαὸν ὑδωρ· / ὡς δ’ ὦτ’ ὅπως Βορέης / νεαρὸς’ ἀλωῆν / αἰψ’ ἀγξηράνη, χαίρει δὲ μὲν / ὡς τῆς ἔθειρ’· / ὡς ἐξηράνθη πεδίον πάν, / καὶ δ’ ἄρα νεκροὺς

and all the plain was parched and the shining water was straitened. As when the north wind of autumn suddenly makes dry a garden freshly watered and makes glad the man who is tending it, so the entire flat land was dried up with Hephaistos burning the dead bodies.

Odyssey, 1.190-193, description linking Laërtes' life (cont.)

ἀλλ’ ἀπάνευθεν ἐπ’ / ἀγροῦ πήματα πάσχειν / γρηῒ σὺν ἀμφιπόλω, ἢ οἱ

[Laërtes] away by himself on his own land leads a hard life with an old woman to look (cont.)
to the orchard-garden, his condition being a sign of a mal-governed society and of his innate character

Odyssey, 6, 291-294, description of Alkinos garden close to Athene’s sacred grove as a sign of his special status

Odyssey, 7.122-126, part of description of garden of Alkinos, emphasising its wond’rous productivity, a sign of divine favour

Odyssey, 11.192-197, Odysseus’ dead mother relates the sufferings of Laërtes, again associated with his orchard-garden, a prod to Odysseus to return and take up government of the kingdom; the same theme as 1.190-193

βρῶσίν τε πόσιν τε / παρθίθει, εὐτ’ ἀν μιν κάματος κατὰ γνία λάβῃσιν / ἐστικύοντ’ ἀνὰ γουνὸν ἀλῳῆς οἰνοπέδου.

dήμουν ἀγλαὸν ἄλσος Αθήνης ἄγχι κελεύθου / αἰγείρων, ἐν δὲ κρήνη νάει, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμών· /ἐνθὰ δὲ πατρὸς ἐμοῦ τέμενος τεθαλυῖα τ’ ἀλῳῆ, /τὸσσον απὸ πτάλιος, ὄσον τε γέγωνε βοήσας.

dε οἱ πολύκαρπος ἄλσος ἔφεξαται, / τῆς ἔτερον μὲν θ’ εἰλόπεδον λευρό / ἐν χώρῳ /τέρσεται ἡμέρα, ἐτέρας δ’ ἀριστοπόν /τρυγόσει /τέρσεται ἠελίῳ /τέρας δ’ ἀρατεύσει /τέρας δ’ ἀρατεύσει· τάροι δ‘ ἐνθ’ ὅγεκεῖται /τέρας δ’ ἐνθ’ ὅγεκεῖται.

Odyssey, 6, 291-294
Odyssey, 11.192-197
Odyssey, 7.122-126

You will find a glorious grove of poplars sacred to Athene near the road, and a spring runs there, and there is a meadow about it, and there is my father’s estate and his flowering orchard, as far from the city as the shout of a man will carry.’

There also he has a vineyard planted that gives abundant produce, some of it a warm area on level ground where the grapes are left to dry in the sun, but elsewhere they are gathering others and trampling out yet others, and in front of these are unripe grapes that have cast off their bloom while others are darkening

but when the summer comes and the blossoming time of harvest, everywhere he has places to sleep on the ground, on fallen leaves in piles along the rising ground of his orchard, and there he lies, grieving, and the sorrow grows big within him as he longs for your homecoming, and harsh old age is on him.
Odyssey, 24.220-221, Odysseus seeks his father, in his orchard-garden

αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς / ἀσσον ἱεν πολυκάρπτου ἀλῳῆς πειρητίζων.

but Odysseus went closer to the abundant orchard, searching

Odyssey, 24.222-225, continuation of above, linking good, hard-working characters and the garden

οὐδ᾽ εὑρεν Δολίον, μέγαν ὀρχατον ἐσκαταβαίνων, / οὔδε τινα διών οὐδ᾽ νιών· ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα τοι γε / αἰμασιάζει λέειστες ἀλῳῆς ἐμεναι ἐρκος / ἔχοντ᾽, αὐτὰρ ὅ τοις γέρων ὅδου ἤγεμόνευε.

He did not find either Dolios, as he came into the great orchard (orkhatos), nor any of his thralls, nor his sons, for all these had gone off to gather stones and make them into a wall retaining the orchard (aloe), and the old man had guided them on their errand.

Odyssey, 24.226-227, continuation of above, reinforcing care in the orchard-garden

tὸν δ᾽ οἶον πατέρ᾽ εὑρεν ἐυκτιμένη ἐν ἀλῳῇ, (226) λιστρεύοντα φυτὸν

but he did find his father alone in the well-worked orchard, spacing out a plant.

