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Abstract

This study explores the changing nature of household cult practices, a currently under-studied category of evidence, in the Roman province of Achaia, from the first century BCE to the fourth century CE, with reference to pre-Roman domestic religion. The primary aim of this investigation is to understand to what extent Roman cult practices were integrated in select households across Roman Achaia. Household religion is an ideal indicator for cultural change and shifting cultural identities; it was essential in both Greek and Roman cultures and vital to the survival of the family unit and the wider community, but was conducted differently in these two cultures. To trace these changes archaeologically, the arrangement and function of rooms within the house are analyzed, and a specific identifiable group of finds are studied contextually. It is argued that the differences lie in the selection of deities, the location of household shrines and their accessibility, both physically and visually, to inhabitants and visitors. The framework within which cultural change is analyzed is “Romanization” that is re-interpreted as “cultural interaction,” emphasizing the impact that local communities had in shaping Roman domestic religion in the Roman Empire.

To document the dynamic and complex nature of Roman culture and its relation to pre-Roman religious activities within the province, five sites were selected from Achaia: Corinth, Patras, Messene, Athens, and the Piraeus. The sites represent variations between colonies and free cities, different economic interests, different political relationships with Rome, urban development, and concentrations of Roman immigrants. The findings are compared and contrasted with those from Delos, the first substantial
Italian community in the Greek world, in order to enrich understanding of the complex cultural interactions in the Roman Empire. The results of this study demonstrate the validity of this approach towards household religion as a type of household assemblage, and the variations of discrepant experiences of the household units, the communities, and the regions which composed the Roman Empire.
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Chapter I: Introduction

This study explores the nature of household cult practices in the Roman province of Achaia, from the 1st century BCE to the 4th century CE. By conceptualizing Roman culture as dynamic and complex in nature and as a product of different responses to specific historic circumstances and local traditions and identities, it is clear that what it meant to be “Roman” varied between communities and regions even within a single province. Household religion, as the focus of this study, is a distinct marker for identifying the integration of Roman practices into the domestic spaces and for measuring the degree to which household cult practices were used to display Roman identity in five different cities in Achaia. These cities are Corinth, Patras, Messene, Athens, and the Piraeus. Furthermore, to better understand the emergence of Roman household cult practices in the Greek world, I also consider domestic religious practices on Hellenistic Delos in comparison with these five later communities.

Special attention is given in this study to built spaces, as they are formed by, and inform, a society and its habits. Houses, therefore, should reflect the cultural identity and social habits of the individuals who inhabited them. While other factors, such as topography, climate, available construction materials, or reuse of a building, must also be taken into consideration, social behaviors are a dominant, formative influence on these structure. This can be identified through the construction or elimination of interior barriers, the placement of certain objects, and the decoration of the interior spaces.

Objects and features associated with household religion form one such group of finds that reflects the particular cultural identity of the owner. The objects themselves,

---

1 See Sanders 1990 and Grahame 2000, pp. 6–28 for further discussion.
both moveable and fixed ones, such as altars, and their location within the house can be taken to express cultural identity. Whether shrines or cult objects needed to be exhibited to the community or located in a specific space of the household, as well as who was able to see and use them, and under what circumstances, are key to understanding household religion as a cultural expression. Household religion was an essential component in both Greek and Roman cultures and vital to the survival not only of the family unit but also the community within which the family lived. However, worship in the home was conducted differently by these two cultures and can be distinguished in the archaeological record. The differences lay not only in the deities worshipped but also the location of shrines within the dwelling and the accessibility, both physically and visually, to inhabitants and visitors. Consequently, changes in the location and placement of household shrines, as well as in their form, can be used to trace changes in cultural identities.

All five cities under discussion had a pre-Roman past but they differed with respect to their political status within the empire (colony or free city), concentration of Roman immigrants (large or permanent community versus small or temporary groups), access to the sea, economy (trade, tourism, agriculture), and urbanization. To observe these changes, I will compare the Roman colonies of Corinth and Patras with Athens, Piraeus and Messene. Politics, economics, history, and population composition of each site are examined in order to assess their potential influence on such changes. I have developed a three step approach to identifying and analyzing household religion which takes into account the arrangement and function of rooms within the houses, as well as
this specific, identifiable group of finds and their contexts in order to examine cultural identity at a more intimate level.

The subject of Roman Greece in general has been greatly discussed in recent scholarship. Much research has been devoted to the political relationship between Rome and Greece and to portrait sculpture, sanctuaries, and public monuments. The focus has been to gauge responses and changes under the Roman Empire. However, these particular aspects of Roman Achaia were directly affected by the political agenda of Rome as the conqueror of the province. Rome’s concerns were focused on provincial institutions which might have threatened their control of the region. Therefore, public sanctuaries were restructured to accommodate Roman practices and to exhibit Roman authority; and public monuments were constructed and positioned so as to demonstrate Rome’s dominance, as well as benefaction, likely to dissuade subversive behavior. Worship within the household, on the other hand, was not within the purview of Rome. Therefore, household religion is a neutral avenue for studying the reactions of these people towards Rome and its culture, since there was no targeted interference from the Roman administration into this realm.

Although not as recent, the most referenced work on cultural change in Roman Greece has been that of Susan Alcock. Alcock has argued that, because of Greece’s strong cultural identity, which was continually self-defined and separated from Roman

---

2 E.g., Camia 2009; Rizakis and Camia 2008.
3 E.g., Lagogianni-Georgakarakos 2002; Spetsieri-Choremi 2003; Bookidis 2005; Longfellow 2011.
5 Walker 1997; Spetsieri-Choremi 2003; Longfellow 2011, pp. 107–139.
cultural, the province was resistant toward Rome.\textsuperscript{6} Using the results of survey projects in Greece, as well as literary and epigraphic sources, Alcock gives evidence for an elite class that held strongly to local traditions and allegiances and turned away from opportunities to participate in the wider imperial culture.\textsuperscript{7} Alcock’s resistance argument seems to suggest that the daily lives of those in Roman Achaia were completely unchanged by Roman culture. Furthermore, scholars like Greg Woolf have proposed that even the introduction of objects and monuments associated with Roman culture had little impact on the nature of Greek culture.\textsuperscript{8}

However, there have been a few more recent studies which focus on more specific groups of monuments to demonstrate patterns of behavior and regional discrepancies, such as Catharina Flämig’s monograph on grave monuments.\textsuperscript{9} These studies have demonstrated that there was an integration of some Roman cultural elements to varying degrees at sites across Greece and that the variations appear related to political, economic, historic, and population differences among the sites. My project seeks to re-examine all of these interpretations of Roman Greece by considering household religion, a previously unexplored body of evidence which can reveal much about the different experiences of the inhabitants of Roman Achaia. Among this evidence there was a mixture of Roman elements incorporated into local traditions of honoring the gods of the house. At the same time, by looking more closely at these “Roman” elements, the adherence to local and regional traditions can also be found even as late as the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE. The evidence reveals that Roman household cult practices were not adopted, but

\textsuperscript{6} Alcock 1997a, pp. 103–115, esp. 110–112.
\textsuperscript{7} Alcock 1997a, pp. 110–112.
\textsuperscript{9} Flämig 2007.
certain elements were integrated. It is in this selective integration that I will explore the cultural interaction between Roman and Greek further.

As for the study of domestic space in Roman Greece, recent interest in the subject has led to several catalogues and studies of the evidence of Roman period housing from sites in Greece.\textsuperscript{10} These studies analyze the form and plan of the house and look for signs of Roman influence in the construction, decoration, and arrangement of the rooms. But, they do not attempt to study physical and visual accessibility or the artifacts in context and in relation to the functions of space. The reason for the former is likely because of the state of preservation of most of these houses. Still, there are a sufficient number of houses with complete plans to make spatial analysis possible; and visibility analysis is a helpful technique for examining the use of a space even when the plan of the house is incomplete. The reason for the latter may be explained by the fact that, in the past, much of the artifactual evidence from these buildings was either not well preserved or not properly published, except for special finds, like sculpture, or those useful for dating the building, such as coins.

Excavations in Greece in the last decade have published more information regarding the finds and their find spots from Roman period houses, for example those for the New Acropolis Museum in Athens.\textsuperscript{11} This is likely the result of the renewed interest in the Roman period seen in the field of Greek archaeology.\textsuperscript{12} Therefore, a more detailed study of object assemblages of this period, like those of household religion, is now possible and topical. As mentioned, household religion was essential in both Greek and Roman cultures. The protection of the hearth and its fire, of the food stores, and of the

\textsuperscript{10} Nevett 2002; Papaioannou 2002 and 2007; Bonini 2006.
\textsuperscript{11} Sirano 2005; Eleutheratou 2006 and 2008; Bouyia 2008.
\textsuperscript{12} E.g., Vlizos 2008b; Rizakis and Lepenioti 2010.
members of the household was vital to the survival of the household unit and the
community. Nevertheless, little work has so far been done on household religion in
Roman Greece. Paolo Bonini and Maria Papaioannou briefly mention this category of
evidence in their surveys of houses in Roman Greece.13 Recently, Lea Stirling and
Polyxeni Bouyia have each examined specific assemblages found within domestic
contexts, one from Corinth and one from Athens.14 However, how these two
assemblages compare with others from across the province and what they demonstrate
about cultural change in Greece have not been fully considered. This, therefore, is the
first goal of this project.

In addition, a feature or object can also be identified as related to household
religion through understanding its context and its relationship to the rest of the house.
How and by whom these features and objects were seen and used are important factors in
understanding the nature of the cults and rituals of a household. Furthermore, such
information is also significant for understanding the cultural identity of the inhabitants as
it reflects specific patterns of behavior unique to each tradition of household religion.
Therefore, in this study I look at the houses of Roman Achaia and the find spots of the
objects and features related to household cult. To do so, I must not only take into account
previous studies of the arrangement and decoration of the houses15 but also add to them
the study of the accessibility and visibility within the structure in order to understand
their cultural significance and that of the cultic objects associated with them. This is my
second goal.

334.
14 Stirling 2008; Bouyia 2008.
Romanization has been a long-discussed process related to the appearance of Roman material culture, institutions, and practices throughout the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{16} If Romanization is conceptualized as a multifaceted process of interaction and exchange among many different cultural groups in the Roman Empire, and not as an unidirectional change placing Roman culture above all others, then it allows us to discuss Roman influences on household cults. Although Greek and Roman cultures had a long history of interaction prior to the Empire, the practices of household religion for each group were distinctly different, making this a valid indicator for changes within Achaia under the Roman Empire. Therefore, household religion can shed new light on key concepts and processes related to the discussion surrounding Romanization and cultural identity.

To be sure, in these discussions of cultural identity in the Roman Empire, Achaia has not played a major role. In early debates over Romanization, most scholars dismissed Greece as unaffected since it was the homeland of high culture. Furthermore, the pre-Roman culture of Achaia was revered by the Romans and it has long been accepted that the Romans sought to preserve and conserve Greek culture in the province. As A. H. M. Jones stated in 1963, “the Greeks had no impulse to Romanize themselves, and the Roman government felt no mission to impose their civilization on the East.”\textsuperscript{17} More recently, some scholars, like David Mattingly,\textsuperscript{18} have used Achaia as comparanda in their analysis of identity in other provinces, but they do not examine Achaia in any detail. Other scholars, such as Rizakis, have done excellent, detailed work on a single Achaean site or region, but they only briefly consider the provincial context.\textsuperscript{19} The few scholars

\textsuperscript{17} Jones 1963, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{18} Mattingly 1997b, pp. 117–139.
\textsuperscript{19} Rizakis 1997, 2010a, and 2010b.
who have considered the whole province have arrived at conflicting conclusions. Alcock and Woolf have considered the economic, social, and historical evidence from Achaia and have concluded that although they lost their political independence, the inhabitants of Achaia were able to maintain their pre-Roman culture in opposition, or indifference, towards Roman culture.\textsuperscript{20} Bonini and Lisa Nevett, both examining houses, have drawn the conclusion that there was an acceptance of Roman culture on a domestic level in this province.\textsuperscript{21} Therefore, my third goal is to reevaluate this understanding of the relationship between Achaia and Rome and to determine if these established opinions should be revised in light of this analysis.

Roman Achaia is not an insignificant province for looking at cultural changes and identities. The domestic remains of Roman Achaia have much to offer to the current discussion regarding the definition and identification of Roman culture in the Empire. This discussion revolves around the idea that Roman culture was continually redefined and created by all inhabitants of the empire; different communities took and translated what elements suited their association with being Roman and ignored the ones that did not suit.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore, to be Roman was symbolized differently in different places. The domestic remains from Achaia also reflect this multifaceted concept of Roman culture, and they furthermore encapsulate this variability because their reactions to, and integration of, Roman culture were different among communities across the province. Accordingly, what I have undertaken is a new way of looking at domestic spaces and a hitherto neglected category of material culture in Roman Achaia in order to enrich our

\textsuperscript{20} Woolf 1994, pp. 130–135; Alcock 1997a, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{22} Webster 2001; Revell 2009; Mattingly 2011.
understanding of cultural interactions and to bring the province of Achaia into the broader discussion of cultural identity in the Roman Empire.

I.A: Conceptual Framework: Romanization as a Process and Practice

With the introduction of the modern concept of Romanization in the early part of the 20th century, a debate began regarding the nature of cultural change and interaction under the Roman Empire. Views as to the root of change have ranged from the dominating and civilizing force of Roman culture to native emulation and resistance and from an active Roman practice of converting the provincial elite to the unintended processes of assimilation as the provincial elites had to relate to Roman magistrates. Many scholars have proposed different definitions for Romanization over the last century. For the most part, however, they are one-sided and imply that cultural change was unidirectional emulation, with a monolithic Roman culture prevailing over native cultures, typically through the action of provincial elites.

However, more recent scholarship has taken a different perspective. Jane Webster has called for an end to the dichotomous either/or model for studying cultural change, whereby one either chose to be Roman or not without varying shades of acceptance, resistance, or adaptation. This study, likewise, intends to look for the variations. Similarly, other scholars, such as David Mattingly and Louise Revell, propose

---

23 Mommsen 1885, pp. 1-6 and pp. 225-227; Haverfield 1905–1906 and 1923. Also see Freeman 1997b and Webster 2001, p. 211.
27 See Millett 1990 for passive Romanization.
30 Webster 2001, p. 217.
that cultural changes, instead, were multilateral and more of a conversation between two or more cultures that reacted to each other over and over again.\textsuperscript{31} These scholars tend to look from the perspective of the provinces and see how the cultures present within a province or community respond to one another, taking into account numerous factors that can affect the responses. They tend to favor other related terms like \textit{creolization} and \textit{globalization}. These terms, however, also come with inherent biases. \textit{Creolization}, while a very attractive term for cultural adaptation and hybridization, carries with it the idea of forced relocation of peoples and the adaptation to a slave-master relationship, which did not occur in a province like Achaia.\textsuperscript{32} On the other hand, \textit{globalization} conveys modern, economic associations that are not applicable to antiquity. While neither term is wholly suitable, they do promote the idea that having and using Roman material culture should not be seen as a wholesale adoption of Roman cultural identity but rather as a reflection of different degrees of perception and acceptance of what is Roman depending on many factors.

In order to avoid such terminological implications, I will simply refer to \textit{cultural interactions}, which are, in fact, what we are looking for at the most basic level, and such a phrase, while not original, lacks all the preconceptions of the more commonly used terms. By \textit{cultural interactions}, I mean the processes of exchange of cultural materials, ideas, and activities between two or more cultures, which have been brought into contact through historical, economic, or political situations resulting in a visible change in the cultures of the participants. By \textit{culture}, I mean the set of shared ideas, values,
institutions, and practices of a specific group who, in sharing these, identify themselves as a single entity. In looking for these concepts in the archaeological record, I do not assume that one culture dominates the other, nor do I assume that an object equals a cultural identity. However, by looking not only at the physical remains but also the way the object or feature was used and the function of its context, we can see variations within the cultural materials and cultural practices which may indicate changes in culture and identity.

Looking only for evidence of Roman culture in Achaia, however, perpetuates the one-sided approaches discussed above, and it does not account for the cultural conversation visible in the provinces. Since my intention is to understand cultural change within domestic activities, a suitable model to follow is that of *discrepant experiences*. First put forth by post-colonial historian Edward Said\(^{33}\) and first applied to the Roman Empire by Mattingly,\(^{34}\) *discrepant experiences* is an approach to studying cultural changes, which recognizes that cultural change was produced by multilateral exchange between cultures, such as Roman culture and native cultures, and possibly others as well. By accounting for all of the different perspectives, one is better able to understand the changes or lack of changes which are observed in the archaeological and historical records. The discrepant experience approach put forth by Mattingly looks for meaningful patterns of uniformity in society and “slight but significant variations in the use of material culture.”\(^{35}\) He lays out eleven factors that play a part in identity in antiquity: status, wealth, location, employment, religion, origins, linkage with the imperial

---

\(^{33}\) Said 1993, pp. 31–43.
\(^{34}\) Mattingly 1997a, pp. 11–12; 2011, pp. 29–30.
\(^{35}\) Mattingly 2011, p. 217.
government, living under civil or martial law, language and literacy, gender, and age.\footnote{Mattingly 2011, p. 217.}

All of these factors relate to the general political, economic, and historical environment that influenced and formed the social structures of the community.

The discrepant experiences model is a valuable approach because it acknowledges the multiplicity of perspectives and responses to cultural change. The new political and economic role of the cities of Roman Achaia led to many degrees of acceptance of, or resistance to, new cultural ideas and these variations depended on multiple factors, such as personal tastes and interests, personal and communal histories and politics, and the presence of a large Roman community. Accordingly, it is important to consider the historical, economic, and political backgrounds specific to each city and the relationship of this background to the evidence from household cults. It is from these different perspectives, then, that I will seek to identify the various responses to the Roman administration of Achaia.

There are, however, a few limitations to using the discrepant experiences model in this study. The largest of these is the fact that history is written by the victors; there is little surviving literature from native authors to present the perspective of those living under the Roman Empire.\footnote{Mattingly 2011, p. 29.} Unlike other provinces, Roman Achaia did produce several authors, such as Plutarch, but even these sources were writing for an audience in Rome and may not reflect the opinions of their fellow Achaeans. Inscriptions, which play a minor role in this study, must also be used with caution, as they were public in nature, even funerary inscriptions; they were meant to be viewed, not only by those living in the community but also by those visiting. They, therefore, represent the public image and

---

\footnote{Mattingly 2011, p. 217.}
\footnote{Mattingly 2011, p. 29.}
not necessarily all aspects of an inhabitant’s identity.\textsuperscript{38} A similar problem exists for the physical remains of household religion. An altar or niche alone expresses only one perspective of household religion and practice. Therefore, I also consider the behavior involving that altar, through access and visual analysis, and look at all the surviving evidence from each site. In doing so, general trends and changes for each site can be observed, while unique examples are highlighted to further demonstrate the variations within each site.

Furthermore, inscriptions, literature, and even graffiti imply a certain level of literacy and education, which may not have been available to all the inhabitants and, consequently, cannot represent all the opinions of the populace. Of course, this is not to say that literature and epigraphy should not be used when considering the historic, political, and economic backgrounds of these sites, but only that we must account for the perspectives they represent. The remains of the houses also contain a similar bias. Those which are preserved well enough for study represent only the wealthy upper and middle classes. This assessment has been established based on the large size, specialization of certain spaces, and the quality of the decorations and finds from these houses. There is very little preserved, identifiable housing for the lower classes from Achaia. This is not to say that the elite were solely responsible for the cultural changes observed in Roman Achaia, but rather that their material culture and cultural practices were most available and legible for interpretation. There are a few structures which might be identified with a lower economic and social class, but not enough for a meaningful study. Instead, these structures will be considered on a case by case basis and discussed in comparison to the upper class houses of that site. Thus, the conclusions made in this study are related to

\textsuperscript{38} Millis 2010, pp. 25–29.
these upper classes of individuals and are not assumed equally applicable to the lower classes.

The main problems with the discrepant experiences approach is that, while it is possible to account for many perspectives, it is not possible to account for all, given the temporal distance and the nature of the preserved evidence. However, by seeking out as many perspectives as possible, this approach makes it possible to create a clearer and more flexible reconstruction of the community. As mentioned, the cities of Achaia had very diverse backgrounds and factors which affected the behaviors and interests of the inhabitants. And Rome had a unique relationship with Achaia in terms of how it valued Achaia’s cultural heritage and how Achaia contributed to the resources of the Empire. Therefore, it is the flexibility of the discrepant experience model which makes it appropriate for this study.

When discussing cultural interactions or Romanization one must deal with the concept of identity, which I have already mentioned. The term identity refers to how individuals associate themselves with a certain group or groups within the community. This takes into account not only the nature of the material remains but also the behaviors that can be reconstructed from the physical remains. The current discussion regarding cultural identity in the Roman Empire is specifically concerned with the question of how much personal choice the individual had in identifying with Roman culture or in the creation of the community’s understanding of it. Accordingly, first we must understand to what extent the inhabitants of these communities actually displayed Roman forms of household religion and to what degree they followed Greek practices. It is my hope that, by identifying cultural change at the level of household religion through its physical

39 Revell 2009; Madsen 2009; Mattingly 2010.
remains, a better understanding of the process may be possible, so that Roman Achaia can be viewed in relation to the wider discussion of cultural identity in the Roman Empire.⁴⁰

Furthermore, it is tempting to see a homogeneous Roman culture, but this was not the case. Our understanding of Romanitas is based on authors writing for a Rome-centered audience and there are few domestic remains from Rome to confirm the literature. Typically, scholars have relied on the houses found at Pompeii to confirm the literary evidence. However, Pompeii was a Samnite city which was made a Roman colony under the Republic and was located in the middle of what had been Magna Graecia. Therefore, it cannot represent a “pure” example of Roman culture. Conversely, those inhabiting Pompeii appear to have had a strong desire to be viewed as Roman and, therefore, strove for Romanitas, or their version of it. From this perspective, Pompeii serves as good comparanda for other Roman colonies and provinces, like Achaia.

Furthermore, from the Severan marble Forma Urbis Romae there are several, albeit sketchy, plans of houses from this period recreated on the plan (Figure 36). Although these were not drawn in full detail, they do indicate the cultural expectation of what a house plan in Rome would look like at that time, as the viewer needed to recognize the type of building. More importantly, they resemble the house plans from Italian sites such as Pompeii and Ostia making the use of examples from these sites appropriate as examples of Roman-style housing. I will not be relying on the Forma Urbis Romae plans for an example to analyze; nevertheless, their similarity to the examples from other sites in Italy is an important point to be mindful of when dealing with the idea of “Roman”.

⁴⁰ E.g., Alcock 1997a; Laurence and Berry 1998; Grahame 1998a and 1998b; Hingley 1997; Revell 1999 and 2009; Mattingly 2010.
This raises another issue which is the focus of Revell’s study of public
architecture in Roman Britain; that Roman identity and culture under the empire is not a
fixed point to attain, but fluid and heterogeneous. She proposes that we not see Roman
identity and non-Roman identity in conflict with one another, but that non-Roman
identity affects the Roman identity and vice versa creating a Roman identity that is
diverse and dynamic. Mattingly makes a similar argument for North Africa,
demonstrating that there was much more of a mutual exchange between cultures, both
local and foreign, and an adaptation of what constituted Roman. Therefore, the
evidence from Pompeii is a good example of Roman culture and identity in that it is one
of the earliest instances of this dynamic development of what it is to be Roman.

The question then becomes whether Roman culture is actually perceived as
Roman or as a status symbol within the local cultures of the provinces. I argue that in
some communities Roman culture was perceived as Roman and did not necessarily carry
social value; and in others, the incorporation of Roman cultural elements was socially
valuable for its connection with the power and political advancement of the imperial
administration. In the case of Roman Achaia, there is a further element of preserving and
perpetuating Greek culture because it was revered by the Roman elite who tried to
emulate it. Thus, I expect cultural identity in Roman Achaia to be a clear example of
the cultural dialogue discussed by Mattingly and Revell in that there were varied
responses and an expectation for the inhabitants, at least of the upper classes, to bridge
the two different cultures.

Hellenism in the Roman Empire.
I.B: Roman Achaia as a Case Study

Roman Achaia was a unique province in many ways. It became part of the empire early in Rome’s outward expansion after different city-states sought military help from Rome against the Macedonian kings, rebelled against Roman aggression, and were finally subdued by the end of the 2nd century BCE. It was positioned at the center of the empire without a frontier to protect or extend, yet, according to the surviving literary and epigraphic sources it was never mentioned as part of the core. Geographically, it was composed of what is now modern Greece, except for Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Crete, and the eastern Aegean islands (Figure 1). The diverse landscape had limited fertility, which was sufficient to support the population and its taxes to Rome but could not sustain agricultural production on the level of other provinces like North Africa. Since it was neither a frontier nor a particularly troublesome area after the 1st century BCE, there were no large military garrisons for the province to support or levies to raise. It is, therefore, easy to see why it might be perceived as the forgotten province.

Roman Achaia was primarily populated by a native population whose cultural past, respected and emulated by the Romans, was always perceived as culturally separate, despite certain shared cultural elements. Also living in the province were Roman and other foreign merchants, officers of the imperial administration, Roman veterans and freedmen sent as colonists from Rome, and other types of immigrant populations, both permanent and transient. The types of settlements that have been found ranged from
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45 See Gruen 1984 and Alcock 1993, pp. 8–17 for histories of Roman Greece.
47 Alcock 1993, pp. 17–18.
48 See Alcock 1993, pp. 24–32 for discussion of this perception of Roman Achaia.
49 See introductions to each case study in Chapter V for more specific details.
50 Alcock 1997a, p. 111.
large cities to smaller villages, hamlets, and individual farming establishments. Initially, Rome instituted synoecism in certain regions, such as at Patras, or established colonies, such as at Corinth, to create centralized administrative centers. After Augustus, however, there was little Roman imposition on the settlement structure of the province.

In general, Roman presence in Achaia became more established in the 1st century BCE, and we will, therefore, use this as the lower chronological limit for the study at hand. In this century, the province of Achaia was formed and Roman colonies such as Corinth and Patras were founded, drawing increasing numbers of residents to these principal urban centers. Alcock has observed that not only the 1st century CE shift in politics but also in economics may have led many people living in the countryside to move to urban centers with a major effect on housing. The countryside was not deserted, but, as Alcock’s study of the landscapes of Achaia has shown, small family farms were replaced with large agricultural villas, owned by the wealthy and worked by the local farmers who remained in the country. As a result, small rural community centers, such as villages and hamlets, were no longer needed, and the commercial opportunities of the market place shifted from the rural landscape to the urban landscape. With this shift, the wealthy landowners no longer needed to stay on their farms to oversee daily operations and were able to move to the cities, where they could control the sale of their agricultural goods, participate in local politics, and enjoy the amenities of the city.

The general upper chronological limit of this study will be the late 3rd to early 4th centuries CE because this was a period when, across Achaia, there was a visible
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constriction of urban sites and a decline in the economy.\textsuperscript{53} This was contemporary with a shift within the broader empire by which political unrest led to the establishment of the Tetrarchy in 293 CE and eventually to the creation of the second capital at Constantinople in 306 CE. Also within this period, many scholars have identified destruction or abandonment levels at sites across Greece, which have been linked with earthquakes and invaders from the north, specifically the Herulians and the Goths.\textsuperscript{54} These invasions and natural disasters need not have been the cause of all the destruction and/or abandonment at every site, but the overwhelming evidence for destruction and abandonment at many sites makes it clear that, in general, there was a change in settlement patterns at the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} and beginning of the 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE. Accordingly, the materials I have collected for my study range in date from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE to the early 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE, reflecting these changes in settlement habits. However, the present study will focus especially on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} to 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE because the majority of the relevant finds are dated to this time period.

In regards to geographic limits, I have chosen fives sites for analysis: Corinth, Patras, Athens, the Piraeus, and Messene. Keeping to these five urban centers provides manageable boundaries for study. These sites were selected for their quantity and quality of archaeological evidence relevant to my study (Appendix A). They were also selected because they represent a variety of interaction with Rome.

Corinth was a colony and was almost completely rebuilt in the Roman period as the Roman provincial capital. Therefore, it was the political point of intersection connecting Rome and the province. Corinth was also located between two important

\textsuperscript{53} Alcock 1993, pp. 217–220.
ports for the eastern Mediterranean, Kenchreai and Lechaion, which would have had an impact on the composition of the population. Patras was also a colony, but it lacked the interruption in habitation at Corinth, and also unlike at Corinth, there is the added variable of evidence for a large Roman immigrant population. This population was a result not only of the colony but also of the role the port at Patras played as a key trading center with Italy.

On the other hand, Athens was not a colony, but it was a major cultural center for the Romans. Although there had been significant damage done by Sulla in some residential neighborhoods the site remained inhabited without a break. Athens was a major destination for Romans either as a place for education or as a tourist destination for those travelling eastward. The Piraeus too was continuously inhabited and non-colonial, but it lacked the cultural appeal of Athens. As Athens’s port city, it was an important port of call for travelers, and, consequently, the foreign population there was more transient than permanent. As a port city, the Piraeus also serves as a comparison for Patras, which was also an important port. Finally, Messene was a major inland city with a strong and distinct local culture, populated mostly by people identifying themselves as Messenians. There is also evidence for Romans living in the region and the city, but they seem to have had very little effect on the housing and the religion of the Messenians. Messene, furthermore, provides a comparison for the other inland cities of Athens and Corinth, which, unlike Messene, were major destination cities for Roman travelers, officials, and merchants.

With these five sites I am able to explore the discrepant experiences of the people living in colonial (Patras, Corinth) and non-colonial (Messene, Athens, the Piraeus)

55 The nature of “Messenian” will be discussed in detail in Section V.C.
cities, ports (Patras, the Pireaus) and their inland companions (Athens, Messene, Corinth), cities with economies based on trade (Patras, the Pireaus, Corinth) and those based on agriculture (Messene), large permanent Roman communities (Patras) and smaller or more temporary enclaves (Athens, the Pireaus), and cities that were politically, culturally, or economically significant within a single province. Furthermore, these sites are well distributed throughout the province of Achaia and, therefore, provide a regional perspective. The exceptions are Athens and the Pireaus, which will be used to demonstrate commonalities and differences within a single area of the province. All of these factors may have contributed to the changes which are observed in the houses and household cults and all are key factors in the discussion of cultural interaction.

The database for this project initially included all known domestic structures, dated from the 1st century BCE to the 4th century CE, which have been uncovered in modern Greece, including urban, suburban, and rural sites. However, in the appendices at the end of this thesis, I have presented only the structures from the province of Achaia (Appendix A) as most relevant for this study. For each structure entered I have noted when finds and architectural features that may be indicative of domestic cult are mentioned in publications. I have identified 60 with evidence of domestic cult from Achaia (Appendix B). Most of the evidence used in these case studies comes from excavation volumes and preliminary excavation reports. Further information has been gathered by looking at key objects in the museums related to these sites and through personal communications with those involved in the projects.

Even though there is much information from these sites, there were, of course, some challenges in working with this material. To begin with, four of the five sites lie
under modern towns and cities, and, as a result, much of the excavated remains were uncovered through rescue excavations. Often, only part of the ancient structure was uncovered because it either extended past the limits of the modern construction plot or was damaged by later phases of habitation and use. Furthermore, the results of most rescue excavations were only preliminarily published, and, therefore, detailed recording of materials found in the excavations is lacking or inadequate. Even for the long-term excavation projects, such as at Athens, Corinth, and Messene, information is sometimes lacking or inadequate because of earlier excavation and recording methods. However, these are all issues inherent in archaeological research, and, in spite of these challenges, I was able to uncover sufficient, suitable information for houses from each site to create a workable sample that is fairly representative of each site.

For comparison, I will also be looking at Hellenistic Delos. Delos was an important center of trade in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, much as Corinth, Patras, and the Piraeus were in the Roman period. From 166 to 87 BCE a large community of Romano-Italians had settled at Delos to protect their commercial interests in the East and became the first permanent settlement of Romano-Italians in the Greek world. This site, with its significant number of well preserved houses, provides earlier comparanda for the integration of Roman and Greek cultures with respect to household religion.

I.C: Method for Analyzing Household Religion and Cultural Identity

For the study of household religion, I use a three-fold analysis to assess the evidence. First, I will analyze the physical and visual accessibility of each house in comparison with its decoration and room types. Next, paying special attention to the
forms of the shrines and the deities honored, I will identify the evidence of household cult. Then, I will explore the functional context of the cult and its visibility within the structure. Finally, in addition to these three steps, I will consider the wider factors that may have affected the choices of the household unit; it is my hypothesis that the collective identity of the community as seen in their houses and household religion differed from city to city and depended on a number of different factors, including population composition, pre-Roman history and urbanization, relationship with Rome, and economy, all of which will also be considered for each site in comparison with the information collected from household religion.

For the first step, I will look at the houses in respect to their construction, form, decoration, and the function of their rooms in order to compare how the householder wished to be identified by the outside world with how he and the other inhabitants used the spaces and behaved within the structure. Obviously, I do not think that the house alone can recreate in full the cultural identity of the inhabitants, or how deeply changes in perceived identity permeated into their daily lives. As Revell has pointed out, Roman-looking buildings do not equal Roman cultural identity, and to suggest that they do ignores the history of the buildings beyond their initial constructions, those who actually used the spaces, and the activities performed within them. 56 Revell was referring to public buildings in Roman Britain, but the idea is equally applicable to houses in Roman Achaia. In terms of domestic architecture, while the original owner may have built the house in a Roman-style, subsequent residents may have decided not to use the atrium space for display and might have even shifted the activities of the house to center around another space. Therefore, because the function and accessibility of a space might be

56 Revell 1999, p. 52.
changed to suit new inhabitants, it is also crucial to consider the changing function and accessibility of spaces.

The use of space in the household can be understood through spatial and visibility analysis. As I will demonstrate in a later chapter, the ideas and behaviors of these two cultures are reflected in the differences of accessibility, circulation, and visibility within their respective houses. Such an approach will lead to a better understanding of the function of the space and the behavior of the people within it. This part of the study will complement recent studies of the form and decoration of domestic spaces in Roman Greece\textsuperscript{57} and provide the context for the household cult evidence.

In the second step of this analysis, I will look at the evidence for household cult uncovered in these houses to distinguish any distinctly Roman or Greek elements. Of course, Greek and Roman religion have overlapping characteristics, but, as I will demonstrate with regards to household cult, there are a few key identifiable aspects in which they differ, most notably the form of the lararium and the deities honored.

The two cultures of household religion also differ with regards to location and visibility; therefore, the third step in the application of my method combines the spatial and visibility analyses of the house with the evidence of household cult and its functioning location within the house. Through this, I will be able to determine more clearly with which culture the head of the household identified. In some cases, this will be in opposition to interpretations based solely on the decoration and form of the reception spaces of the house.

\textsuperscript{57} Papaioannou 2007; Bonini 2006; Nevett 2002.
I.D: Analyzing Space and Visibility in Houses

The location of the activities and materials related to household religion is one of the main distinctions between Greek and Roman practices; therefore, spatial and visibility analysis of the houses is vital for observing changes in household cult practice. To this end, I am using spatial syntax analysis to study the mobility and accessibility of the houses of Roman Achaia as well as to understand the accessibility to household shrines within these houses. Developed by Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson, these types of analyses have been conducted on houses at other ancient sites around the world. Most notable for this study are the works of Mark Grahame and Michael Anderson in Pompeii. Grahame employs spatial syntax analysis to objectively describe Pompeian society as it is reflected in the house. Anderson combines spatial syntax analysis with a visual access analysis, which he refers to as point viewshed analysis, in order to determine public and private spaces, with the premise that, although some spaces are physically shallow, they may be invisible and, therefore, private. Although the distinction between public and private space in Roman houses is problematic, as will be discussed below, Anderson’s combination of accessibility and visibility is important for the study of any built space. Sight is one of our most important senses for learning and participating in social behaviors, its importance in dictating movement through a house is equal to the ease of access. However, one must also allow for objects that may be visually accessible yet physically inaccessible, such as objects placed near windows. Therefore, I use both of these types of analysis in order to understand how visitors and
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residents behaved within the houses of Roman Achaia, with special reference to household cult.