Odyssey, 24.336-337, culmination of above, Odysseus using his childhood garden as an identification

εἰ δ᾽ ἀγε τοι καὶ δένδρε' εὑκτιμένην κατ᾽ ἀλῳῆν / εἵπω, ἀ μοι ποτ᾽ ἐδώκας, ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἤτευν σε ἐκαστα / παιδνὸς ἐών, κατὰ κήπων ἐπισπόμενος·

‘Or come then, let me tell you of the trees in the well-worked orchard which you gave me once. I asked you of each one, when I was a child, following you through the garden.’\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{158} For aloe as threshing floor: ll. 5.499, 13.588, 20.496.
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Appendix 3: ἀκρόδγυα
The word ἀκρόδρυα does not seem to predate the fifth century; its earliest extant use in literature is Hellanikos Lesbios (Frag. 187b), preserved in Clement of Alexandria. The single reference in Aesop/Aesopica (Fabulae Dosithei, 16) is undatable.

Thereafter, references increase considerably. There are three in the Hippocratic corpus (De humor. 16, De natura pueri, 1.488/12.28, De affect. 61), one in Xenophon (Oik. 19.12), one in Plato (Kritias, 115a-b), a double in Demokritos (Abderita, Frag. 5, 123-128), one in Demosthenes (53.15), one in Diokles (Karystios, Frag.182, 136-144), two in Aristotle (Hist. animal. 606a-b, Prob. 930a-b) and one in a further fragment of Aristotle (Frag. 271). There are seven references in Theophrasos (HP 2.5.7, 4.4.11, 4.7.8, CP 3.6.7, 6.11.2, Char. 11.4, Frag. 4.5). These texts are given at the end of this appendix. There are a few later references, but the focus here is on the classical period.

The most illuminating aspect of these references is the extent to which the word is used almost exclusively by philosophical and medical writers. When the philosopher is focused on plant classification (Theophrastos), the references mushroom. As these writers were particularly concerned with accuracy of classification and knowledge, it is possible that they were using the word in a fairly specific way.

In epigraphy, there are but five references to the word, all of which are from Attica (IGII² 1035, IGII² 2494, SEG 26.121, SEG 39.153, DRII 180). These references are, in fact, reduced to one for the classical and post-classical period: IGII² 2494 and DRII 180 (discussed in section 3.3.2), belong to the same text. Dated to 339/338, this inscription comes during the fourth-century peak of this word, during the lifetimes of Aristotle and Theophrastos. IG II² 1035 and SEG 26.121 are also the same text, relating to the restoration of sanctuaries in Attica, but they are no earlier than 10/9 BC and so not relevant here. SEG 39.153 consists of the word alone and this is only one of three possible reconstructions.
In sections 3.2.4 and 3.3.2 it was suggested that the word *akrodrua* was used specifically to describe grafted fruit trees such as apples, these being distinguished from the figs and grapes of older, vegetatively-propagated Mediterranean species. The texts adduced in this appendix, certainly make a distinction between ‘fruits’ (ὀπώρα) and ἀκρόδρυα. The phrase used (with variations) - συκών τε καὶ σταφυλῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων (of figs and grapes and of the other *akrodrua*) is capable of two interpretations, one which includes and one which contrasts.

It could be argued that the category *akrodrua* is inclusive: that figs and grapes have some primacy, but that *akrodrua* are merely other fruits of the same generic classification. The Demokritos example (*Frag.* 5, 123-128) would support this view, distinguishing only between a general category of fruit and vegetables (ἀκρόδρυα, λάχανα), or between food crops/fruit and fruits/nuts in general (καρποί, ἀκρόδρυα). Hippokrates (*De humor.* 16), describes wine and *akrodrua* as providing a more varied diet in autumn and again makes no distinctions of the category.

However, if that is the case, the question arises of why the linguistic distinction was made in the first place. A perceived difference or contrast is the most probable explanation, and several texts make this specific. Plato (*Kritias*, 115a-b) distinguishes several categories of nutrient: that produced by trees, that providing drink, a category of food generally, and oils (ξύλινος, πώματα, βρώματα, ἀλείμματα). A further category is the *akrodrua* fruit that is so hard to store (δυσθησαύριστος ἀκροδρύων καρπός). All fruit can be difficult to store. However, grapes were normally turned into very easily storable wine and figs are often dried (τράγηματα – see Diokles fragment). It is perfectly possible to dry apples if cut into rings, but is a more complex operation. The reason for a distinction between *akrodrua* and food produced by trees is not clear. The categories are clearly different from those of our own day.

---

159 For example, Aesop/Aesopica (*Fabulae Dosithei*, 16), Xenophon (*Oik.* 19.12), Theophrastos (*HP* 4.4.11, 4.7.8).
The medical writer Diokles (*Frag.* 182, 136-144) makes a connection between food that is good and that which has the potential for harm (δύσχορςτος), stating that *akrodrua* are in the latter category; *akrodrua* seem again separate from figs and grapes. Aristotle (*Prob.* 930a-b) is similarly preoccupied with beneficial diet. In considering the consumption of liquids with fruits/foods, he makes a clear distinction between ‘fruits’ (ὅπωρα, primarily figs) and the other sort - the *akrodrua*. Writing of similar digestive concerns, Hippokrates (*De affect.* 61) again cites these same two categories.

It might be reasonable to expect greater care with horticultural language from Theophrastos. *HP* 4.4.11 and 4.7.8 are ambivalent and *Characters* (11.4) distinguishes only categories of nuts, myrtleberries and *akrodrua* for sale in the market (κάρυα, μύρτα, ἀκρόδρυα). His other references, however, strongly support the contrast between a generalised fruit and *akrodrua*.