Spatial syntax and visual access analyses are both objective ways to describe space, minimizing the imposition of one’s cultural biases and tendencies upon the structures of those from another culture and even another time. Spatial syntax can be used to describe permeability through a structure and between individual cells of space. The term *permeability* in spatial syntax analysis refers to how easily one can access a specific space from outside the structure or from another space within the structure. Visual access analysis is used to describe the visibility of a space from a specific point. Both methods can be used to suggest the function of individual cells of space in terms of public and private; however, one also needs to understand what these words meant within the culture that built the structure.

Privacy in a Roman house was unlike our modern, western definition of the word. The Roman house was a means of demonstrating one’s role in Roman society and was used as a public arena for such display. Therefore, privacy was related to social status; slaves, who occupied the lowest class, were meant to be hidden from view, while the wealthy, elite must be on display. Conversely, in most Greek societies, privacy was related to *genos*, or kin group. The members of the *genos*, especially women, were meant to be sheltered from, or limited in, interacting with outsiders, typically unrelated men.

For the spatial syntax of the houses of Roman Achaia, I first convert the plan of the structure into an access map. In doing this, all factors other than access are removed from the plan so that there are no other influences on the analysis; these other
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factors, such as windows and decoration, will be brought back into the interpretation later. The plan of the building is reduced to a simple map composed of circles representing each space and lines representing access points into each space. This access map can then be used to determine permeability within a structure.

To begin this process of access analysis, one must first assign a depth value to each of the spaces within the structure. A depth value is the number of spaces one passes through from the carrier point, the outside of the building, to the specific space in question. Thus, if a building contains spaces x and y and the only access to y from the carrier point is through x, then y has a depth value of two and x will have a depth value of one. Depth value can be represented by a justified access map, which is a graph with all spaces of the same depth value aligned horizontally over the carrier point and their connections represented by lines connecting the appropriate circles (Figures 2 and 3).

These graphs can be used to measure the syntactic relationships of the structure’s spaces, namely symmetry and asymmetry and distributedness and nondistributedness. These relationships can then be applied to other properties of spaces, such as accessibility from within and without the space (Figures 2 and 3). Symmetry in this type of analysis refers to the relative depth of the spaces; a plan with several rooms of equal depth is said to be symmetrical, while a plan with more varied depths is asymmetrical. Distributiveness is related to the number of access points between spaces. In a distributed plan, the spaces have multiple points connecting them to one another, creating
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different independent paths throughout the structure. In a nondistributed plan, the spaces are arranged to limit or control passage between spaces.

Buildings will vary in degrees of symmetry and distributiveness. Therefore, the justified access map can be used to calculate mean depth (MD), relative asymmetry (RA), and the control value for the structure, all of which describe the permeability of the spaces of the structure in more detail. The MD of a space is the distance of that space from the other spaces of the structure; in other words, it is the number of boundaries which need to be crossed to travel from one space to the space in question. The MD is calculated by assigning depth values to the rooms around the space in question based on their distance from that space. Then, the mean of these depth values is calculated to get the MD, which can then be used to calculate the RA of the space.

RA is the manner by which the accessibility of the space is quantified in relation to the other spaces of the structure; the fewer boundaries between all the spaces of a structure, the more symmetrical the structure. The RA shows how well integrated the spaces are within the structure. To calculate the RA of a space, the following equation is used: $\text{RA} = \frac{2(\text{MD}-1)}{k-2}$, where $k$ is the total number of spaces in the structure. RA values range between zero and one, with those values closer to zero indicating a shallower, more accessible space and those values closer to one indicating a deeper, more segregated, and less permeable space.\(^7\) Consequently, the lower the RA, the more integrated and, therefore, more accessible the space is for those living in the structure and to those visiting. Using these calculations for Hillier and Hanson’s example structures (Figures 2, 3, and 4) one can make preliminary hypotheses about the level of intimacy

\(^7\) Hillier and Hanson 1984, pp. 108–109.
within these examples, even without any information about the culture, decoration, or uses of the spaces.

RA is thus an effective and objective method of describing the accessibility of a space in relation to the spaces around it and can be used to help measure the amount of privacy, or inaccessibility, a room would offer both internally, among the inhabitants, and externally, between the inhabitants and visitors. However, RA can only work effectively in a structure of more than three rooms. This is related to the fact that, with so few rooms, it would be difficult to calculate depth of space when there is no real depth. In addition, the opposite is also a problem with RA. A larger structure with more boundaries to consider will have a disproportionately higher denominator than a smaller structure and, therefore, a lower RA. Therefore, the larger structure would appear to be more accessible than the smaller one, even though it has more boundaries.\(^7\) So Hillier and Hanson proposed an adjustment called Real Relative Asymmetry (RRA).\(^2\) They calculated the root values for structures with 5 to 300 spaces and provided them in Hillier and Hanson 1984, Table 3 of page 112. The RA of a space can then be divided by the root value of that structure to arrive at the RRA, which can be any number from zero to infinity, with higher numbers equaling less accessible spaces. RRA can then be used to compare the permeability of structures with different numbers of spaces, such as the houses found in Roman Achaia.

Permeability, however, is only part of accessibility. Control of one space over the others within the structure is also an important factor. This control value can be calculated based on the number of spaces which are immediately accessible from the
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space in question. The higher the control value, the more influence the space exerts on the form of the structure. This is calculated, again, using the justified access map. Each space on the map is assigned a value of one. Then, the value assigned to each space is divided by the number of connecting neighbors it has. In selecting a space to be considered, the values for each of its immediate neighbors are added together. If the number is higher than one, then it is a controlling space; if it is lower, then it is a controlled space.

While spatial syntax analysis does remove the biases of the observer, there are some problems with using access analysis. Access analysis does not take into account the presence of interior, non-architectural, and semi-permeable barriers, such as curtains. Depth values and points of access are not the only indication of privacy in a space nor do they always mean that seemingly private spaces are indeed private. Nevertheless, access analysis, control values, and relative asymmetry are a satisfactory beginning point for an analysis of space. This is because, if a room is remote and difficult to access, requiring one to walk through many other rooms and entrance points, it is less likely to be accessed. An outsider would be deterred by the room’s remoteness from the main entrance of the building, and inhabitants from traveling through so many other spaces first. Rooms such as this tend to have higher depth values and RA values in comparison to the rest of the building’s rooms. Furthermore, these issues can be addressed after access analysis is completed by then comparing the analysis with architectural and cultural features.

Incomplete house plans are also an issue with spatial analysis in this study, since not all of the rooms of the structure or doorways can be accounted for. In these instances,

I have limited the analysis to the justified access map. If the entrance has not been identified, these justified access maps will be justified to the courtyard space where a visitor was likely to have been directed from the entrance. The approach remains the same for incomplete houses, but the amount of analysis conducted will be varied on a case-by-case basis, and my ability to compare them to complete structures will be limited.

For visual access analysis of these houses, I will use UCL’s Depthmap program, which demonstrates the visibility in a space from a specific point. Since the walls of the majority of the houses under consideration are not preserved to their full height, I cannot take into account the height of interior walls or the presence of interior windows but, I can estimate visibility using isovist polygon in the Depthmap program, which does not require a reconstruction of the height of the walls or of the viewer. For this study, I have selected the carrier point and the reception space, or spaces, as two points from which to understand the visual access of the house. This is to account for the passerby and for the invited visitor, both of whom are important in the arrangement of domestic space in Greek and Roman culture.

To accomplish this, I have taken plans of each of the houses and using Wintopo software I have thinned each plan and converted them into vectors which can then be used by the Depthmap program for analysis. In Depthmap, I then select the point from which I wish to view the structure and apply the isovist polygon. This polygon reflects all possible angles of view from the selected point and appears in color on the blackened house plans. When windows, columns, or low parapet walls have been found, I account
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for these as well in the visibility maps. Therefore, some of the plans for visibility will look slightly different from those of accessibility; for instance, parapet walls will appear in the latter but not the former.

Following these spatial and visual analyses, one must turn to the material culture which was set aside for the objective analyses. For each structure in this study I will describe the type of construction used, the way the houses were decorated, and the arrangement of the rooms. By applying these factors to the analysis of each house, as described above, I will understand the context of the evidence for household cult. I will then be in a better position to understand whether or not the activities and chosen identities of the inhabitants, as seen in the evidence for household cult, were indicative of new behaviors. Finally, I will be able to observe general trends for cultural change across each city and the prominence of identifiable Roman cultural elements in Greek communities at the level of household units.

I.E: Organization

This thesis has six chapters. In Chapter I, the theoretical and methodological framework has been presented. Chapter II will discuss Greek and Roman household religions and identifies the evidence for these household cults and rituals. Here, Greek and Roman domestic religion and practices of household religion are discussed in general terms based on literary and archaeological evidence. This is important groundwork for the analysis of hitherto understudied household cults in Roman Achaia. In Chapter III, the three-part method of analyzing houses and their cults is applied to a selection of Classical Greek houses and Romano-Italian houses in order to
generate data against which to compare and contrast the data collected for household
cults in Roman Achaia. Chapter III concludes with a discussion of Greek and Roman
cultural identities comparing the literary evidence with the analysis from this chapter. In
Chapters IV and V, I analyze in detail within my framework cultural interactions between
Romans and Greeks in household cults to establish to what extent to which Roman
behaviors can be identified. Chapter IV considers the evidence of houses and household
cults from Delos, which is the earliest example of a large community of Romans in the
Greek world. As Delos is highlighted as a precursor to the Roman-Greek cultural
interaction observed in Roman Achaia, the observations made there serve well as a
comparison to those made for Roman Achaia. Chapter V constitutes the main focus of
this project as it presents the five case studies from Roman Achaia. Each city will first be
treated individually beginning with a general description of the settlement followed by a
description and analysis of the houses. Then, the evidence for household cults will be
presented followed by the analysis of the evidence in context. The study of each city will
conclude with a summary of the observations made. At the end of the chapter, I will
present some conclusions about the nature of household religion in the province and its
implications for cultural identity. Finally, a general review will gather together all the
threads and draw the necessary conclusions in Chapter VI. Particular attention is made to
the evaluation of the discussed data and the effectiveness of this three-part approach.
Finally, I will situate my findings within the wider discussion of cultural change in
Roman Achaia.

The main text is then followed by five appendices that convey further detailed
information about all of the houses mentioned in this study. Appendix A provides a list
of Roman houses in Achaia in alphabetical order of the city in which it was found; each entry consists of a short bibliography at the end. Appendices B to E provide useful overviews for specific aspects that I used as worksheets for Chapter V. The most important appendix is Appendix B, as it lists all the houses with potential shrines or possible household cult evidence and where this evidence was located in the house, if known.
Chapter II: Greek and Roman Household Religion

In this chapter, I define household religion within each of the two main cultures under examination and describe its evidence within each cultural group in order to highlight the key differences between the two. This chapter will, therefore, serve to provide the background for identifying household religious evidence in the Roman province of Achaia.

In this study, the term household religion refers to the cults, cultic rituals and practices carried out within the domestic space by those residing within the same domestic space and which were concerned with the health, safety and fecundity of those specifically within that domestic space. The cultures of pre-Roman Greece and of Rome have distinct differences in their household religions, its cults, and rituals. In the following sections, the basic cults and rituals, as well as the material evidence for them will be described based on literary and epigraphic sources as well as archaeological evidence. This is in order to identify criteria by which evidence of household religion may be distinguished in Roman Achaia.

II.A: Evidence for Greek Household Religion

The primary evidence for household cults and rituals in ancient Greece is Attic literature, which does create an Athens-centered picture of domestic religion, but, as will be demonstrated, the few epigraphic and archaeological remains from other poleis reveal similar practices and household cults. These common elements will establish the criteria for the material culture that can be applied to household religion in Roman Achaia.
Because of the state of the physical evidence, however, literature and epigraphy are relied upon more than I would like, but the fact remains that most of our identification of household religious material depends upon literature. The literary descriptions of Greek household cults and rituals, moreover, come from sources ranging from Homer to the late Hellenistic and even the late Roman periods, and I do not assume that Greek religion in general remained the same for all time or was the same at every site. I wish instead to highlight literary and archaeological evidence that can be related to the traditions of household cult practices. The text of Homer, however, will only be introduced when it demonstrates the longevity of a ritual or cult.

There are four formal cults found in literature and inscriptions which were common in some form to most Greek houses: two of the genos and two of the oikos. The first was the cult of Zeus Herkeios, or Zeus of the Courtyard, mentioned in several tragedies and works of history and politics.\footnote{Aristotle Athenaion Politeia 55; Demosthenes 57.67; Herodotus 6.67.3–69; Homer Odyssey 22.334–337; Euripides Trojan Women 16–17; Sack of Ilion (arg. 2); Euripides Herakles 922–927; Sophocles Antigone 486–489a.} By his very epithet this Zeus was a domestic deity. He was honored with an altar in the courtyard for the protection of the genos and its property. It is uncertain what kind of offering or sacrifice was typically made to honor him, but it was probably some kind of libation and/or cake offering, and possibly an annual blood sacrifice.\footnote{Herodotus 6.67.3–69 describes a blood sacrifice to Zeus Herkeios in a house in 6th century BCE Sparta. However, Zeus Herkeios may have also received cakes; according to Faraone, “that the offering of a cake might be a typical household variant of animal sacrifice is suggested by the fact that Clearchus, the Arcadian man mentioned by Porphyry [De Abstinentia 2.16], also offers sacrifice cakes to his ancestral gods” (Faraone 2008, p. 215).} In literature Zeus Herkeios’ cult was strongly associated with legend and the past.\footnote{Homer Odyssey 22.334–337; Euripides Trojan Women 16–17; Sack of Ilion (arg. 2); Euripides Herakles 922–927; Sophocles Antigone 486–489a; Pausanias 5.14.7.} This sense of deep antiquity and of ancestral cult
may be the reason that worshiping Zeus Herkeios was required for an Athenian citizen to be qualified to hold office.\textsuperscript{79}

How this requirement was enforced is uncertain, but, it clearly links the cult with the \textit{genos} and not with the \textit{oikos}. This association is supported by the passage in Herodotus, in which the lineage of Demaratus is confirmed through a sacrifice and oath to Zeus Herkeios.\textsuperscript{80} Mikalson considers this domestic cult to be a symbol of the \textit{genos} to the outside world.\textsuperscript{81} In Athens, according to \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{2} 4983 and fragment 67 of Philochorus,\textsuperscript{82} there was an altar to Zeus Herkeios on the Athenian Acropolis under the sacred olive tree. In addition, the cult is listed on the sacrificial calendar for the Attic deme of Thorikos in the year 430 BCE.\textsuperscript{83} In terms of archaeological evidence within excavated houses, one would expect to find altars dedicated to Zeus Herkeios, however, so far none is known.

Along with Zeus Herkeios, Aristotle also mentions worshipping Apollo Patroos, Apollo of the Ancestor, as a requirement for holding office in Athens. How this cult was honored is uncertain, but if it was similar to that of Zeus Herkeios, then there may have been an altar in the house for the \textit{genos}, led by the father, to make offerings to Apollo. There is no known archaeological evidence for this cult from a domestic context either, although it has a shrine in the Athenian Agora. Nor have I found any literary references linking this cult of Apollo specifically with the house. It is possible this was not a cult performed in the house, but by the \textit{genos} at a public altar. As it involved the \textit{genos} and was important for lineage, it is discussed by scholars as a domestic cult; however, it may

\textsuperscript{79} Aristotle \textit{Athenaion Politeia} 55.
\textsuperscript{80} Herodotus 6.67.3–69.
\textsuperscript{81} Mikalson 2005, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{82} \textit{FGrH}, 328, Θ.67.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{SEG} 33: 147, line 22.
have been one practiced physically outside the house, and, therefore, outside of the boundaries of this study.

As for cults of the oikos, the primary cult was that of Hestia, the hearth. This cult was probably the most widespread domestic cult in the Greek world, as attested to by the existence of civic versions of hearths to Hestia in the Prytaneia of different cities and a pan-hellenic hearth to Hestia at Delphi.\(^8^4\) Although she was one of the most revered deities, she lacked her own specific civic festivals and sanctuaries. Hestia was completely a domestic deity concerned with the health and protection of all those who dwelled within the house.\(^8^5\) Daily offerings were made to her at the household hearth. According to Nilsson, bits of food from the main meal of the day were placed on the hearth before the meal began, and the first piece of any sacrifice in the house was offered to Hestia.\(^8^6\) The importance of the hearth as the beginning, whether of a meal or sacrifice, is emphasized by epigraphic evidence found in various poleis which record processions, sacrifices and oaths, all beginning at the polis hearth or in Hestia’s name.\(^8^7\)

In the house all new members of the household whether a baby, bride, or slave were ceremonially presented to Hestia upon their arrival. At Athens, the amphidromia was the ceremony in which the father of a new baby or the women who delivered it ceremonially recognized the child as a member of the family and household by walking it

---

\(^8^4\) Plutarch *Aristides* 20.4.

\(^8^5\) Her civic and pan-hellenic hearths are usually interpreted from the point of view of the “oikos” as a model for the polis; the polis is one big “oikos” and Hellas is the “oikos” of all Greeks (Boedeker 2008, p. 236; Nilsson 1972, p. 75).

\(^8^6\) Nilsson 1972, p. 73. He does not provide his sources for this information, but it is possible the information was found in the *Homeric Hymns*, in Pindar *Nemean Odes* 11.1–10 (although this may be a public sacrifice), and in Plutarch *Commentary on Hesiod’s Works and Days*, 48 (commenting on lines 342–343 in Hesiod). All the sources regarding this practice are either earlier or referring to a period earlier than the time periods with which this study is concerned; however, since later authors like Plutarch (*Commentary on Hesiod’s Works and Days*, 48) and Aristokritos (FGrH, p. 493, F.5) reference these earlier sources regarding this practice, it may be assumed that a pre-meal offering to Hestia was not uncommon in their times.