*HP* 2.5.7 makes a clear distinction between the basic Mediterranean fruit triad of olive, fig and vine (which, as a group, are best planted on flatter, lower land - την πεδεινήν) and the *akrodrua* (best grown on the lower hill slopes - τας ὑπώρειας). *CP* 3.6.7 confirms the contrast. The preceding paragraph (3.6.6) has discussed the nature of land suited for figs and grapes, whilst 3.6.7 turns to the land best suited for *akrodrua* (again, τας ὑπώρειας) where wild species grow there naturally, indicating an affinity between fruit trees and this land type. In discussing flavour, *CP* 6.11.2 clearly separates *akrodrua* from figs.

A brief Theophrastan fragment (*Frag.* 4.5) provides the best evidence for *akrodrua* as being grafted fruit trees, as it specifies apples and pears. In referring to food that is fragrant (έυοσμος), Theophrastos says, ‘such as fruits of the *akrodrua*, both pears and apples’ - οἷον αἱ τῶν ἀκροδρύων καὶ ἀπίων καὶ μήλων. Demosthenes (53.15) confirms the specific connection between *akrodrua* and grafting. The grafted stock of choice fruit trees - φυτὰ ἀκροδρύων γενναίων ἐμβεβλημένα, of this elite
orchard-garden was discussed in section 3.3.6; these fruit species were distinguished from the tree-vines and olives on the same plot.

Several of these passages show in translation the uncertainty surrounding this word. Presumably partially because of the two categories of fruit (ὀπώρα and ἀκρόδρυα or καρποὶ and ἀκρόδρυα) the latter has been translated ‘nuts’ or ‘hard-shelled’ fruit, for which there seems little justification. LSJ defines akrodrua as ‘fruit grown on upper branches of trees, esp. hard-shelled fruits, opp. ὀπώρα’, citing the De affectionibus and the Historia Animalium passages below. These do not, however, support a translation as either ‘nuts’ or ‘hard-shelled fruit’ and are typical of the confusion surrounding plant classification in Greek.

Graham (2010, on Demokritos, Frag. 5) translates karpoi and akrodrua as ‘fruits and nuts’, as does Potter (1988, on Hippokrates, De affect. 61), who later (2012, on De natura pueri, 1.488) renders akrodrua as ‘hard-shelled fruits’, almost the same as ‘nuts’. Mayhew (2011, on Aristotle, Problemata, 930a-b) again translates as ‘hard-shelled fruits’; Jones (1931, on De humor. 16) as simply ‘fruits’. Balme (1991, on Aristotle, Historia animal. 606a-b), discussing the scarcity of food for herbivorous wild creatures, translates akrodrua as ‘nuts’: ‘also for hares and all those that do not eat flesh, because neither nuts nor fruit have a long season - τοῖς δὲ δασύποσι, καὶ ὅσα μὴ σαρκοφάγα, ὅτι οὔτ’ ἀκρόδρυα οὔτ’ ὀπώρα χρόνιος.

This Historia Animalium fragment shows the ‘nuts’ or ‘hard-shelled fruit’ translation to be inaccurate: hares are unlikely to eat nuts, their teeth being adapted to cutting and chewing large quantities of grasses, as well as seeds, buds, even twigs and bark, not for cracking nuts. Even if they did, contra Aristotle, nuts do have a long season, being preserved for months in their hard shells.

160 This passage also gives further support to the interpretation of akrodrua as apples and pears. It describes moisture turning to air and escaping from wood, leaves, grains, pulses and akrodrua under the influence of heat. With apples or pears you would get this hiss of escaping air; with nuts, the most likely result is an explosive bang as the hard shell is ruptured.
Much later, Athenaios (2.52a) stated that ‘The Attic and the other authors jointly speak of all the *akrodrua* as nuts’ (κάρυα). As far as surviving evidence is concerned, that does not seem to be the case for the classical period, but perhaps this text has helped provide a justification for the ‘hard-shelled’ interpretation of the word. Translating *akrodrua* as apples or pears or orchard fruits, in separation from the grapes, figs and olives group, seems the best solution to this translation problem. Apples and pears do not, indeed, have a long season unless preserved under very careful conditions organised by humans. Lamb (1925) and Bury (1942), when translating *Kritias* 115b, come nearest to this translation, rendering *akdodrua* as ‘fruit of the orchard trees’. Einarson’s (1990) ‘tree fruit’, translating *CP* 6.11.2, is equally specific.

Therefore, by the evidence of the above-cited texts, the separation of ὀπώρα and ἀκρόδρυα indicates a distinction between the Mediterranean fruit triad and later grafted species of large fruit, like apples and pears. Theophrastos (*HP* 2.5.7, *CP* 3.6.7) supports this, by giving different land requirements for the two and (*Frag.* 4.5) by specifically citing apples as *akrodrua*. This is also supported by Demosthenes (53.15) which links the *akrodrua* with grafting.