\(^8^7\) Miller 1978, p. 14.
around the hearth. This placed the child under the protection of its goddess and ended the pollution in the house that followed the birth; this was probably then followed with a sacrifice to the house gods and a meal.\(^{88}\) For a bride, after the nighttime procession from the house of her upbringing to that of the bridegroom, she was greeted by her new mother-in-law and was introduced to the hearth and the gods of the house, placing her under their protection as a new member of the family and household.\(^{89}\) A white ground pyxis from Athens dated c. 400 BCE depicts Hestia accompanying the bride and bridegroom during the procession carrying torches.\(^{90}\) Hestia here takes on the role of the women of the bride’s family who would have surrounded her in the procession protecting her in her liminal state between child/daughter and woman/wife.\(^{91}\)

The cult of Hestia thus played one of the bigger roles in handling miasma.\(^{92}\) The hearth was also where anyone, including slaves, could seek asylum.\(^{93}\) Archaeologically, the physical evidence of this cult would be a fixed hearth, as these served as the altar and embodiment of the deity. However, many excavated houses lack fixed hearths; therefore, Barbara Tsakirgis suggests that braziers may have been used instead not only for heating and cooking but also for domestic cult practices.\(^{94}\)

The second *oikos* cult, the cult of Zeus Ktesios or Zeus of the Possessions, is more well-known from archaeological evidence but, for consistency, I will start with the

\(^{88}\) Garland 1990, p. 93–94. Garland cites the playwright Ephihippos (CAF II, p. 251.3) as evidence for the banquet that followed the ceremony.

\(^{89}\) Garland 1990, p. 221.


\(^{91}\) Morgan 2007, p. 307.

\(^{92}\) For discussion of miasma, see Parker 1983.

\(^{93}\) Homer *Odyssey* 7.153; Euripides *Herakles* 712–715.

literary references. He was the protector of the stores and property of the oikos and was often associated with a snake. Isaeus (8.15-16) depicted the ceremony honoring this deity with a blood sacrifice at an altar in a secluded location in the house. Isaeus also described how this ceremony was restricted to the genos, since he used the defendant’s participation in the ritual as proof of his lineage. However, Antiphon (1.16-19) mentioned the participation of a mistress and a friend in this ritual. In Aeschylus’ Agamemnon (1036-1039), Cassandra was sent to the altar of Zeus Ktesios to meet the other slaves. From these literary examples scholars have suggested that this is a cult of the oikos. Also supporting this argument is a passage of Athenaeus (11.473b-c) that illustrates a different sort of cult for Zeus Ktesios. Here, an aniconic image of Zeus Ktesios in the form of a jar with two handles and a lid was set up in the storeroom of the house. White wool garlands were placed on the handles and a yellow piece of wool stretched from the right handle to the lid. The jar would have been filled with olive oil, grain, water, or fruits as an offering to Zeus Ktesios for the protection of the food and property and for good luck. Literary testimonia also mention offerings of cakes. Outside the domestic context, Pausanias mentions Zeus Ktesios as one of the deme altars found at Phyla and Myrrhinus, which, has been cited by some scholars as proof of the adoption by the polis of domestic cults for the well being of the community.

95 Menander, Pseuderakles, frag. 519k; Harpocration s.v. “Ktesiou Dios”; Isaeus 8.15–16; Athenaeus 11.473b–c; Antiphon 1.16–19; Aeschylus Agamemnon 1036–1039.
97 Mentioned in Faraone 2008, p. 217, but he does not indicate what testimonia.
98 Pausanias 1.31.4; Boedeker 2008, p. 243.
Archaeologically, an altar with the name of Zeus Ktesios has also been found on Thera,99 and another inscription dedicated to this deity was uncovered in a house in Halieis100 (Figures 34). The jar form of Zeus Ktesios cult is also attested on Kos, and a 3rd century BCE relief of Zeus Ktesios as a snake was found on Thasos.101 Thus archaeologically, he may also be connected with snake imagery. A coin from Sparta of unknown date depicts two of these jars with snakes wrapped around them.102 He is also listed next to Zeus Herkeios in an inscription from Thrace.103 Therefore, in terms of material evidence for the cult, one would expect to find not only an altar but an image of a snake or a ceremonial jar with fillets or snakes. However, the actual jars themselves, with their fillets and offerings, are most probably not legible in the archaeological record. The fillets and offerings are too ephemeral to survive and the sacred jar, or its remains, most likely would not stand out from other utilitarian jar remains in a storeroom.

Recently, however, a stone jar has been found at the Hellenistic site of Halos in Thessaly with two snake-like silver and iron objects in it104 (Figure 27). The excavators interpret this jar as one of these vessels to Zeus Ktesios based on comparison with the literary references.105

In the jar form of the cult, Zeus Ktesios took on an apotropaic role in warding off evil and misfortune. Apotropaia were very common in Greek houses and were usually an

---

99 Nilsson 1960, p. 276. The dedication on the altar also includes Hestia, Zeus Kataibates, Stropheus, Tyche, Zeus Soter, Hygieia and Agathos Daimon. Nilsson also goes on to mention that there were smaller altars found with the name of Zeus Ktesios on them but does not say where they were found.
100 Ault 2005, p. 51.
102 Published in Roscher 1884–1937, p. 1171; mentioned in Nilsson 1972, p. 69 and fig. 29. The two jars are meant to represent the Dioskouri, the two sons of Zeus. Nilsson argues that this iconography for the twin gods was taken from that of Zeus. The Dioskouri are also known to have been worshiped as household deities, but not nearly as widespread as Zeus Ktesios.
103 Syll. L III, 991.
object in the image of, or sacred to, a deity who had the power to bring misfortune; thus, those wishing protection either appeased the deity or protected themselves from the deity with the deity. Like the formal domestic cults described above, these could have been honored with offerings in exchange for the protection of the house and household. Since they were a part of a ritual made in honor of a deity within the confines of the house for the purpose of protecting the house and household, they are also included in this study.

Apotropaia took on many different forms, but some of the more common ones were herms, hekataia, and images of Apollo Agyieus. Herms and hekataia were semi-iconic images of the deities Hermes and Hekate, although herms are also known with the heads of heroes, philosophers, and important familial figures. They were placed inside the front door of the house to protect it from within against thieves and evil spirits. In Aristophanes’s *Plutus* (1153), Hermes offered to protect the door of the house in exchange for bread and a share of the banquet. And, in Porphyry’s *De Abstinentia* (2.16), the Arcadian Clearchus honored his herms, hekataion and other ancestral shrines with incense and cakes at the new moon of each month; this confirms the inclusion of apotropaia in the realm of domestic religion.

Apollo Agyieus also guarded the door of the house but from the outside as a statuette or pillar before the door. Offerings were also made to him either in front of or on top of this image or pillar. This external guardianship was sometimes also given to

---

107 E.g., Porphyry *De Abstinentia* 2.16 and Aristophanes *Plutus* 1153.
108 Faraone 1992, p. 8; Scholia to Aristophanes *Plutus* 1153.
109 Also known as Apollo Thyraios, Prothyraios, Propylaios, Prostaterios, Alexikakos, Apotropaioi.
Herakles in a similar manner.\textsuperscript{110} He was typically represented by a depiction of his club (Figure 84). The general \textit{theoi prothyraioi}, such as Pan and Aphrodite, were also known to protect the threshold of a house as mentioned in comedies, and their images are thought to have been placed in niches next to the door.\textsuperscript{111} No images survive which can be linked with this function, but small recesses next to house doors have been found;\textsuperscript{112} it is also possible that these received offerings for various deities but did not hold images of them. Other small plaques and terracotta figurines or protomes have been found near doorways,\textsuperscript{113} which may have been apotropaia, and near hearths, which literature indicates were for good luck.\textsuperscript{114}

This form of domestic religion has the potential for being the most well represented in the archaeological record, although one must also keep in mind the tendency of scholars to categorize objects of unknown purpose as apotropaic or religious. Still, herms and hekataia are specific enough to be placed in this category. As for the plaques, statuettes, and pillars or columns, the location of these objects in the space of the house may be the key to identifying them as apotropaic; that is to say, if they are found around the area of the doorway to the house, one strong possibility is that they were placed there to protect the \textit{oikos}.

Also related to divine protection for the health, well-being and fecundity of the household were the rituals surrounding transitions in stages of life. The material culture associated with these transitions was amulets\textsuperscript{115} and lustral basins. Amulets were very

\textsuperscript{111} Faraone 1992, pp. 8, 9.
\textsuperscript{112} Jameson 1990a, p. 105.
\textsuperscript{113} Faraone 1992, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{114} Aristophanes \textit{Birds} 436 and Scholia on this passage; Eustathius \textit{Commentary on the Odyssey} 17.455; Faraone 1992, p. 55.
important for protecting the sick\textsuperscript{116} and the young\textsuperscript{117} and in rites of passage or transition. In childbirth, amulets that were associated with Artemis and Hera were also used to protect the mother-to-be and the child during delivery.\textsuperscript{118} A bride-to-be sacrificed her amulets from childhood to deities associated with marriage like Artemis or Aphrodite right before her marriage.\textsuperscript{119} These events and their rituals were the responsibility of the family and the household, not only for the purposes of protecting the individual in transition but also to protect the community from the miasma that comes with these passages. To this end, other precautions were taken to prevent the pollution of birth or death from escaping the house as well.

These precautions included the placement of lustral basins outside the house or within it that would provide visitors and the \textit{oikos} with a means of cleansing pollution.\textsuperscript{120} However, one must be cautious in identifying these as solely ritualistic. Water basins also have utilitarian functions in the house and may have had only a ritualistic function when necessary; therefore, there is no definitive way to identify them as having been used in this way, and they will be noted when found but will not be included in the categories of evidence. Figurines could also be toys for children or decorations in the house without necessarily cultic or apotropaic significance; however, so much of the potential evidence for domestic religion takes the form of figurines that all figurines found within houses will be included in the categories of evidence but with caution.

\textsuperscript{116} Plutarch \textit{Perikles} 38.2: In this passage a group of women made an amulet for the dying Perikles in an attempt to help him.

\textsuperscript{117} Children after the \textit{amphidromia} wore amulets to protect them until they reached adulthood: Garland 1990, p. 94 and attested to in vase painting, especially on choes (Hamilton 1992, pp. 84–88).

\textsuperscript{118} Morgan 2007, p. 307.

\textsuperscript{119} Garland 1990, p. 220.

\textsuperscript{120} Aristophanes \textit{Ekklesiazusae} 1032–1033; Euripides \textit{Alcestis} 98–104; Menander \textit{Shield} 225–229; Pimpl 1997; Morgan 2007, p. 306; Boedeker 2008, p. 240.
Finally, an aspect of household cult, which is unique to Athens but is only known archaeologically, were the sacrificial deposits found under the floors of Athenian houses. These pits were usually filled with burnt animal bones and miniature pottery vessels.\textsuperscript{121} There is no literary evidence for rituals related to such deposits. However, Stephan Weikart has identified them as offerings for the protection of the physical structure of the household, which may be related to construction, both initial and later renovations.\textsuperscript{122} Thus, these votive foundation deposits and their associated ritual were probably conducted for the protection of the \textit{oikos} indirectly as a result of protecting the physical building. Until recently, all known examples of these deposits dated to the Classical period; however, in the last decade examples of these deposits have also come to light in houses of the Roman period, making them important for this study.

With this brief overview of Greek household religion, the type of evidence to look for becomes apparent. Hearths or braziers may be found which were both functional and sacred based on literary sources. Altars were also important for formal domestic cults, possibly to a version of Zeus. Depictions of snakes or two-handed jars with fillets or snakes could mark the area sacred to Zeus Ktesios; however, the jars themselves may be difficult to distinguish from others found in houses. Herms and hekataia are also distinctive indicators, as are the pillars, columns or statues of Apollo Agyieus and the club of Herakles. But, herms and hekataia are often carved from marble or made of bronze and therefore accessible only to those with wealth. More modest houses may have had versions of these apotropaia made of a less durable material, such as wood, which may not be preserved in the archaeological record. Or, this may be a situation in

\textsuperscript{121} Weikart 2002.
\textsuperscript{122} Weikart 2002, p. 99.
which terracotta figurines and plaques were placed near the doorway instead of marble or bronze herms and hekataia. Additionally, figurines found elsewhere in the house could have been related to cult or apotropaia as well, although this identification may be difficult to substantiate without the supporting evidence of location. Furthermore, a niche outside the doorway could serve as an indication of domestic cult. And finally, in Athens, there were votive deposits under the floors of the house containing miniature pottery and animal bones.

There was not one central shrine for all domestic cultic activities, but rather several sacred areas, objects, or features arranged where needed to protect the oikos, the genos, and the community outside the house. They are dedicated to attributes of Olympian deities associated with the oikos and genos, and they take many different forms from formal altars in the courtyard to a jar in the pantry. Without the need to display all their household cults and rituals to the wider community, there could be any number of variations in location, deities, and forms.

II.B: Evidence for Roman Household Religion

As with Greek household religion, much of the scholarship concerning Roman household religion relies heavily on literary sources. However, unlike Greek household religion, there is significantly more preserved archaeological evidence for Roman household religion. This is in part due to the well preserved remains in the area of the Bay of Naples and also due to the nature of the two domestic religions. Greek household cults took many forms and were dispersed throughout the house, making them more difficult to identify. Roman household cults were typically placed in one central location.
making them much more distinctive in the archaeological record. In spite of this, the
general method employed by modern scholars has been to look at the literary sources and
compare them with what is found in Pompeii and its environs, where the majority of the
archaeological material has been found. The picture created through this method is then
used to analyze evidence from other Roman sites in more general overviews of Roman
household religion.\textsuperscript{123}

The literature describing or mentioning Roman household religion like the Greek,
also spans many centuries, from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE and beyond,
and was written with various agendas. Later literature was often written to promote
Christianity and discredit traditional religions, such as the writings of St. Augustine.\textsuperscript{124}
Earlier authors were heavily influenced by Greek literature and often attempted to
describe their own culture through Greek models,\textsuperscript{125} or like Cato in direct opposition to
Greek culture. Other literary sources include citizens in exile trying to regain their
‘Romanitas’\textsuperscript{126} or authors from the provinces observing the culture of Rome.\textsuperscript{127} Second,
these literary sources only provide glimpses at domestic religion but never a complete
picture and, therefore, we are reconstructing these practices from various scraps of
information from different time periods and perspectives. There is then also little
accountability for developments and changes within this social institution which surely
occurred.

\textsuperscript{123} E.g., Orr 1978 and Bodel 2008. Bakker 1994 uses Vesuvian comparanda for his study of domestic and
workplace religion at Ostia but does not put much weight on literary sources.
\textsuperscript{124}E.g., Augustine, \textit{De Civitate Dei Contra Paganos} 6.9.2. Augustine’s description is based on Varro of a
household ritual following childbirth and was meant to satirize the worship of pagan deities.
\textsuperscript{125} E.g., Varro, Vitruvius. For a discussion of Greek philosophy influencing early Roman authors see
\textsuperscript{126} E.g., Cicero, Ovid.
\textsuperscript{127} E.g., Martial, Plutarch, Apuleius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus.
Still, in many of these primary references, it seems the mention of the household
gods or of the practice of household cultic rituals was linked with the author’s or
character’s cultural identity. For instance, Ovid writing from exile laments that his
Genius abandoned him when he was forced to leave Rome and give up his citizenship
(\textit{Tristia} 3.13.1-10). And, Virgil’s Aeneas as the progenitor of Romulus and Rome brings
his Penates to his new kingdom (1.68, 1.378-380, 2.293-297, 7.121, 8.39, 8.679).
Furthermore, there is very little archaeological evidence for domestic life in Rome itself.
Thus, the primary literature, as well as some epigraphy, is important for understanding
Roman religious practices and beliefs once the inherent problems are recognized.

The majority of the archaeological evidence considered for the reconstruction of
Roman domestic religious practices comes from the towns and cities buried by the
eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE. I have already discussed the issues related to using these
sites as examples of Roman culture. However, Pompeian evidence can be used as an
example of Roman culture if it is viewed from the perspective that most of what is
understood as Roman culture in Italy was developed from Roman initiatives. Still,
Pompeii is only a snapshot of domestic life in 1st century CE imperial Italy, and the site
cannot provide information about later developments. But, other sites lack the extensive
amount of evidence of the Vesuvian towns; therefore, the material evidence from this
region must be relied upon because there is little else. Another Italian site which
provides some evidence, although not as complete or plentiful, is Ostia, which was a
Roman military colony established in the 4th century BCE not far outside of the city of
Rome to protect the grain supply. Much of the evidence from Ostia is contemporary with
that of the sites studied in Roman Achaia, with a building boom in the 2nd century CE and
abandonment in the 4th century CE, so Ostia will be referenced whenever possible. Nevertheless, Pompeii will be the basis for much of this description of Roman household religion.

Displayed and honored within the central household shrines was a collection of deities, which reflected the inhabitants’ relationship with Roman society. Two main cults can be found in almost every house of Pompeii and in most literary references to domestic cults in Roman houses: the Lares and the Genius. These cults and their rituals in the lararium, as well as Vesta and the hearth, were strongly connected with Roman cultural identity in both Rome and Pompeii.\(^\text{128}\) In addition to these, the Penates, which were a collection of different deities related to the livelihood and personal concerns of the paterfamilias, and the apotropaic Genius Loci have also been identified as important parts of household religion. In Ostia, the Genius is less commonly found in household contexts and the Lares familiaris not at all.\(^\text{129}\) This may be due to the slow abandonment of the site during which the inhabitants likely took the portable parts of their shrines with them, but it may also indicate a development in household cults of the High Empire in which the Lares and the Genius were no longer criteria for a lararium, only the personally chosen Penates. Still, given their importance in Rome and Campania, from where at least one significant Italian community in Roman Achaia came, they must be considered among the criteria and evidence.

The Lares were protective deities of liminal and potentially dangerous features, such as boundaries, sea travel, roads and military service. In the household, they were

\(^{128}\) Hales 2003, p. 18 and pp. 113–114.

\(^{129}\) Bakker 1994, pp. 191–193. Lares have been found in compital shrines, lararia from shops and warehouses, or are without provenience, but not specifically in houses.
associated with the hearth and with guarding the health and welfare of the inhabitants.\textsuperscript{130} The Lares appear to have been an Italic domestic tradition which was made a public cult by Augustus as part of his religious reforms in 7 BCE. The evidence for Lares in houses can be found as far back as the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE in literature.\textsuperscript{131} These references indicate not only the association of the Lares with the protection of the household but also that their cult was something commonly understood by the audiences and, therefore, a long held tradition. In these early references, the deity is spoken of in the singular, Lar, rather than the plural which appears in the imperial period as a result of Augustus’s religious reforms of 7 BCE. In this public cult two Lares were worshiped at compital shrines as the Lares Augusti.\textsuperscript{132}

As for physical remains, the earliest known are reliefs, wall paintings and inscriptions found on Delos dating to the late second and early first centuries BCE and attributed to Italian merchants residing there.\textsuperscript{133} These will be discussed further in reference to the houses of Delos in Chapter IV. The majority of physical evidence for the Lares, however, comes from 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE Pompeii and consists primarily of wall paintings and inscriptions\textsuperscript{134} as well as a few statuettes. Only in Pompeii were they usually depicted in the same medium as the Genius of the \textit{paterfamilias} and the Genius Loci.

\textsuperscript{130} E.g., Plautus \textit{Aulularia} 1–5; Tibullus I.10.15–24; \textit{CIL} X 861; \textit{CIL} X 7555; \textit{CIL} IV 1539.
\textsuperscript{131} Cato \textit{De Argi Cultura} 143.2; Plautus \textit{Aulularia} 1–8.
\textsuperscript{132} E.g. Bakker 1994, p. 9; Fröhlich 1991, p. 27. This switch in number may indicate a change in practice between the Republican period and the early Imperial period or it may indicate that some people only honored one Lar while others honored two.
\textsuperscript{133} Those found on Delos are Lares compitales and not one of the domestic versions of Lares, but they are found in domestic contexts, which Nilsson has suggested was the result of the Italian immigrants not being able to establish these shrines at the actual crossroads (Nilsson 1960, p. 278).
\textsuperscript{134} E.g. \textit{CIL} IV 1539 from the Casa degli Scienziati (VI, xiv, 43) found below a niche with painted serpents, reads ITE LARES; \textit{CIL} X 861 from the Domus Epidi Rufi (IX, i, 20) carved in a marble base found in an ala, reads GENIO·M·N·ET | LARIBUS | DUO·DIADUMENI | LIBERTI.
Representations of the Lares are identified by their distinct and consistent iconography; they are usually depicted as a pair of dancing youths carrying a rhyton in one hand and a patera or situla in the other, although their garments vary depending on the time period and location135 (Figure 57, the flanking painted figures). Some scholars have proposed that this iconography for the Lares comes from Bacchus in Southern Italy, or the Dioscuri or Kabiri.136 From literary sources, which range in date from the 2nd century BCE through the early 2nd century CE it is known that the domestic Lares were honored with spelt, grapes, garlands of grain or flowers, honey cakes, honey combs, first fruits, wine, blood offerings, grain and incense.137

While their role in household religion is unquestionable, who they were has been much debated in modern scholarship. One side suggests that they represent the familial ancestors138 and the other that they were agricultural deities brought into the house.139 A third group further proposes that, rather than looking for their origin, the Lares should be considered gods of the living family and household.140 This debate springs from conflicting literary sources and interpretations of them. Plautus’s Mercator (834) and later Tibullus’s Elegies (1.10.15-20) identified the Lares as deities of the ancestors. Plautus’s character Charinus implored the di penates meum parentum, familiae Lar pater to protect his ancestral home so he may run away. Here the Lar as the father of the

---

135 On Delos in the late 2nd and early 1st centuries BCE they wear short skirts and Phrygian caps. In Pompeii of the 1st century CE they usually wear a high-girded tunica, a shawl-like garment, and are either bare headed or wear wreaths except for one example where a Lar wears a pilleus, the felt cap of a freedman.
136 Orr 1978, pp. 1568 and 1568 n. 6; Waites 1920, pp. 251–261.
137 E.g., Juvenal 9.138 and 12.83–90; Calpurnius Siculus Bucolica 5.25–27; Tibullus 1.10.21–24, 1.1.21–22, 1.3.34, 2.1.59–60; Horace Carmina 3.23.3–4, 4.5.33–36; Horace Satires 2.5.12–14, 2.3.164–165; Plautus Rudens 1208; Plautus Trinummus 39; Prudentius Peristephanon liber 10.261; Ovid Fasti 2.631; Martial 3.58.23; Cato De Agri Cultura 143.2.
138 E.g., Waites 1920; Bodel 2008.
139 E.g., Laing 1921; Orr 1978.
140 E.g., Foss 1997; Tybout 1996; Fröhlich 1991.
*familia* can be interpreted as an ancestor. However, as the character is listing the cults of the household, *pater* might refer to the Genius of the *paterfamilias* instead; thus, he is invoking the Penates, the *Lar familias* and the *paterfamilias* or his Genius.

Tibullus’s *Elegies* (1.10.15-20), however, refers to these divinities as the *patrii Lares*, which can be interpreted as either the spirits of ancestors or as the gods honored by them and passed down from them. Dionysios of Halicarnassus writing before Augustus’s reforms, describes the establishment of compital shrines by Servius Tullius to honor heroes (IV.14). This could be interpreted as indicating that the Lares were divine ancestors, but it could also be that this Greek author was trying to explain a Roman practice through his own cultural experience; he may have been equating the compital shrines with herms or Apollo Agyieus, which were placed at the entrances of Greek houses.

Moreover, the Lares associated with the household (*Lares familiaris, domestici, casanici*) were worshipped by everyone in a household but most especially by the slaves. If the Lares were ancestral deities, why were they important to slaves who had no ancestors. The evidence for the significance of the Lares cult to slaves is stated in literature\(^\text{141}\) and epigraphic sources\(^\text{142}\) dating from the Republican period to the High Empire. In addition, in the few Pompeian houses with multiple shrines, the Lares have

\(^{141}\) Cato, *De Argi Cultura* 5.3 and 143.2; Horace, *Satires* I.v.51–70. The passages from Cato were written as instructions to an overseer of the farm regarding his role as head slave. That from Horace is a battle of wits between a free-born citizen and a freedman; the freedman offering a chain to the Lares is made as either a passing comment or a commentary on the man’s manumission.

\(^{142}\) E.g. *CIL* IX 2996 = I\(^2\) 1762 (Anxanum, c. 100-50 BCE); *CIL* VI 36808 (Rome, date unknown); *ILS* 3604=*CIL* II 1980 (Adra, South Spain, dated to the Antonine period); *ILS* 3608=*CIL* IX 723 (Morrone, near Lerins, South France, dated to Severan period). Fröhlich asserts that some of the inscriptions from Pompeii regarding the domestic cults of the Lares and Genius reveal that these cults were the concern of the slaves and freedmen, like those of the compital Lares and Genius, and that the slaves and freedmen were organized into groups called *collegia Larum* or *collegia familia* to care for these domestic shrines, at least in the big villas (Fröhlich 1991, p. 31).
been found in all of them, both the *lararia* in reception spaces of the house and those in servant areas and kitchens. This indicates that their worship was significant for everyone in the household, including slaves.

Bodel and others have offered interpretations linking the Lares with slaves, for example the mother of the Lares was a slave or that the mother of Romulus and Remus was a servant of the Lares;¹⁴³ their evidence being the nature and focus of holidays celebrated by slaves, such as the Acca Laurentia and the Saturnalia, and later Roman historians’ interpretations of these holidays. However, there are no reliable sources which can support these interpretations of slave holidays leaving the arguments speculative.

Furthermore on the subject of Lares as ancestors, there were other cults specifically for ancestor worship, namely the *di Manes* or *di parentes*. These cults are mentioned on funerary inscriptions which were honored in funeral rituals and at the *dies parentalis* celebrated in February, and they were something entirely different from the Lares.¹⁴⁴

Other sources such as the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*¹⁴⁵ connected the Lares of the household with the fields, as did the compital shrines found at the borders between properties which housed the *Lares compitales*. The epigraphic sources for the former date to after Augustus’s religious reforms, but may represent long standing traditions. The Fratres Arvales were one of the oldest *collegia* of priests in Rome, said to have been founded by Romulus, which was dedicated to the worship of agricultural Lares and the

---

¹⁴⁵ These were recorded on inscriptions dating from 14 to 325 CE, e.g. *ILS* 451= *CIL* VI 2086.
gods of the harvest. But, there is no indication in their inscriptions that the Lares they honored were the same as those found within a house.

As for compital shrines, they rose to prominence after Augustus’s reforms, but were mentioned in earlier literature, such as Cato the Elder and Cicero, and were found on Hellenistic Delos; this indicates that they had existed for some time. Their decoration and iconography resemble that of domestic *lararia*, although they lack the Penates. And, slaves were also important in the maintenance of these shrines. For these reasons, scholars such as Rolf Tybout, connect domestic *lararia* with compital shrines.\(^{146}\) However, Lares appeared as guardians of many different places in addition to crossroads and households; some examples are the *Lares viales*, of roads, the *Lares permarini*, of seaways, the *Lares ludentes*, of games, and the *Lares praestites*, of the Roman state and later the imperial cult. And, they could have been guardians of specific collectives of people, such as the *Lares militaris* for the soldiers or the *Lares Augusti* for the imperial family.

Since there were Lares of various places and people, they seem to me to have been simply guardians protecting those entering into dangerous or liminal spaces and activities. As David Orr argues, “it should be remembered that the Lares were not limited to precise spheres of influence or certain clearly defined functions. The nature of tutelary religious forces is that they protect and watch and not define their powers. To the Roman it was enough that they had power and it did not matter much how it was evolved and where it was directed.”\(^{147}\) Therefore, the *Lares familiaris, domestici* or *casanici* were protective deities of the household as a unit. They were not only deities of

\(^{146}\) Tybout 1996, p. 259.  
\(^{147}\) Orr 1978, p. 1564.
place specific to that house but also to its inhabitants. The Lares were associated with the hearth which provided food and warmth to the household, but which could also cause great damage, whether by destroying the house through fire or by ceasing to provide sustenance to the inhabitants. This argument is further supported by the Lares’ connection to the slaves of the household.

Slaves were individuals existing permanently in a liminal state as participants in the society who lived on the fringes of it but on whom the society depended for survival. In addition to living in a liminal state, the slaves also represented a danger to the household through their role as procurers and preparers of food. The Lares were also honored in rites of passage for the members of the household. While in this liminal state from one status to the next, the Lares would have protected the individual in transition. Furthermore, the Lares as divine guardians of the familia, may explain why at Pompeii wall-painting shrines were white-washed over and new shrines painted, presumably as the property changed hands. This definition for Lares in general also provides for the other non-domestic Lares found in the Roman world.

In the lararia and epigraphy found in Pompeii, the Lares were closely linked with the Genius of the paterfamilias. The genius was essentially the numen of a person, place or thing. It was not a god, but a protective spirit representative of that with which it was associated. It has been considered the oldest element present in Roman religion. Some have suggested that it was related to the Etruscan genius, a protective spirit,

150 CIL X 860, 861 and 1235.
151 Orr 1978, p. 1570; Wissowa 1912, p. 182.
represented as a phallus, which was subordinate to the one it protected. The genius worshipped in the house was considered the protector of the fecundity of the *paterfamilias* in his capacity both for reproduction and for his ability to provide for the inhabitants of the household. The Genius was honored on the birthday of the *paterfamilias* and on his wedding day. When the *paterfamilias* passed away, the Genius would have been transferred to his male heirs *sui iuris*.

Offerings to the domestic Genius, sometimes called the *Genius familias*, included wine and honey cakes for both the Genius and the worshippers and possibly blood sacrifices. In the later Republic and early empire, a Genius was also honored as a protective *numen* for temples, colonies and the emperor, and a Genius was part of Augustus’s re-establishment of compital cults in 7 BCE in the 265 *vici* of Rome. The figure of the domestic Genius is depicted in wall paintings at Pompeii as an older man dressed in a *toga praetexta* which was folded in such a way as to form a hood or veil over his head (Figure 57, central painted figure). He stands between the two Lares, and he usually carried a cornucopia and/or a patera, typically making an offering at an altar. Genii were depicted in shrines not only in Pompeii but also on Delos; however, there they were not flanked by the Lares. Inscriptions mentioning the Genius of individuals have

---

154 *CIL* X 860 and 861. These two inscriptions also reflect the importance of this cult to the servant members of the household; Tibullus 2.2.1; Censorinus 2.2; Martial 10.24.
155 Horace, *Epistles* 2.2.188.
158 Fröhlich 1991, p. 126. Fröhlich mentions that this arrangement of the figures is not seen until the Augustan reforms of the compitale cults in 7 BCE, which is well after Delos ceased to be an active commercial center.
been found in Rome and other Italian sites in addition to Pompeii. These inscriptions are of uncertain date, but they indicate a continuity of the cult of the Genius of the individual throughout the Italian peninsula as a Roman element of domestic religion. The last known depictions of the Genius are dated to c. 300-325 CE, and the Genius was included in the Codex Theodosianus passage (16.10.12) outlawing the worship of the pagan domestic cults.

Although connected with the *paterfamilias*, the identity of this domestic *numen* is still much debated. At issue is whether it was the Genius of each individual *paterfamilias* or, with the passage of time, of the emperor as *paterfamilias* of the state. The Genius as that of the individual *paterfamilias* is the traditional identification of the figure put forth by Georg Wissowa and accepted by most scholars. The argument in favor of it representing the emperor, at least at Pompeii, was presented by Thomas Schäfer and by Heidi Schäfer who cite the *toga praetexta* worn by the Genius and the cornucopia he holds as evidence because these are iconographically associated with the Genius Augusti in compital shrines. They also argue that all painted Genii are representations of the Genius Augusti including those found in servants areas, and that the Genius of the *paterfamilias* was honored only in the *lararia* found in rooms of representation as a statuette. In support of this argument they cite the senatorial decree of 29 BCE mentioned in Cassius Dio (51.19.7), which ordered that libations should be made in honor of Octavian before all banquets whether public or private. The description of the

---

159 E.g., *AE* 1961, 118, *CIL* VI, 3498 and *CIL* VI, 30547 from Rome; *AE* 1994, 1228 from Mediolanum (Milan); *CIL* IX, 5572 from Tolentinum.
161 Wissowa 1912, p. 173; e.g., Tybout 1996, p. 371.
162 Schäfer 1993, pp. 442–446.
163 Schäfer 1996, pp. 73–98.
law in Dio does not state if the Genius of the emperor was meant or not, but this has traditionally been assumed by scholars. Ittai Gradel, however, argues that since the testimonia to this practice stated that the libation was to the emperor, but none stated that the libation was to the Genius of the emperor, that this offering was intended for the emperor directly and not his Genius.\footnote{Gradel 1992, pp. 45–46.} Since there are inscriptions documenting the worship of the Genius Augusti, it does not seem likely that those making the statements regarding the libation to the emperor would omit the Genius part from the dedication.

With regards to the \textit{toga praetexta} of these domestic Genii, Tybout states that the \textit{toga praetexta} has many different functions. It was worn not only by the emperor but also by boys of noble families, by high magistrates (consuls, praetors, dictators, censors), high ranking state priests (flamines, pontifices, augures, arvales), and municipal officials, and so was not necessarily a specific indicator of the emperor.\footnote{Tybout 1996, p. 371.} As for the cornucopia, Tybout does not discuss this, but it was a common fertility symbol in Roman iconography and, again, is not an indicator of the particular cult of the emperor’s Genius.

Tybout argues a third possibility for these figures. He suggests that these togate figures, depicted in the action of sacrificing, are symbolic representations of the Genius in the guise of his worshipper. “The painted Genius is a fixed generic type without individualizing characteristics….The most important element of the Genius’ iconography lies in his action: he is almost always depicted holding a patera and libating on an altar, and in this way seems paradoxically to be involved as a divinity in the ritual performed in his honour by mortals.”\footnote{Tybout 1996, pp. 371–372.} Therefore, he was depicted wearing the toga of a priest, holding the tools of a priest, and acting as a priest. Furthermore, Tybout states that this
argument can be supported in Greek and Roman art which showed the divinities in the guise of their priests or priestesses making offerings at their own altars; it is a way to visually indicate sacredness, like the nimbus of a Christian saint.\textsuperscript{167} He concludes with the argument that if all painted Genii are the Genius Augusti and the Genius of the \textit{paterfamilias} was depicted only as a statuette in his shrine then this would suggest that he had a higher status than the emperor.\textsuperscript{168}

The painted \textit{lararia} were the least costly form of shrine and were found in servant areas as well as in reception rooms, but that of the \textit{dominus} was more expensively decorated and placed more prominently in the house, which would suggest a more honored place. It is hard to believe that the emperor was less revered than the \textit{paterfamilias}. And, if one does agree with the identification of the Genius Augusti in the Dio passage and that this Genius was expected to be honored with libations before each banquet, there would be no purpose in placing his shrine in servant areas where banquets did not occur.\textsuperscript{169}

It is my opinion that the Genius found in domestic shrines was that of the \textit{paterfamilias} for several reasons. The first is that the earliest depictions of the Genius in Pompeian households predate the reforms of Augustus\textsuperscript{170} which regarded the compital shrines to the Lares Augusti and Genius Augusti but not the domestic shrines. Secondly, although it is possible that over time the association shifted from the \textit{paterfamilias} to the emperor, I agree with Tybout that the depictions of the Genius are emblematic and not meant to be portraiture, so that when they occur with similarities between one house and

\textsuperscript{167} Tybout 1996, p. 372.
\textsuperscript{168} Tybout 1996, pp. 373–374.
\textsuperscript{169} Tybout 1996, p. 374.
\textsuperscript{170} The earliest depiction of the Lares and Genius at Pompeii is dated to c. 20 BCE by Fröhlich (Fröhlich 1991, p. 119). Those found in Delos date to the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} and early 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BCE.
the next, this does not automatically indicate that they were the emperor. And thirdly, if it were for the emperor, who was supposed to be honored with a libation during banquets, there would not be a reason for a shrine to the Genius to be in a servant area as well as the rooms of the free-born family, especially since the cult of Genius Augusti would be related more to the socio-political welfare of the free family rather than the sustenance of the household. Tybout also introduces the possibility that both Genii could have been honored in the *lararium* that of the *paterfamilias* with a painted shrine or statuette and that of the emperor with a statuette.171

Related to the cult of the Genius of the *paterfamilias* was the female equivalent guardian force called Juno. Like the Genius it protected the wife of the *paterfamilias* and her fertility. “Juno, a feminine form of *iuvenis* (*iunix*) also reflected a ‘youth’ concept in the representation of procreative force.”172 Little was written about the Juno of the matron in literature.173 There are also a few inscriptions referring to the protective deity of the matron.174 Orr considers this cult to be a later development after the development of Juno as the goddess of birth and women,175 but very little is known about this *numen* who is not represented in remaining wall paintings or statuettes of *lararia*. Therefore, she is mentioned here only because she may have been a part of Roman domestic cult. It may be that she developed from the Genius cult as a need for such a *numen* arose.