Two of the passages (Plato, *Kritias*, 115b, and Hellanikos Lesbios, *Frag.* 187b) maintain the early elite associations of fruit. *Kritias* describes food and repletion on the utopian Atlantis, whilst Hellankios Lesbios is describing the mythical world of the Hyperboreans. The participants of the ‘discussion’ in Xenophon’s *Oikonomikos* (19.12) and Demosthenes (53.15) are of the elite class. The use of the word by medical and philosophical writers is, however, fundamentally scientific and analytical.
Cited Texts

**Aesop and Aesopica, Fabulae Dosithei, 16**

ΜΥΣ ΑΡΟΥΡΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΜΥΣ ΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ
μῦς ἀρουραῖος ἐκάλεσεν ἑφ' ἐστιάσιν μῦν ἀστικὸν καὶ παρείχεν αὐτῷ
σιτείσθαι τὰ ἐν ἄγρῳ, συκῶν τε καὶ σταφυλῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων.
(Hausrath and Hunger, 1.2, 1959)

A country mouse invited a city mouse to dinner and gave him food from the fields to
eat: figs and grapes and the other *akrodrua.*

**Hellanikos Lesbios, 5C BC, Frag. 187b, recorded in Clement of Alexandria (Strom. I 15)**
(Jacoby, 1a, 4, F)

τοὺς δὲ Ὑπερβορέους Ἑλλάνικος ὑπὲρ τὰ Ῥιπαῖα
ὄρη οἰκεῖν ἱστορεῖ· διδάσκεσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς δικαιοσύνην μὴ κρεοφαγοῦντας,
ἀλλ' ἀκροδρύοις χρωμένους.

Hellanikos records that the Hyperboreans live beyond the Rhipaia mountains. He
teaches that for righteousness sake, they eat *akrodrua* instead of meat.

**Hippokrates, De humoribus, 16**

....... καὶ ἐν τῆς ὕφεςι,
diáταται, καὶ σιτία, καὶ ποτά, ὁ μὲν γὰρ χειμῶν ἄργος ἐργῶν, καὶ
πέπονα τὰ ἐσιόντα καὶ ἀπλὰ, μέγα γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο· αἱ ὅπωραι δὲ
ἐργάσιμοι, ἠλιώσιες, τὰ πινόμενα πυκνά, ἀκατάστατα σιτία, οἶνοι,
ἀκρόδρυα.

So with the seasons vary modes of living, foods and drinks. In winter no work is done
and foods are ripe and simple - an important point; in autumn work is done, exposure
to the sun is beneficial, drinks are frequent and foods varied, with wine and *fruits.*
(trans. Jones 1931)
Hippokrates, *De natura pueri*, 1.488 (12.28)

καὶ ὁκόταν διαθεμανθῇ τὸ ύγρὸν τὸ ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ ενεόν πνεῦμα γενόμενον χωρεῖ εξω καὶ τῇ δε ἐξων ἐξω τὸ θερμὸν τὸ ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ ἐνεόν ἀντιστά ἐτερον ψυχρόν, ἀφ’ οὕ τρεφεται. ποιεῖ δὲ τούτο καὶ φύλλα χλωφά, ὅταν καὶ πνεῦμα γὰρ ἰσχεὶ ἐπείτα ψήγνυσι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ὁδὸν ποιεῖ καὶ χωρεῖ εξω ἐλισσόμενον χωρέον δὲ ψόφων παρέχει, ἦ τὴν ἐκπνοὴν ποιεῖ καὶ χέδροσι, καὶ σίτος καὶ ἀκρόδρυα ὑθηματίσμενα πνεῦμα ἰσχεί, καὶ εξω ἔρχεται ἰσογην ποιησάμενον

When moisture present in wood is warmed through, it turns to breath and passes out, and just through the place where this breath passes out, the warmth in the wood attracts fresh, cold breath, from which it will be nourished. Green leaves, too, do the same when they are burned, since they also contain breath. Then the breath causes a tear, forms a passageway, and passes out with a swirl; as it passes out it makes a noise at the place where the expiration occurs. Pulses, grains, and hard-shelled fruits also take in breath when they are heated, and this then passes out by making a tear.

(Hippokrates, *De affectionibus*, 61)

Σύνη καὶ ακρόδρυα, διὰ τὸ τόδε μετὰ τὸ σιτίον ἀλυπότερά εστι καὶ υγιαίνοντι καὶ ἀσθενέοντι ὅτι βεβρωκότος μὲν ὀλίγην ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἰκμάδα σπᾶ τὸ σῶμα, ἢν δὲ νήστις ἐσθίῃ, πλεῖω.

Fruits and nuts are less injurious after the meal in both the healthy and the sick, for the following reason: because, in a person that has eaten, the body attracts little emanation from them, whereas if someone eats them in a fasting state, it attracts more.

(Xenophon, *Oikonomikos*, 19.12)

Καὶ περὶ ἀμπέλων ἀρὰ σύγε, ἐφη, φυτείας, ὡς Σώκρατες, τὰ αὐτὰ ἔμοι πάντα γιγνώσκω τυγχάνεις. Ἡ καὶ συκῆν, ἐφην ἐγὼ, σωτὶ δεὶ φυτεύειν; Οἶμαι δ’, ἐφη ὁ Ἰσχώμαχος, καὶ τὰλλα ἀκρόδρυα πάντα. τῶν γὰρ ἐν ἀμπέλου φυτείᾳ καλῶς ἐχόντων τί ἀν ἀποδοκιμᾶσαι
'About vine planting then, Socrates, your views are again exactly the same as mine. Does this method of planting apply to the fig too?' I asked.