Also housed within the *lararia* are the Penates, or *Di Penates*. The Penates were a group of undefined deities which were handed down from one generation to the next.  

---

173 Petronius 25; Tibullus 3.12.
174 *CIL XI* 1820 from Beneventum, refers to the Juno of the mother and father; *CIL VIII* 22770 from Tripolitania, refers to the Genius of a woman; *AE* 1994, 1228 from Mediolanum (Milan), simply says IUNO ET GENIUS (early 3rd century CE).
175 Orr 1978, p. 1570.
and were added at the discretion of the worshippers. This cult forms a more personalized component of Roman domestic religion, although every household, at least in Pompeii, appears to have venerated some collection of Penates. These included deities well-known to modern scholars like Jupiter, Minerva, and Mercury as well as more local deities like Tellus and Pilumnus. Foreign deities, such as Isis, Serapis, and Asklepius, were also found in these collections. No group of Penates was the same from house to house in Pompeii or in other shrines found in Italy.

Known assemblages contain both iconic and aniconic images of various materials ranging from cheap to precious, rendered in varying degrees of quality and artistry and included statuettes, busts, household utensils and objects. They are found painted in wall-painted *lararia* as well as in plastic form, and in the former they were sometimes represented by symbols such as ears of wheat for Ceres or garlands of laurel leaves for Apollo. Also, duplicates of the same deity have been found in these collections, indicating that newer versions could be added but none removed.

At Pompeii, there are many examples of these diverse collections such as the assemblage found in Casa delle Pareti Rosse (VIII, v/vi, 37) of six bronze statuettes of Asklepius, Apollo, Mercury, Hercules and two Lares found in an *aedicula* with a wall painting of the Lares and a Genius (Figures 56 and 57). Another house at Pompeii (courtyard next door to IX, vii, 20) had an *aedicula* containing terracotta statuettes of Asklepius, Bacchus, Minerva, an unidentified female, and a bird, possibly a dove. In Rome, a late 3rd to early 4th centuries CE house on the Oppian hill was found with an

---

178 Boyce 1937, p. 77 Cat. No. 371.
179 Boyce 1937, p. 89 Cat. No. 446.
apsidal niche containing a marble statue of Isis-Fortuna with a marble statuette and bust of Serapis, a bust of Harpocrates, a stele of Horus on his crocodiles, statuettes of Zeus, Apollo, Aphrodite, Hecate and Hercules, two herms of Hercules, and a Bacchant.\textsuperscript{180} Also in Rome, the public version of this cult was a collection of sacred objects and the Palladium housed in the \textit{penus Vestae}. Thus, the Penates were a collection of deities represented by tokens and images sacred to the deities and significant to the individual who worshipped at that \textit{lararium}.

There are, however, very few of these assemblages known in the Roman world; only roughly one hundred total according to Bodel in 2008.\textsuperscript{181} Therefore, given the vastness of the Roman Empire both physically and temporally this is only a tiny sampling of such collections of domestic cult. Still, we should not totally disregard this evidence. Forty-one of these were found in Campania, mostly preserved by the eruption of Vesuvius which makes them all contemporary in this region. Thirteen more are found throughout the rest of Italy of varying dates. All of these assemblages, however, exhibit this variety of objects and deities; therefore, one may conclude that the Penates were a collection of deities chosen by those honoring them in their homes. Most scholars agree that the \textit{paterfamilias} as head of the household was probably responsible for the selection of these deities.\textsuperscript{182} There are some regional and local trends that can be distinguished, such as the popularity of the Egyptian deities in Campania, but personal choice seems to have had a role in these selections.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{180} Bodel 2008, p. 261.
\textsuperscript{181} Bodel 2008, p. 273 n. 36.
\textsuperscript{183} Bodel 2008, p. 262. Bodel also suggests that the cult of the Lares, which does appear universally in Roman domestic shrines, may have been more of a way of acknowledging the sanctity of the home but did not necessarily reflect a belief in the Lares themselves.
The Penates were responsible for the protection and welfare of the family, its pantry, and its status in the community. Based on the types of deities found in these collections, these deities were related to the welfare of the inhabitants of the household and to the political, economic and social welfare of the free-born family. While gods like Asklepius and Serapis would relate to the health of the inhabitants, Jupiter and Minerva were gods of the Roman state and Mercury was the patron of merchants. In addition, foreign deities might relate to business affairs or the ethnic background of the family. Thus, these deities were more important for the domestic religion of the free-born family and the *paterfamilias* as provider for the household than they were for the slaves. Further evidence for this social distinction in relation to the cult of the Penates is also found in the location of images of the Penates in households at Pompeii. In larger houses with two or more *lararia*, the Penates typically only appear in those *lararia* found in the reception rooms of the house, where the free-born members would entertain guests. Penates were only rarely found in servant areas. When they were, they were deities such as Fortuna and Vesta, which were connected with domestic life and welfare.

The Penates are occasionally depicted on wall paintings, but more often they are found as statuettes or mentioned in inscriptions, graffiti and literature. They were not identified on Delos, like the Lares and Genius; however, symbols of deities and games

---


185 In Casa dei Dioscuri (VI, ix, 6/7) there was found a *lararium* painting depicting Fortuna in the kitchen; another *lararium* painting of Fortuna was found in House VII, x, 3 and 14; and, in Casa di Sirico (VII, i, 25 and 47) on the wall of the kitchen was a *lararium* painting of the Lares with Vesta and Vulcan. All three of these examples also have *lararia* in the room of reception of the house; therefore, the shrines in the kitchen were not necessarily the main shrine used by the entire household.

186 E.g. *CIL* VI, 560 SACRUM DIIS PENATIBUS from unknown location in Rome; *CIL* VI, 561 DIIS PENATIBUS HERMES. DISP D.D found on the Aventine; *CIL* IV, 1410 an inscription from the Casa di Ercole to Venus with a serpent next to it, possibly a Genius Loci; Catullus IX.3 (Veranius comes home to his Penates); Horace, *Satires* II.iii.176 (Oath sworn by the Penates); Horace, *Epistles* I.vii.94 (Oath sworn by Genius and Penates); Ovid, *Metamorphoses* XV.865 (Poet invokes Vesta and Apollo as among Caesar’s Penates).
were found painted on these shrines. These may be related to the Penates, but the Penates were not worshipped at compital shrines in Italy and these symbols may represent something else. The Penates in household shrines were honored on holidays or when their help was needed, with various offerings similar to those offered to the Lares and Genius.  

Included among the Penates was the goddess Vesta who, along with the Lares, protected the hearth. According to Ovid, Vesta was the living flame of the hearth and the goddess appears painted on several Pompeian lararia found near hearths. Orr states that the image of Vesta had the power to avert crisis and danger in the house; however, he does not provide evidence for this statement. Likely, Orr inferred this role for the household deity from her role in the public cult which averted crisis and danger to the state. Little is known about Vesta in the domestic context other than her association with the hearth, its fire, and the Penates. However, considering her relationship to the hearth, it is possible that Vesta was honored in most households like the Lares and the Genius. Foss suggests she was associated with the women of the household as well, and Orr proposes an additional agricultural connection, citing a passage from Ovid’s Fasti (6.267) in which the poet stated that Vesta was equal to earth or land and one from Cato’s De Agri Cultura (132) in which Vesta could be honored in

---

187 According to Horace this might have include flour and salt (Carmina 3.23.19).
189 Boyce notes ten painted images of Vesta (Cat. Nos. 77, 185, 236, 240, 247, 313, 316, 318, 419, 420); six are found in kitchens or near hearths, five are found in pistrini (three of these are associated with the hearth), and five are found in houses (three of these in the kitchen, the other two are a room of unknown function and a latrine).
190 Orr 1978, p. 1561.
192 Orr 1978, p. 1560. Ovid uses the word terra here, not Tellus, therefore, he did not say Vesta was the goddess Earth but just earth.
the celebration of Jupiter Dapalis. Most knowledge of the worship of Vesta is related to her public sanctuary in the Roman Forum.

She was, of course, strongly connected to the hearth which was honored with offerings by the household and is, therefore, included in this study. The hearth was the center of the welfare of the household, where the food was prepared and family ritual celebrated. In literature, a cold hearth was used to represent an abandoned house or death in the household. Many literary references describe the hearth being honored in conjunction with other household deities. In these references, women played a prominent role and it is possible that the women of the household were the ones responsible for tending to the hearth and its worship. Offerings made to the hearth included incense, spelt, cakes, and wine. Aside from the few images of Vesta, archaeological evidence for this domestic cult would also be the hearth itself which was located in either the atrium or in a separate kitchen, much like the Greek cult to Hestia.

In almost every lararium in Pompeii, including those with no other painted features, there were also found painted representations of the Genii Loci, which may have served as apotropaia to protect the shrine. At Ostia, a few molded terracotta plaques of the Genii Loci have also been found. Depicted as one or two serpents, the Genius Loci was the force of the place, as the name suggests. It protected the area on which it was painted from defilement, whether it was a domestic shrine or something more mundane such as an exterior wall. This is recorded in the inscriptions which have been found with some of these images of serpents, specifically those on walls protecting against urinating

---

193 Ovid *Tristia* 1.3.40–45.
194 Cato told the foreman’s wife, or housekeeper, to hang garlands over the hearth and to honor the Lares (*De Agri Cultura* 143). Juvenal mentions decorating hearth and shrines with garlands and offering incense to the Lares (12.83–90). And, Ovid in the *Tristia* described the hearth on the lady’s birthday as veiled in garlands, and incense and wine were offered to the fire and the lady’s Juno (5.5.10–12).
and graffiti. As I will discuss below, Roman household shrines were not considered sacred spaces like temples and public sanctuaries. Therefore, it was not sacrilege to steal or defile someone’s domestic shrine. In order to protect the shrine, then, these Genii Loci were needed to ward off evil and ill-intentioned visitors.

There are few literary references to the Genius Loci, such as in Vergil’s *Aeneid* (5.84-96) when Aeneas sacrificed at his father’s tomb and a serpent appeared who consumed some of the offerings. Vergil wrote that Aeneas was unsure if the snake was the Genius Loci or the attendant of Anchises’ spirit (5.94-96). The mention of Genius Loci was made as though the audience would have understood the reference and so the connection between the Genius Loci and the serpent appears to be valid. This is the only literary evidence for this connection, but there is one inscription from Herculaneum identifying the serpents on a domestic shrine as Genius Loci, although it is without provenience. However, given the use of these serpents in other contexts to protect against violation, it is probable that they are depicted on domestic shrines for this purpose, especially considering the fact that almost every known shrine in Pompeii, as well as a few in Ostia, has them.

When depicted on shrines, there does not seem to have been an identifiable pattern to whether there was one serpent or two. George Boyce proposes that it was dependent on the personal taste of the commissioner or maker and the available space. This suggests that the use of Genii Loci on shrines may not have been one of the required elements of Roman household religion, but rather a common personal choice for the protection of a secular shrine; this supports their use as apotropaia. Also, these serpents

---

195 *CIL* IV, 813; *CIL* IV, 3832 (from a latrine in a house); *CIL* IV, 6641.
196 *CIL* IV, 1176.
197 Boyce 1942, pp. 21–22.
were often depicted coiled around an altar or uncoiling in an aggressive manner towards an altar, which is either painted in the scene with the serpents or the actual altar of the lararium. This is also an indication of their role as apotropaia.\textsuperscript{198} Also shown were offerings of two eggs and a pinecone on these altars. While not a domestic cult, the fact that serpents are typically present in domestic shrines makes them important evidence for identifying shrines which may have no other surviving decoration or elements of cult.

Wissowa argued that these two serpents were the Genii of the \textit{paterfamilias} and \textit{materfamilias} rather than Genii Loci; and, when only one occurred the owner was unmarried.\textsuperscript{199} This has been supported by the observation that when two serpents are depicted, one often has a beard and a crest and is identified as male, while the other is beardless, crestless, and female. However, Boyce stated that there is no explicit mention of the Genius in association with serpents in literature except for the Genius Loci in the Aeneid (5.84-96),\textsuperscript{200} and compared the occurrence of these two serpents with known owners of houses in Pompeii, discovering that only one male serpent was found on the single lararium of the House of the Vettii, owned by two men according to epigraphic evidence.\textsuperscript{201} In addition, shop IX, viii, 4, which epigraphic evidence reveals to have been owned by a married man, had only one shrine with one serpent.\textsuperscript{202}

Of course, the problem with this evidence is that ownership could have changed hands since the electoral inscriptions on the outside of the buildings, which were used to identify the inhabitants, were written. Moreover, there is evidence in other houses at

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{198} Tybout 1996, p. 361.
  \item \textsuperscript{199} Wissowa 1912, p. 176.
  \item \textsuperscript{200} Boyce 1942, p. 16-18.
  \item \textsuperscript{201} Boyce 1942, p. 18.
  \item \textsuperscript{202} Boyce 1942, p. 18.
\end{itemize}
Pompeii that when a new owner took over the house a new lararium was painted.\textsuperscript{203} However, there are many houses at Pompeii with more than one shrine depicting one and two serpents on each shrine without any discernible pattern as to when or where they are one or two. If the serpents were meant to each represent a head of household then they should not be so numerous.\textsuperscript{204} And this same lack of a pattern appears on compital shrines where serpents were also depicted, presumably for the same purpose.\textsuperscript{205} Orr also associates them with the Genius of the paterfamilias and with the Genius Loci and cites among his evidence a bronze statue of a togate Genius with a serpent coiled around his arm and its head arching behind that of the Genius, which was found near the entrance of a house in Pompeii.\textsuperscript{206} “It is shown as the guardian of the place, as the animate arm of the procreative Genius force, and as a simple apotropaic device. It also means good fortune and serves as an indicator that a place or object is sacred and not to be treated with disrespect.”\textsuperscript{207} However, I do not think that the serpent in a lararium has to be the extension of the Genius of the paterfamilias, considering that it is found without the Genius in other places appearing in the same manner with the same action, such as in latrines.

All of these domestic cults, for the most part, were concerned with the protection, welfare, and prosperity of the household. As in Greek households, there were also several rituals carried out within the household marking the different transitions in life. All of these rituals, at least in part, involved the lararia and the hearth of the household. The first known use of the term lararium is found in Scriptores Historiae Augustae,

\textsuperscript{203} Tybout 1996, p. 367.  
\textsuperscript{204} Boyce 1942, pp. 17–18.  
\textsuperscript{205} Boyce 1942, p. 18.  
\textsuperscript{206} Spano 1910, pp. 379–381.  
\textsuperscript{207} Orr 1978, p. 1575.
Marcus Antoninus (3.5), compiled sometime in the 4th century CE. The lararium was where Marcus Aurelius placed golden statues of his teachers and honored them with offerings and prayers. It is unknown whether the term was used prior to the 3rd century CE; however, if the term is derived from the Lares who would have been honored in household shrines as well, it seems plausible that it was used earlier as evidence for the worship of the Lares dates back to at least the 2nd century BCE. Modern scholars use the term lararium to mean a Roman household shrine and for this study I will do the same.

Lararia from Campania and Ostia were made following certain forms and placed in accessible and visible locations, typically the central courtyard or atrium of the house. When more than one lararium has been found, the additional shrines were located in kitchens or secondary courtyards which, although not typically accessible to visitors, were communal spaces for the servants. The forms of lararia satisfied two key requirements. The first was representations or images of the deities that were worshiped. These could be three-dimensional representations (figurines or statuettes) or painted, either on a wall or in the shrine structure. The second element was a provision for sacrifice, which could have been a large permanent altar before the shrine, a small portable one in the shrine or a tile set into the wall. These two elements dictated the form of the shrine, but at the same time allowed for personal choice in the details and appearance.

Boyce identified four main types of shrines in Pompeii, to which Orr later added a fifth type. These five categories of shrines, which were found in Campania
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208 Boyce 1937, p. 10.
209 Boyce 1937, p. 10.
210 Boyce 1937, p. 10.
211 Boyce 1937, p. 10.
and Ostia, are niches, *aediculae*, pseudo-*aediculae*, *sacella*, and wall painted shrines. Niche shrines are identified by Boyce as “merely a square or rectangular recess set in the wall of the room and coated with the same plaster as that which covers the wall.”\(^\text{213}\) However, more often they are arched and have an elaborate form with, for example, a vaulted or peaked ceiling or an apsidal back wall; how elaborate seems to have depended on the space available and the personal taste of the maker or commissioner (Figure 71). Furthermore, not all niches found in houses were shrines, and since most niches at Pompeii and Ostia lacked contents when they were found, niches which were used as shrines must be identified by their decoration. Decorations included tile or stone slabs to cover the floor of the niche, a low step or apse at the back of the niche, an aedicular façade either painted, stuccoed, or attached\(^\text{214}\) to the outside of the niche or the wall around it, and painted or relief images of deities, decorative motifs, or scenes on the walls and ceiling of the niche. Sometimes, also, holes were found in the floor of the niches for statuettes to be fixed in place. Furthermore, niche shrines would need to have been placed at an accessible height in order for worshipers to use them; in some cases they may also have rested on floors.\(^\text{215}\)

*Aediculae* are essentially three-dimensional versions of the niches set on a podium and are often placed against a wall (Figures 48, 56, and 63). They typically resemble temples in miniature with gabled roof, pediment, architrave, and columns along the front and sometimes the sides.\(^\text{216}\) There are some examples which are a simple cube-like

\(^\text{212}\) Orr 1978, p. 1576; Bakker 1994, pp. 8–9.
\(^\text{213}\) Boyce 1937, p. 10. Boyce is the main source for my descriptions of shrines and their decorations.
\(^\text{214}\) Not only are there examples of marble or stuccoed façade elements, but nails were found around some niches which indicate that wood was used as well (Boyce 1937, p. 11).
\(^\text{215}\) For floor niches as shrines, see Bakker 1994, p. 16.
\(^\text{216}\) Boyce suggests that the origin of this form of niche comes from 5th century BCE Greece (Boyce 1937, pp. 12–13), while Orr finds comparanda in Etruscan culture (Orr 1978, p. 1576).
structure placed on a podium, but even these have a pediment and sometimes a vaulted ceiling.\textsuperscript{217} They are found with similar interior embellishments as the niches. On the exterior, they usually have stone columns of the Doric order, although there are some with Corinthian columns instead, set on bases and covered in stucco. The podia are usually decorated to coordinate with the exterior of the shrine, which either matches the wall decoration of the room or stands out from the walls as a centerpiece. The podia are often roughly 1m in height and have a moulded stucco cornice. They also sometimes have depictions or symbols of the deities worshiped in the shrine painted on them.