'Yes, and to all the other fruit trees, I think; for in planting other trees why discard anything that gives good results with the vine?'

(trans. Marchant and Todd 1923/2013)

Plato, *Kritias*, 115a-b

ἐτι δὲ τὸν ἡμερον καρπὸν, τὸν τε ξηρόν, ὃς ἡμῖν τῇς τροφῆς ἕνεκα ἔστιν, καὶ ὅσοι χαίρε τοῦ σίτου προσχρώμεθα—καλούμεν δὲ αὐτοῦ τὰ μέρη σύμπαντα ὀσπρια—καὶ τὸν ὅσοι ξύλινος, πύματα καὶ βρώματα καὶ ἀλείμματα φέρων, παιδιᾶς τε ὃς ἔνεκα ἰδιόνῃς τε γέγονε δυσθησαύριστος ἀκρόδρυων καρπός, ὅσα τε παραμύθια πλησμονής μεταδόρπια ἀγαπητὰ κάμνοντι τίθεμεν,

also the fruit which admits of cultivation, both the dry sort, which is given us as nourishment and any other which we use for food – we call them all by the common name of pulse and the fruits having a hard rind, affording drinks and meats and ointments, and good store of chestnuts and the like, which furnish pleasure and amusement, and are fruits which spoil with keeping and the pleasant kinds of dessert, with which we console ourselves after dinner, when we are tired of eating – (trans. Jowett 1970)

Demokritos (Abderita), *Frag.* 5, 123-128 (Diels/Kranz)

οἱ τότε δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπλότητος ὄντες καὶ ἀπειρίας ἀνάμεσοι οὐδεμιᾶν οὔτε τέχνην οὔτε γεωργίαν ἐπιστάντο ὦτ' ἄλλο οὐδέν, οὔτε ὅ τι ἐστι νόσος ἤ θάνατος ἐπεγίνωσκον, ἀλλ ὡς ἐπὶ κοῖτον ἐπὶ τὴν γην πιπτοντες ἀπέψυχον οὐκ εἰδότες ο πάσχουσι· φιλαλληλίαν δὲ μόνον ἀδικούντες ἀγελαίον διέζων τὸν βίον δικήν ποιμνίων ὦτ' νομάς ἐξίσουντες καὶ τοῖς ἀκρόδρυοις κοινῶς καὶ τοῖς λαχάνοις τρεφόμενοι. καὶ ἄλλης κατὰ θηρίων προσεβοήθουν καὶ συνεμάχοντο γυμνοὶ γυμναίς ταῖς χειμάς γυμνοὶ δὲ οὕτω τυγχάνοντες καὶ σκέπης καὶ χρημάτων ὄντες ἐπίδειες καὶ μηδέ καρπούς καὶ ἀκρόδρυα πρὸς ἀποθήκας συναγαγεῖν εἰδότες, ἀλλὰ μόνην ἐσθίοντες τροφὴν τὴν ἐφήμερον χειμῶνος γεγονότος πολλοὶ διεφθείσοντο.

That first generation of men, being innocent and inexperienced, possessed no art – they understood neither farming nor anything else – nor were they familiar with
sickness or death, but they would fall to earth as if to go to sleep and there breathe out their life not knowing what was happening. But being sociable they would live their lives in a flock like sheep, going out to pasture and feeding on fruits (akrodrua) and herbs (laxanoi). And they would defend each other against wild beasts and fight as a group, being naked and having only their bare hands as weapons. Because they were thus naked and destitute of shelter and possessions, and ignorant of the need to lay up stores of fruits (karpoi) and nuts (akrodrua), only foraging for the day’s food, when winter arrived many of them perished.
(trans. Graham 2010)

Aristotle, Historia Animalium, 606a-b

αἰστιώνται δὲ τὰς τροφὰς, ὅτι τοῖς μὲν ἄφθόνως· τοῖς δὲ σπανίως, οἶνον τοῖς λύκοις καὶ τοῖς ἱέραξι· τοῖς δὲ σαφκοφάγοις ἡ ὕλη, σπάνια γὰρ τὰ μικρὰ ὄρνεα· τοῖς δὲ δασύτοσι, καὶ ὡσα μὴ σαφκοφάγα, ὅτι οὔτ’ ἀκρόδρυα οὔτ’ ὑπώρα χρόνιος.

The cause [of the difference in animals] is said to be the food, in that it is unstinted for some but scanty for others, such as the wolves and the hawks, and so is the provision for carnivores since the small birds are scanty, and for hares and all that do not eat flesh because neither nuts or fruit have a long season.
(trans. Balme 1991)

Aristotle, Problemata, 930a-b

Διὰ τί ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπολαύσει τῆς ὑπώρας, οἶνον σύκων καὶ τῶν τοιουτῶν, ἢ οἶνον ἀκρόδρυα δεῖ ἐπιπίνειν ἢ ὕδωρ; ταῦτα δὲ ἐναντία. ἢ ὡσα μὴ σαφκοφάγα καὶ τρέμει ἐστι καὶ ὑγρὰ διὰ τὴν γένεσιν; ἐχεῖ γὰρ πολὺ πῦρ καὶ ὑγρότητα, ὅτε διὰ μὲν τὸ πῦρ οἶνον ἐρῶν ποιεῖ ὁ χυμὸς εἰς ὕνω, ὡσεὶ ἐξ ἂν γλυκὸς ποιεῖ. έττον δὲ ἐχεῖ δύναμιν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ἀκρόδρυα.

Why, for the enjoyment of fruits such as figs and the like, should one drink unmixed wine or water with them? Is it because fruit is both hot and moist owing to its origin? For it contains much fire and moisture, so that owing to the fire, the juice produces something like boiling within, just as the sweet juice produces outside. (The other, hard-shelled fruits, have less of this power.)
(trans. Mayhew 2011)
Aristotle, Frag. 271

(In Photius) ἔσμα Ἀριστοτέλης, ὅπερ Θεόφραστος μίσχον· ἐστὶ δὲ ὁ ἀὐχήν τοῦ καρποῦ τῶν ἀκροδρύων.

(In Eustathius) ἐν αὐχένι σημειώσαι δὲ ὅτι αὐχήν οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ ζῴων λέγεται ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ καρπῶν, ὡς δηλοί ὁ οὕτω γράψας “ἔσμα φησίν Ἀριστοτέλης, Θεόφραστος δὲ μίσχον. ἐστὶ δὲ ὁ αὐχήν τοῦ καρποῦ τῶν ἀκροδρύων”

*Hesma*: [found in] Aristotle; what Theophrastos [calls] misxon it is the stalk of the fruit of akrodrua.

(In the stalk) To be noted: that the stalk is not only said to be on living things but also on fruits, as what is written shows: Aristotle says *hesma*, but Theophrastus says *misxon*. It is the stalk of the fruit of *akrodrua*.

Demosthenes, 53.15

ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸ χωρίον τῆς νυκτός, ὅσα ἐνῆν φυτὰ ἀκροδρύων γενναῖα ἐμβεβλημένα καὶ τὰς ἀναδενδράδας ἐξέκοψε, καὶ φυτευτήρια ἐλαῶν περιστοίχων κατέκλασεν,

Then he entered my property at night and cut down all the cuttings grafted to the fruit trees and the vines trained on the trees and broke down the rows of olives planted around the garden beds.


Diokles (Karystios), Frag. 182, 136-144

ἀκρόδρυα δὲ δύσχρηστα μὲν ἐστὶ πάντα, ἣκιστα δ’ ἐνοχλεῖ τοῦ λόγον μέτρια λαμβανόμενα πρὸ τῶν σιτίων. τῆς δ’ ὦπωρας τα μὲν σύκα περιελόντας τὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸν ὀπὸν περιπλύναντας καὶ βρέξαντας ἐν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βέλτιον ἐστὶ λαμβάνειν, καὶ μὴ ἔχοντας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς μὴ δυναμένους ἐσθίειν μετὰ δείπνου, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς πρὸ τοῦ δείπνου-σταφυλήν δὲ λευκὴν πάντας ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ· τραγήματα δ’ ἐρεβίνθους λευκοὺς βεβρεγμένους ἢ ἀμύγδαλα καθαρὰ βεβρεγμένα.
Fruits grown on the upper branches of trees are all bad, but they cause least trouble when taken in moderate proportion before dinner. In late summer (opora), it is better to take figs with the pods removed and the juice washed away and after wetting them in cold water; for those who do not have this at their disposal and for those who are not capable of doing so, it is better to eat them after dinner; for the others it is better to take them before dinner. A bunch of white grapes is good for everyone during dinner; as for dried fruits, it is better to take white wetted peases or wetted pure almonds.

(trans. van der Eijk 2000)

Theophrastos, HP 2.5.7

Μέγιστον δὲ ὡς εἰπεῖν τὸ τὴν πρόσφορον ἑκάστῳ χώραν ἀποδιδόναι· τότε γὰρ εὐθενὲι μάλιστα. ὡς δ’ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἐλάᾳ μὲν καὶ συκῇ καὶ ἀμπελῷ τὴν πεδεινήν φασιν οἰκειοτάτην εἶναι, τοῖς δὲ ἀκροδρύοις τὰς ὑπωρείς.