Pseudo-\textit{aediculae} were initially considered a variation by Boyce, but were later made a separate category by Orr.\textsuperscript{218} These resemble \textit{aediculae} in form and decoration but are not free-standing. Instead they were built into the corner of a room but were still placed on a podium.

The fourth category of shrines, the \textit{sacellum}, is the rarest type. These were rooms, \textit{alae}, or exedra which served as a shrine. They are distinguished by the presence of benches, niches, permanent altars and often wall paintings of religious scenes or deities (Figure 64). However, these might not always be for all the cults within the household; another possibility is that they were used for specific divinities or rituals while the other deities of the household were placed in a \textit{lararium} elsewhere. These shrine rooms are rare in Italy, but they represent cultic rituals within the house presumably for the protection and prosperity of the inhabitants, and thus, fall within the parameters of this study. They, furthermore, represent an exception to the above observation that all deities of the household were placed in one location. However, there

\textsuperscript{217} Boyce states that these do not appear until the Imperial period in Pompeii and assumes they come from the niche tradition (Boyce 1937, p. 13).
\textsuperscript{218} Orr 1978, p. 1576; Bakker 1994, pp. 8–9.
is no parallel for such shrine rooms in the evidence of Greek household religion and will be considered one of the indicators of Roman ritual practices in this study.

The term *sacellum* has been called into question by Åke Fridh, who argues that the word refers to a public building, while *sacrarium* or *fanum* are terms more appropriate for a private sanctuary.\(^{219}\) At its basic meaning, *sacellum*, he argues, is an open air building; authors such as Varro and Nepos misused the term resulting in our modern definition of the word.\(^{220}\) Whether this is true or not, it is clear from the primary sources Fridh cites that by the early empire the term *sacellum* could have been used for a shrine room found in a house. To be consistent with previous scholarship on Roman household shrines, I will use this term as a category of shrine, although I recognize that it may be misapplied in modern scholarship.

The final type of Roman domestic cult shrine is the shrine painted on the wall. These are found in combination with the other four types (Figure 57) or alone, ranging from a single panel to a large portion of the wall. At Pompeii they usually depict the Lares, the Genius of the *paterfamilias*, the Genii Loci, and occasionally the Penates as well.\(^{221}\) Sometimes they also have an *aedicula* painted around them. As for the provision for offerings, some have been found with a tile projecting out from the wall in association with the figures depicted. This tile may have held offerings or further images of the deities. Although not preserved, it is also possible that tables or portable altars were used to receive offerings or hold images in conjunction with the wall paintings.
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\(^{220}\) Fridh 1990, p. 187.
\(^{221}\) The details of these paintings will be discussed more fully when the individual deities are addressed below.
In addition to these shrines, altars and statuettes are two other types of archaeological materials associated with Roman household cult in Italy. There were two types of altars found at Pompeii. The first type is the permanent altar found in association with the shrines described above, either free standing or built against the wall. These were made of stone or masonry covered in stucco, and they were either rectangular or cylindrical in shape. Sometimes they were substituted with a pilaster attached to the wall. They were usually decorated with painting, sometimes to resemble marble and sometimes with decorative or religious motifs. In addition, there was almost always some provision made to the top of the altar for fire, such as bolsters or a depression. Another substitute for these large altars might also have been tables, but these are not preserved in this function.

The second type of altar is the smaller portable type which could be placed inside the shrine. At Pompeii, a few of these were actually found in shrines, but most were found in the houses. These were made out of marble, travertine, tufa, terracotta, and rarely bronze, and they varied greatly in size, shape, and decoration. These smaller portable altars are not as well preserved as the larger type, but the wall paintings in shrines provide further examples of the types of portable altars used with lararia. These are typically cylindrical and vary greatly in size and scale. Occasionally they are depicted on a square base. They are usually painted red, white or yellow and can sometimes be decorated to resemble marble.

---

222 According to Boyce, altars which date to pre-Roman periods were made of tufa and some dated to the 2nd century BCE were found still in use in the 1st century CE (Boyce 1937, p. 15).
223 In the Imperial period both stone and masonry were covered in stucco. Before that it was only the masonry type that was stuccoed (Boyce 1937, p. 15).
224 Boyce 1937, pp. 16–17.
In addition to altars, one other form of cultic object found in Roman houses is the lamp. Peter Stewart has argued that in Roman culture, the lamp, especially those depicting deities, may be seen as miniature, portable altars\textsuperscript{225} (Figure 57, in foreground). Stewart’s argument goes further to suggest that when a lamp has an image of a deity which resembles a statue, especially a known cult statue, it may have been used as an offering and an altar to that deity.\textsuperscript{226} While not all lamps with images of deities were probably used in this way, it is possible some did have cultic functions.\textsuperscript{227} Since it is not possible to distinguish those with cultic functions from the utilitarian, this type of evidence should be considered with caution. Even those found within or near shrines cannot be identified definitely as cultic. However, some of the evidence for Roman household cults in Roman Achaia involves lamps; therefore, they will be taken into consideration with caution.

Several statuettes have been found at Pompeii either within shrines (Figure 57) or, more commonly, in houses and are thought to have come from shrines. They were made of terracotta, plaster, marble, alabaster, tufa, bronze, silver, and ivory. Annemarie Kaufmann-Heinimann warns that not all statuettes are for \textit{lararia}, and that sometimes figurines were used as talismen and amulets; if one was not found in or near a \textit{lararia} then it might not be from one.\textsuperscript{228} They may also have been toys for children or decorations for the house. Therefore, as with figurines and amulets from Greek houses, these are also included in this study with caution.

\textsuperscript{225} Stewart 2003, pp. 195–207.
\textsuperscript{226} Stewart 2003, p. 198.
\textsuperscript{227} Stewart 2003, pp. 197–198.
\textsuperscript{228} Kaufmann-Heinimann 2007, pp. 199–200. She cites the following as examples as evidence: Plutarch \textit{Sulla} 29.6, Ammianus Marcellinus 22.13.3, and Apuleius \textit{Apologia} 63.2.
Finally, Orr notes that a *lararium* may not have been required for the domestic cults and that the presence of hundreds of portable altars found at Pompeii indicates that possibly all one needed was an altar to honor the household deities.\textsuperscript{229} In humbler homes images of the deities could be set up on the altar as well as sacrifices and offerings. Tybout also points out that since multiple *lararia* are found in some Pompeian houses, other houses with only one *lararium* may have had one or more portable altars as multiple shrines even though they are not preserved.\textsuperscript{230} Therefore, there may have been more domestic cult activity than we have evidence for.

Tybout’s point is a valid one. Many household cult objects were likely carried off by the owners, and some may have been completely destroyed in the eruption. However, given the regularity with which *lararia* are found, even in the humblest of inhabited spaces, I think that a fixed, main shrine was what was required, although it could have portable elements, such as terracotta altars or lamps. Furthermore, when two such shrines are found in a house, the house is usually very large, such as the House of the Faun at Pompeii (VI, 12, 2). I have not seen evidence of second shrines in any of the smaller structures. It is possible the additional shrine remained from the merging of two or more houses into one, as was the case with the House of Menander (I, 10, 4). It is also probable that the additional shrine was maintained to accommodate the larger household.

Thus, Roman household religion conformed to a specific type of shrine and specific deities as proof of their membership and role in their community. Therefore, heads of households and their relatives and associates would have honored Penates, while anyone who was a member of a household would have worshipped the Lares and the

\textsuperscript{229} Orr 1978, p. 1576.
\textsuperscript{230} Tybout 1996, p. 360.
Genius of the *paterfamilias*. Within these cults, however, there was freedom for the individual household to personalize the cults as they saw fit, from the specific form and decoration of the *lararium* to which Penates were honored. By the 2nd – 4th century CE at Ostia, there appears to have also been a tendency to only worship the Penates without the Lares and the Genius, although still within a single centrally located shrine. While this observation may be skewed by the availability of evidence, it is important to note that there may have been more variability of choice in household cults by the time period under consideration, the 2nd to 4th centuries CE.

II.C: Observations

Within the framework of cultural identity, there are three differences between these two household religions that seem significant for identifying with Romans and with Greeks; these are the deities honored, the use of a single central shrine versus several different sacred areas, and the intended audience for the rituals of the shrines. The religious practices of the Greek household were focused on the protection of the household and the community and were primarily the responsibility of the kin group. Unrelated visitors were not a factor in these rituals except in that they needed to be kept away from the miasma of certain transitions of life. Furthermore, the identifiable cult evidence, such as herms and altars, were positioned to protect those within the household from threats from the outside world, such as at the entrance of the house or the open courtyard. This division between household and outsider is a characteristic which will be explored further in the next chapter. They may also have been placed to protect against
internal threats as well, such as in food preparation and storage spaces. These cults were typically to different aspects of the Olympian gods and heroes.

In Romano-Italian houses, household cult shrines were generally but not exclusively centrally located not only for inhabitants’ use but also for display to outsiders, demonstrating the inhabitants’ identity. The cults honored by these shrines included the Lares and the Genius of the paterfamilias as well as any deities which were significant for the paterfamilias, such as related to his ethnicity, occupation, or social status. These deities included Italian gods, Olympians or their Roman equivalents, or other foreign divinities. These cultural elements and differences are what I have looked for in the evidence of household religion from Achaia and Delos in order to better understand changes in cultural identity under the Roman Empire. These differences demonstrate the contrasting definitions of household and arrangements of their houses which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
Chapter III: Houses and Their Cults in the Late Classical and Hellenistic Periods and the Late Republic and the Imperial Periods

Having laid out the key differences between Greek and Roman household religions, this chapter analyzes specific examples from pre-Roman Greece and from Roman Italy in order to examine these differences in more detail. Due to the limitations of preserved and published materials, I was not able to consider the earlier phases for Corinth, Patras, and Messene. Instead, I have selected four specimen houses from four sites, including Athens, which exhibit attributes that appear to be common to housing across Greece and which contain evidence for household religion. These houses were also selected because their household religious evidence represents the different forms of household shrines and cultic materials known for Classical Greece. Although there are preserved Classical remains from the Piraeus, the lack of evidence for household religion has excluded the Piraeus from this discussion. The four sites under consideration are Athens, Olynthos, Halos, and Halieis.231

As there are very few domestic remains from the city of Rome itself, Roman Italy, as the first region to be colonized by the Romans, was considered for evidence. Five houses from four different sites were selected. These demonstrate common characteristics of the type of Romano-Italian housing found in large towns and cities. These sites are Ostia, Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Cosa. Cosa was selected as a 1st century BCE example, while those from Pompeii and Herculaneum date to the 1st century CE, and that from Ostia to the late 3rd and early 4th century CE. Thus, continuities can be

identified which will be useful in looking at Roman Achaia. Furthermore, Ostia is contemporary with the remains from Roman Achaia. In addition, each house under examination contained evidence of household religion, except for that from Cosa.

Based on finds, sizes, and decoration of these houses, all of the examples considered in this chapter belonged to more well-off individuals within their communities, not necessarily members of the elite, but people able to construct large, multi-room structures, which in most cases were decorated with wall plaster and paved flooring. This makes them comparable with the houses studied from Roman Achaia, which also belonged to the more socially or economically successful members of the communities.

Additionally, to all the examples discussed in this chapter, I apply my three part approach: 1) a study of the construction, plan, accessibility, and visibility of the houses themselves, 2) identification of the evidence for household religion, who was worshipped, and how, 3) the evidence of household religion within the context of the house, who could see the sacred features, and who used them.

Finally, having considered these archaeological materials, I will discuss the observations made here in comparison with the literary and epigraphic sources and the conclusions of other scholars regarding Greek and Roman cultural identities. In doing so, I will assess the contribution of household religion to the two cultures.
III.A: Houses and Household Religion from the Greek Mainland of the Late Classical and Hellenistic Periods

There is a long history of the study of domestic space in Greece from the early 20th century to the present. In brief, the first detailed studies of houses, such as those at Delos and Olynthos, focused on describing and creating typologies of the houses, their forms, and their rooms based on Vitruvius, trying to fit the archaeology to the textual sources. There was a need to place all houses uncovered in Greece into one of four categories and to understand it in relation only to the four type sites: prostas houses at Priene, pastas houses at Olynthos, peristyle houses at Delos, and herdraumhäuser at Kassope. By the end of the 20th century, scholars began to look beyond typologies and started to analyze houses within socio-cultural and political frameworks. The most notable of these studies was done by Wolfram Hoepfner and Ernst-Ludwig Schwandner, who suggested that the organization of the house and of the city was a reflection of politics. However, they still relied heavily upon the old typologies and literary sources, and their theories have been called into question.

Since then there have been several studies which have considered the archaeological evidence on its own and what it can reveal about the activities, customs, and local and regional societies, using literary sources when they support the information gathered from the archaeology, instead of the other way around. The most notable are those of Lisa Nevett, Nicholas Cahill, Bradley Ault, and Margriet Haagsma.
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232 For a historical overview, see Nevett 1999a, pp. 21–29; Nevett 2007a.
233 E.g., Chamonard 1922 and 1924; Robinson and Graham 1938.
235 Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994.
237 E.g., Nevett 1999a; Cahill 2002; Haagsma 2003; Ault 2005.
derived my generalized description of a Greek house from the work of these scholars. To it I will add spatial and visibility analyses to facilitate my study of the cultic practices which took place within the house.238

III.A.1: The Houses

For this general description of the Greek house, I have considered many houses from pre-Roman Athens, Olynthos, Halos, and Halieis. However, one example from each site has been analyzed in detail (Figures 5 to 35). The examples selected from these sites date from around the mid-4th century BCE at Olynthos and the late 4th century BCE at Athens, to the early to mid-3rd centuries BCE at Halos and Halieis. These four houses, thus, will demonstrate some general consistencies between houses of the late Classical to Hellenistic periods from Mainland Greece. Obviously, these houses are not identical in form, and so also represent the breadth of variation which should be expected in houses from different time periods and sites with different topographies, climates, histories, economies, and social structures. In spite of these differences, however, there are several common elements which not only make such a comparison possible but also affirm that there were common Greek cultural practices and ideals.

Layout

Typically, the rooms of the houses from three of these sites were arranged around an open air courtyard, often with a covered porch along one or more sides; this could also include a full peristyle. There was usually only one entrance which led into the

courtyard, often through a vestibule room or corridor. At Halos, this entrance corridor was much larger and was the central point for the house’s arrangement; the courtyard was instead located at the backs of the houses (Figure 20). Another variation in house plan included a second entrance. This was either for a room or suite not directly connected with the house, possibly used as a shop (Figure 28, Rooms 11 to 13), or it was from a private alley, as in the example from Olynthos (Figure 11). In this house, the alley door, before it was walled up, entered at the back of an exedra of the courtyard; anyone wishing to use this doorway had to enter the courtyard first, the most accessible and visible space in the house. The courtyard would have been an acceptable space for visitors as the architecture directed visitors to the courtyard from the entrances of most of the houses from these four sites.

The rooms intended for invited visitors, often called an andron by excavators, were typically located nearer the front of the house and immediately off the courtyard or central corridor (Figures 11 and 20). These are usually identified by their decoration, off-centered door, and evidence for accommodating dining couches. Not every house has evidence for these rooms, but they do appear in houses at all four sites. Those rooms for the inhabitants, which occupied most of the rest of the house, were more often separated from the visitors’ space by the courtyard or corridor, or else a lack of direct connection between the visitors’ space and a neighboring inhabitant space. Sometimes these spaces for inhabitants could also have been more than one space away from the courtyard, by way of the porch (Figure 11), or on an upper floor.
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239 See Nevett 1995b for a detailed discussion of the Greek single entrance courtyard house.
241 Nevett 1999a, pp. 70–71; Cahill 2002, p. 80.
242 Cahill 2002, p. 82; Ault 2005, p. 73.
**Access and Visibility Analysis**

Looking at the justified access maps of these houses, all appear rather symmetrical and shallow with most rooms no more than two spaces deep from the carrier space (Figure 35). Most of the rooms are readily accessible from the central courtyard or corridor. However, they are arranged in a non-distributive plan, with the courtyard/corridor as a central circulation space regulating access to all points of the structure. This indicates that those moving from one space had to pass through the central courtyard or corridor to access another space of the house. Their mobility could be monitored and controlled from this single space.

This is confirmed by the calculations of the MD, CV, and RAs of these rooms; the courtyard had the highest control value and the lowest depth and level of asymmetry (Figures 7, 14, 23, and 31). The consistency of this observation suggests that among the inhabitants of all these houses, control within the house was as important as access to all the rooms. As for access from outside the building, the carrier points for the examples are symmetrical with the rest of the structure; access for those from outside was regulated through the courtyard or corridor in the same way that it was for the spaces within the house.

Visibility analysis provides further evidence for the courtyard or corridor as the control point for the house. The main or single entrance of each house was usually placed in such a way that those at the door could not see directly into any of the spaces of the house well, except for the courtyard and possibly the reception space (Figures 9, 15, 24, and 32). The exception to this appears to be the house from Halieis where there was visual access from the front door to the back of the house. Room 23 at the back of the
house was a corridor connecting the rooms at the back of the house with the courtyard and staircase; it was a transition space dividing access between other rooms and was not necessarily used for household activities. Furthermore, it is only partially visible since the staircase blocks the rest of the space from view. For all of these houses, though, if the front door was open, any activities in the house were still obscured from the view of passersby, except for those in the courtyard. However, since this was the controlling space within the house, it would seem logical by extension that what outsiders might have seen going on in the courtyard was also controlled.243

Most rooms were placed to the sides of the visual axis, out of view. Also, as Nevett points out, there was no direct visual or physical access from the reception space into any of the other rooms of the house, except for the courtyard or the antechamber to the reception space.244 While Nevett is describing Olynthian houses, the same can be observed in the other three examples as well (Figures 10, 16, 25, and 33). The exceptions to this are the examples from Athens and Halos, where visitors in the three reception rooms were able to see a little into the opposing rooms; however, they were unable to see everything of these rooms, including the possible evidence for household religion.