Most important of all, one may say, is to assign to each the suitable soil; for then is the tree most vigorous. Speaking generally, they say that low ground is most suitable for the olive fig and vine, and the lower slopes of hills for fruit trees. (trans. Hort 1916)

HP 4.4.11

Διαφέρει δὲ καὶ αὐτή ἡ χώρα τῷ τῆς μὲν φέρειν ἐνα τῆς δὲ μὴ φέρειν· ἢ γὰρ ὅσειν ἔχει καὶ ἀμπελόν τὰς ἐλάα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀκρόμματα· πλὴν ἀκαρτικά τῆς ἐλάα, καὶ σχεδὸν καὶ τήν φύσιν ωσπερ μεταξὺ κοτίνου καὶ ἐλάας ἐστι ..... Moreover this country shews differences in that part of it bears certain things which another part does not; thus the mountain country has the vine and olive and the other fruit-trees; but the olive is barren, and in its character it is as it were almost between a wild and a cultivated ............ 162

(trans. Hort 1916)

161 More correctly, ‘soaked chickpeas’ (Foxhall, pers. comm., May 2015)
162 The differences between land requirements in this reference and the preceding one are explained by the fact that 4.4.11 is describing Indian terrain.
Also that there are date-palms on the island and vines and other fruit-trees. including evergreen figs).\(^{163}\)

(Trans. Hort 1916)

---

**Fruit trees** as a class are considered to turn out fine in the foothills, the proof adduced being their growing there of their own accord, since wherever the tree's own nature generates it unaided, this (they say) is the locality most appropriate for the tree.

(Trans. Einarson and Link 1990)

---

But we separate some at least of the flavours from the dry things (as we separate them from the grape-cluster and from the olive). But we do this again with our own ends in view. People also obtain a few flavours in water that they pour on the dry things, as with the flavours in tree fruit and figs.

(Trans. Einarson and Link 1990)

---

\(^{163}\) Again, this describes non-Greek conditions, relating to an island in the Persian Gulf.
Characters, 11.4.2

καὶ πληθούσης τῆς ἀγορᾶς προσελθὼν πρὸς τὰ κάρυα ἢ τὰ μύρτα ἢ τὰ ἀκρόδρυα ἐστηκὼς τραγηματίζεσθαι ἄμα τῷ πωλοῦντι προσλαλῶν

When the agora is crowded he goes to the stands for walnuts, myrtleberries, and fruits, and stands there nibbling on them while talking with the vendor.

Frag. 4.5

Εἰσὶ μὲν ὁν ἔνιαι τῶν εὐόσμων καὶ ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς οἷον αἱ τῶν ἀκρόδρυων καὶ ἀπίων καὶ μήλων· αὕτη γὰρ ἀνευ τῆς προσφορᾶς ἥδεσθαι, καὶ μᾶλλον ὡς εἰπεῖν.

So, there are also some of the sweet-smelling/fragrant things in food stuffs, such as those of the akrodrua of both pear and apple. For they are pleasant without being eaten and more so it is said.
Appendix 4: Adonia
Dillon’s re-dating of the Adonia from summer to spring (Dillon 2003)

Section 4.2.16 referred to Dillon’s re-dating of the festival from summer to spring, based on a re-evaluation of references in Plato and Theophrastos. These texts are examined below and the full texts included at the end of the section.

In *Phaidros*, 276b, Plato’s Socrates describes how a serious farmer would sow, by comparing his action with an imagined frivolous counterpart. The text could bear Dillon’s interpretation - that Plato was adducing two ideas: firstly, that a proper farmer would not plant seeds in summer, secondly that he would not plant in a pot (in a garden of Adonis, i.e. a container - σπουδή ἀν θέρους εἰς Ἀδώνιδος κήπους). But against that, is the fact that, when Plato recites what a proper farmer would do, mention is only made of planting in suitable ground, with no mention of the season - σπείρας εἰς τὸ προσήκον. If the double idea were carried in the original phrase, then logically, the appropriate season, as well as ground, ought to be mentioned in the later section.

In *HP* 6.7.3, Theophrastos says it is possible to propagate southernwood in pots in summer, like the Gardens of Adonis - προμοσχευόμενον [δὲ] ἐν ὀστράκοις, ὡσπερ οἱ Ἀδώνιδος κήποι, τοῦ θέρους. Here Dillon maintains that Theophrastos is comparing not the time of year, but the method: that the best way to propagate is by seeds in pots in summer rather than cuttings, and that, as with the *Phaidros* reference, the Adonis Gardens stand for a method of propagation - in pots rather than open ground. The word προμοσχευόμενον, however, does not refer to seed, but to cuttings, both by word origin and by Theophrastos’ other usage of cognates. Given the lack of punctuation in the original text, this militates against Dillon’s interpretation of the phrase: that the best way is by seeds in pots in summer.

---

164 Einarson and Link (Theophrastus 1990: 36-37) trace the derivation from μόσχος, which can mean a young, rooted shoot as well as a calf. In *HP* 2.5.3 the word is used about types of cuttings for tree propagation, like olive, pear, apple, fig and vine. In *HP* 3.5.3, he again refers to types of cuttings in connection with trees.
In *CP* 1.12.2, Dillon’s interpretation seems valid. Theophrastos comments that autumn planting is preferable, so that the root can get strong before growth starts later (implicitly in the spring), whereas cuttings that shoot up quickly (implicitly in summer) are weak and fruitless like the Gardens of Adonis in the case of seed crops - καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν σπερμάτων οἱ Ἀδώνιδος κήποι. Here, says Dillon, it is not the time of year that is being compared (summer sown) but plants that are poor and fruitless - ἀσθενὴ καὶ άκαρπα. The Greek would bear either, or both, senses. Overall, Dillon’s re-interpretation of the Greek is possible but not convincing.

**Cited Texts**

*Phaidros, 276b*

Παντάπασι μὲν οὖν. τόδε δὴ μοι εἰπέ· ὁ νοῦν ἔχων γεωργός, ὃν σπερμάτων κήδοιτο καί ἐγκαρπία βούλοιτο γενέσθαι, πότερα σπουδή ἀν θέρους εἰς Ἀδώνιδος κήπους ἄρων χαίρων θεωρῶν καλούς ἐν ἡμερίαις ὀκτὼ γιγνομένους, ἢ ταύτα μὲν δὴ παιδίας τε καὶ έσθενκίς χάριν ὄρτων ἀν, ὅτε καὶ ποιώ. ἐφ’ οῖς δὲ ἐσπούδακεν, τῇ γεωργικῇ χρώμενος ἀν τέχνῃ, σπείρας εἰς τὸ προσῆκον, ἀγαπῶν ἀν ἐν ὑγίῳ μηνὶ ὡσα ἐσπείρων τέλος λαβόντα;

Exactly. Now tell me this. Would a sensible husbandman, who has seeds which he cares for and which he wishes to bear fruit, plant them with serious purpose in the heat of summer in some garden of Adonis, and delight in seeing them appear in beauty in eight days, or would he do that sort of thing, when he did it at all, only in play and for amusement? Would he not, when he was in earnest, follow the rules of husbandry, plant his seeds in fitting ground, and be pleased when those which he had sowed reached their perfection in the eighth month?

(trans. Fowler 1925)

*HP 6.7.3*

Ἀβρότονον δὲ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ σπέρματος βλαστάνει ἢ ἀπὸ όιζης καὶ παρασπαδός· χαλεπῶς δὲ
καὶ ἀπὸ σπέρματος· προμοσχευόμενον ἐν ὀστράκοις, ὡσπερ οἱ Ἀδώνιδος κήποι, τοῦ θέρους·
δύσριγον γὰρ σφόδρα καὶ ὅλως ἐπίκηρον καὶ ὅποι ὁ ἥλιος σφόδρα λάμπει·

Southernwood actually grows more readily from seed than from a root or a piece torn off (though it grows even from seed with difficulty); however it can be propagated by layering in pots in summer-time, like the ‘gardens of Adonis’; it is indeed very sensitive to cold and generally delicate even where the sun shines brightly;
(trans. Hort 1926)

**CP 1.12.2**

φανερὸν δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς μετοπωριναῖς φυτείαις· τότε γὰρ ὡς ούται ὁ βλαστάνει δὲ τὰ φυτεύμενα ἢ ἐπὶ βραχὺ τι πρὸ τοῦ ἔαρος· εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἀροία, ἐσήπετ' ἀν. ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτο ἐπαινούσι ταύτην τὴν φυτείαν, ὅτι μᾶλλον τὰς ἀρχὰς ἱσχυρότερα ποιεῖ δι' ἄν καὶ ἢ τοῦ στελέχους καὶ ἢ τῶν ἄλλων γένεσις· ὡς τὰ γ᾽ εὐθὺς ἀνατρέχοντα πρὸς τὴν βλάστησιν (5) ἀσθενῆ καὶ ἄκαρπα γίνεται, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν σπερμάτων οἱ Ἀδώνιδος κήποι.

This (they say) can also be seen in autumn planting, for at that time the cuttings strike root (if they did not, they would decompose), but do not sprout (or sprout for only a short time, depending on the weather). In fact this is why autumn planting is recommended: it does more to make the starting-points stronger by whose agency both the trunk and other parts are produced, since the cuttings that run up at once turn out weak in the end and bear no fruit, like the gardens of Adonis in the case of grains.
(trans. Einarson and Link 1976)

**The significance of the festival**

Section 4.2.17 evaluated the significance of the festival. Further details of scholarly positions are given below. The older, over-structured series of oppositions that Detienne saw in the Adonia are: public/private; the Thesmophoria/the Adonia;
cold/heat; citizen wives/courtesans; married, productive sex/sterile and unproductive seduction; working with/against nature and Demeter/Adonis\textsuperscript{165}.

Reitzammer’s political interpretation is reliant on these oppositions, which reduces her argument, although she is correct in emphasising the public influence of the Adonia in 415, just before the Sicilian Expedition. Furley (1988), in trying to resolve the date discrepancy between the evidence of \textit{Lysistrata} and Plutarch, makes a convoluted argument for the 415 Adonia not being the real, ritual festival. Instead, he argues that the festival was a deliberate and purely political anti-war protest by the women, held at that date to match the debate in the Assembly and organised in the form of an Adonia as a means to legitimate their protest. Their proper Adonia would have been held in the normal summer. This argument seems highly improbable, given the conditions within which women necessarily conducted their lives. Carrying out a political protest in the form of ritual does not make it ritual and a legitimate area for action. It would remain highly political, a public embarrassment for the men who had control over all aspects of these women’s lives; considerable punishment might be expected. Equally, there is no trace of such scandal in the records, which might be expected given the publicity afforded to the Mutilation of the Herms.

\textsuperscript{165} See also summary of mythologically-derived theories in (Baudy 1986: 10-13)
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