Visitors would have to pass through the courtyard where domestic activities took place, but the owner could have controlled who came into the house and what they saw in the courtyard.245 The rest of the house appears to have been closed to them. Meanwhile, the inhabitants, although sheltered from the visitor’s gaze, had visual and physical access to the entire house, and, Nevett suggests, may have been able to observe visitors without
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243 Nevett 1999a, p. 72.
244 Nevett 1999a, p. 72.
245 Nevett 1999a, p. 72.
being observed themselves.\textsuperscript{246} However, they still needed to pass through the central circulation space to access the spaces of the visitors, and, thus, interactions between the two groups could have been controlled.

In summary, Greek houses tended to be shallow and symmetrical with low visibility and controlled accessibility from outside as well as inside. There was also an emphasis on the control of movement through the house, via the courtyard or corridor, and of the interactions between those already in the house and those coming from outside the house. This emphasis on control is furthermore supported by literary sources and the Greek cultural identity which can be interpreted through them. These sources will be explored further below, and they suggest that this control was to keep women of the family separated from unrelated, male visitors to protect the \textit{genos}.\textsuperscript{247} This, however, cannot be proven or disproven by the archaeological remains.\textsuperscript{248}

**Construction Materials and Features**

In addition to spatial and visibility analyses, it is also important to consider the construction, decoration, and amenities found in these houses. These will also be compared with the houses from Roman Achaia to observe changes in the Roman period. In general, the houses of late Classical and early Hellenistic Greece were built of mud brick over a stone socle, but each site varied in the type of stone available and whether they used finished blocks, rough-hewn blocks, field stone, or a mixture.\textsuperscript{249} None of these houses has been preserved much above the stone socle, but fragments of plaster, some of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{246} Nevett 1999\textit{a}, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{247} Nevett 1999\textit{a}, p. 79 and pp. 154–156.
\textsuperscript{249} Athenian houses on hillsides incorporated polygonal retaining walls or rock cut walls as well.
\end{flushright}
which was painted or molded, were found in some of the houses from these sites, except Halos. Floors ranged from packed earth or clay, to cement or plaster, to paving or cobble stones in courtyards, to pebble, marble chip, or tessellated mosaic. These mosaics were rendered in monochrome or polychrome with a linear or figural design. Water was provided by wells, pithoi, and cisterns depending on the environment of the site; at Halos, there were public cisterns instead of private ones. Bathtubs have occasionally been found in some houses, as well as small rooms with drains and cobbled floors identified as bathrooms, but other features requiring running water, like fountains, are not.

III.A.2: The Evidence of Household Cult

Based on the criteria laid out in Chapter II, these selected houses contained at least one object related to household cult activities. From Olynthos a permanent altar was found built in the courtyard of the sample house (Figure 17). Two more portable altars of stuccoed marble were also found in the covered space to the north of the courtyard (Figures 18 and 19), and a head of a female terracotta figurine together with a protome and twelve miniature cups and plates were located in Room a. While terracotta figurines were not always used for cultic purposes, the twelve miniature vessels with which the head was found may indicate a ritual assemblage. It is also possible, given that the other finds in this space indicate a utilitarian space, that the figurine was not decorative.

250 Haagsma 2003, p. 46–47.
252 Cahill 2002, pp. 91–93.
A stone vessel was found set in the floor near the east corner of the hearth in the house from Halos\textsuperscript{253} (Figures 26 and 27). It contained reddish soil, a bone fragment, a shell, a sherd, and two serpent-shaped pieces of metal of iron and silver. This has been interpreted as an offering to Zeus Ktesios. In addition to the vessel, this room contained a hearth. Hearths had cultic functions in Greek household religion because of their connection with Hestia and ritual purifications.\textsuperscript{254}

Two inscribed blocks invoking a familial Zeus, the Dioskouroi, and an ancestral hero (Figure 34) were found in Room 24 of House E at Halieis.\textsuperscript{255} It is unclear whether they belong to an altar base or mark a sacred space.

In addition, under the floor surface of Room 6 of the Athenian house was found a votive deposit, Deposit Q 20:4.\textsuperscript{256} This deposit contained twelve ceramic vessels, a coin of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, and burnt bones, probably from a fowl or small mammal. These vessels included a skyphos, a lopadion with lid, a bowl with a lid, and a plate, all of which are related to dining.

The types of evidence for household cult found here reflect the variations discussed in the previous chapter. They include stone altars, terracotta figurines, a jar with metal snake figurines and evidence of a food offering, a hearth, and the Athenian votive foundation deposit. Herms and hekataia, plaques, and niches have not been identified in this sample, but they are known from other houses at these sites with less

\textsuperscript{253} Haagsma 2003, pp. 58–59.
\textsuperscript{254} Boedeker 2008, p. 234.
\textsuperscript{255} Ault 2005, p. 51 and pp. 76–77.
\textsuperscript{256} Shear 1973a, p. 151, n. 68. Also see Weikart 2002, pp. 91–92.
complete plans, such as the herm found in front of House G in Athens and the votive plaque from House 13, Room d at Olynthos.  

III.A.3: Household Religion: Cult Evidence in Context

Altars, hearths, and figurines, however, can only indicate household religion if they are understood in their domestic contexts. This project also seeks to understand who had access to the shrines and who may have observed these rituals, since these two aspects reveal how the feature was used. Only when combined with an understanding of the contexts, accessibility, and visibility of the material remains can the nature of household religion be interpreted. Household religion works well for this because the objects related to worship were likely kept where they were used, in the shrines or protecting certain spaces.

Furthermore, one would not likely leave household gods and instruments for their worship behind when giving up a house; therefore, when evidence is found, it is likely because it could not be moved, as at Halos, or the inhabitants fled too quickly to retrieve the objects, as at Olynthos. Thus, when they are present in a house, there is a greater chance they were found near where they were used. These four examples have been selected because the nature of the evidence clearly suggested the features were used where they were found. Specifically, the large altar in the courtyard from Olynthos was built into the floor of the courtyard and, therefore, immovable. The inscribed blocks from Halieis were large and not easy to move. Both the jar from Halos and the foundation deposit from Athens were placed in the ground, into clean soil; there is no evidence that they were dug up and re-deposited after their initial placement.

257 Young 1951, p. 271, no. 2, pl. 84 b; Robinson 1933, p. 94, no. 373.
Portable objects like small altars and figurines, however, could have been relocated from the places where they were used, either for storage in antiquity or through the processes by which they were buried and recovered, such as those from the house at Olynthos. It is also possible that individuals visited the structures after they had been abandoned and moved items. I have avoided this problem by placing more value on the information gathered from fixed, permanent evidence of household religion. Portable objects will also be considered, but only as potential evidence, not secure evidence. For the purposes of my analysis, on the visibility diagrams for each of the houses in question, the location of household cult evidence will be marked with a gray star.

From Olynthos, the permanent altar in the courtyard was visible from the entrance of the house, assuming the door was open (Figure 15). However, it was placed so that the celebrant’s back would be to the entrance, unless he sacrificed from the sides of the altar. This position, while it was visible and accessible, suggests that the outsider participation was not intended. Furthermore, from the reception space, Room d, the altar was not visible at all (Figure 16). The courtyard was also the most accessible space from within the house; therefore, the inhabitants would have had easy access to the altar.

In addition to this fixed structure, there were multiple objects found which may have had a sacred use found throughout the house. Because of their portable nature, it is not possible to know for certain. Included in these objects were two portable altars found at the west end of the covered space to the north of the courtyard, which was not highly visible from the front door and not at all from the reception space (Figures 15 and 16). They were found with vessels related to dining, likely indicating a storage area; therefore, in this case, these altars may not have been found where they were used but where they
were stored. However, the fact that they may have been placed into storage when not in use does reflect a flexibility of location. They were found on the floor of the room under a destruction layer, therefore, they were not moved after the house was abandoned and destroyed in the invasion of the city.\textsuperscript{258}

There were also a terracotta female protome and a terracotta female head found with a collection of miniature cups and plates in the northwest corner room, Room 8. This space was completely invisible from the main entrance, the courtyard, and the reception space (Figures 15 and 16), and it was not easily accessible from any of these spaces, being three spaces removed from the entrance, five spaces from the reception space, and two from the courtyard (Figure 13). The other finds in this room are more dining related vessels, storage jars, and loomweights. This space, too, may have been a storage area where these possibly sacred objects were kept until they were needed and transferred where they were required. Alternatively, these altars and figurines may have been placed in these storage areas to guard the stores. Either of these explanations, furthermore, demonstrates the flexibility and organic nature of Greek household religion.

Another fixed piece of evidence for household religion is the jar, possibly to Zeus Ktesios, found next to the hearth in the House of the Snakes at Halos. They were located in Room 8, immediately off the entrance corridor, thus accessible from within the house (Figure 22) but not visible from outside the house or from the reception spaces (Figures 24 and 25). With the vessel set in the floor next to the stone hearth, it was not likely to be visible even from the corridor’s doorway to the room, while the hearth could probably have been seen from the doorway. However, the rim and lid of the vessel were at the level of the floor of the room, suggesting that it was accessible and could be repeatedly

\textsuperscript{258} Cahill 2002, p. 85.
used by those in the space.\textsuperscript{259} Therefore, it appears that the activities which may have involved this ‘pot-shrine’ were not meant to relate to anyone outside of Room 8. It is also possible that this vessel had other uses such as storage, a fixed brazier, or a waste receptacle. However, it seems too close to the heat of the hearth for storing food stuffs, and its interior did not contain evidence of coals or burning. Furthermore, braziers typically were used to transfer heat to other areas of a house. It does not seem practical to have a fixed brazier immediately next to a hearth. As for a waste receptacle, it seems odd that the two snakes made of silver and iron would be placed on top of trash. In addition, this was a closed room; a waste receptacle in this space, next to the heat of the hearth, would begin to smell badly quickly.

The hearth, while visible from outside Room 8, was placed just at the edge of visibility, not at the center (Figure 25); its visibility may be incidental. Accessible from Room 8 were Rooms 5 and 6 in which were found the remains of five pithoi for storage. This suite of three rooms (8, 5, and 6), is clearly a food preparation and storage space and not a reception space for visitors. Thus, the location of the household cult evidence indicates its intended participants and viewers were the inhabitants, and not visitors or outsiders.

From Halieis there are the remains of another altar or marker of a shrine which was specifically dedicated to Zeus, the Dioskouri, and an ancestral hero. The inscribed blocks of stone were found in Room 24, which is located behind a staircase and two spaces removed from the courtyard (Figure 30). The blocks were found with three drinking vessels, two miniature kotylai and an inverted bolsal, which suggest that a ritual

\textsuperscript{259} Haagsma 2005, p. 58–60.
had taken place in association with the blocks. Other finds from the room include stone tools, metal objects, and other vessels related to dining but not to cooking. Ault has interpreted the room as a “day room,” however, the array of finds, which include tools as well as the fine ware, suggests to me a storage area. Moreover, it is not a readily accessible space, nor is it visible from the courtyard (Figures 32 and 33). Based on this location, the intended viewers and participants were probably the inhabitants. If it was not a storage space, the cups would further support the idea that household cult rituals took place in Room 24 in association with these inscribed blocks.

The final example of evidence for household religion is the Athenian votive foundation deposit. Its placement under the floor of Room 6, suggests that this was a one-time ceremony. It, therefore, cannot be evaluated in terms of accessibility and visibility with regards to on going practices in the house. Its presence is important, however, as the tradition continues into the Roman period.

III.A.4: Observations

The examples from mainland Greece demonstrate through both the less visible but accessible locations, as at Halos, and through the evidence for the mobility of the ritual objects, as at Olynthos, that non-inhabitants were not factored into the location and function of household shrines because they were not expected to be present in the house. In Greek houses it seems outsiders were not supposed to interact with the shrines and, therefore, it was less important for them to observe the shrines and their associated
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260 Åström 1987, pp. 7–16.
262 Ault 2005, p. 54.
263 Ault 2005, p. 54.
activities. This does not mean that the shrines were always hidden from their view, but that visitors do not appear to have been a factor in the location and function of the cultic objects. Furthermore, the activities involving the shrines, as well as the shrines themselves, appear to have not been used by the outside community to identify the inhabitants as Greek, but by the inhabitants themselves. Thus, there is an important relationship between the access and visibility of the structure and the function of the shrines. As for who was worshipped at these shrines, the only specifically identified deities are Zeus, the Dioskouroi, and a local hero from Halieis. The evidence from Halos also suggests Zeus, but this identification is based on comparison with literary sources. As discussed in Chapter II, both Zeus and the Dioskouri appear to have been important in household religion, and in Athens at least, worshipping Zeus at home was a requirement for citizenship.

III.B: Roman Italian Houses and Household Religion from the Late Republic to the Early Empire

The study of Roman housing, likewise, has an extensive history, which was strongly advanced by the excavations of Pompeii, starting in the 18th century. Penelope Allison’s article “Using the Material and Written Sources: Turn of the Millennium Approaches to Roman Domestic Space” provides a good analysis of the historiography of the study of Roman domestic space. This field followed a similar path to the study of Greek domestic space, initially trying to align the archaeology with the literary sources. It was assumed, based on Vitruvius, that the Roman atrium house

\[\text{footnotes}\]

264 For a history of these early excavations see Cooley 2003.
was the inevitable linear development of domestic space from Classical Greek houses.\textsuperscript{266} Previous scholarship relied heavily on nomenclature found in ancient literary texts to identify rooms and activities within Roman houses, without consideration for the context of the reference or of the comparable archaeological material.\textsuperscript{267} In addition, there was an assumption prevalent in earlier scholarship that the houses found at Pompeii, a small provincial city in what was once Magna Grecia and completely buried in 79 CE, were typical of all Roman housing regardless of location and time period.\textsuperscript{268}

As Allison’s article points out, even many recent studies continue to perpetuate such assumptions as facts.\textsuperscript{269} Still, scholars like Allison, Grahame, and Wallace-Hadrill have attempted to move past the pitfalls of previous scholarship and to take a more anthropological approach to Roman domestic spaces, although all three of them focus their work on Pompeii. They do, however, treat Pompeii as its own entity, rather than as a Roman type site, making Pompeii a better comparandum for other sites in the Roman world; it too can then be seen to have variation and diversity like other provincial cities.

From Rome itself there are no complete house plans that do not belong to an imperial palace. Rome, however, did not develop in a vacuum and its culture was significantly influenced by its neighbors. By the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE Rome controlled most of the peninsula and by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE all of it. In a way, the Italian peninsula was the first province of the empire, and its cultures were engaging with Roman culture the longest. With this in mind, my generalized description has been assembled from the Italian sites at Cosa, Pompeii and Herculaneum for the late Republican to early imperial
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periods, and Ostia for the high imperial period, roughly contemporary with the evidence from Roman Achaia. And, as with the Greek houses, the Italian houses under consideration likely belonged to owners who were relatively economically successful judging from the size, decorations, and specialization of spaces of these houses.

III.B.1: The Houses

As with the Greek houses above, the general descriptions presented here are based on many houses from the four selected sites, but one example from each site, as well as a second example from Pompeii, is analyzed in detail (Figures 37 to 72). The examples selected from these sites date from around the 1st century BCE at Cosa, the 1st century CE at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and to the late 3rd and early 4th century CE at Ostia. All five of these houses demonstrate general consistencies found in Romano-Italian housing. Obviously, these houses are not identical in form, and so also represent the variation which should be expected in houses from different sites and different time periods. In spite of these differences, however, there are several common elements which not only make such a comparison possible but also affirm that there were some common Roman cultural practices and ideals.

Layout

Romano-Italian houses, for the most part, favored a rectangular shape with an emphasis on symmetry and axiality in their plans (Figures 42, 51, and 65). The Casa degli Amorini Dorati demonstrates a variation with two separate axes, one from the main entrances to Room E and one along the peristyle courtyard, Room F (Figure 58). The
houses at Cosa were not axially arranged, but do share a similar depth of space with their southern counterparts (Figure 37). The general plan of a Romano-Italian house was also arranged around a centrally located circulation space like Greek houses. However, in the Republican and early imperial period, these were often roofed except for a space immediately over a tank at or near the center of the room. This tank, often called the impluvium by scholars, collected rain water from the opening in the roof. This opening also provided natural light inside the courtyard. These atria were common in Pompeii and Herculaneum and were also found at Cosa before the 1st century BCE (Figure 37). However, simple courtyards with no embellishments or roofing were also found at these sites. Later in the imperial period, atria are less often found in the Italian peninsula, replaced by peristyle courtyards like those found in Greece (Figures 58 and 65). In addition to these central circulation spaces, whether atria or courtyard, there was often also a garden at the back of the house which provided further light as well as work space (Figures 37 and 51). These gardens might also be found in a peristyle.

**Access and Visibility Analysis**

The following access analysis of Romano-Italian houses only considers the ground floor plans of these houses. The examples from Cosa, Herculaneum, and Ostia and the Casa degli Amorini Dorati contain evidence for stairs to an upper floor, which is not preserved. For this reason, I have only considered the ground floor plans, but I am aware that there would have been more rooms and greater depth to these houses. For these staircases, I have included them on the justified access maps as a transition space with a dotted line indicating the potential for further spaces. With the Greek houses
above, we did not encounter peristyles, but they present an issue for access analysis; that is, whether to consider the space within the columns separate from the porticos around it. Although the columns delineate a space in the middle, I agree with Grahame’s conclusion that the considerable weakness and fluidity of this boundary makes it reasonable to think of the entire peristyle as a single space.270 However, if there were parapets or a fence placed between the columns, thus limiting access into interior space, then I would consider the space within the columns as separate from that of the porticos.

From the justified access maps of the Romano-Italian house examples, these houses appear fairly symmetrical in arrangement around their courtyards or atria, similar to the Greek examples (Figure 72). However, the Roman houses have greater overall depth, or asymmetry, with most of the rooms three and four spaces from the carrier space. They are also more distributive with multiple entrances between rooms and typically different, independent paths of circulation within the house, the exception being the example from Herculaneum. Taking into account the function of the rooms along these paths, they may not necessarily be distinguished as one for the service spaces and one for the reception spaces of the house. For instance, in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati from Pompeii (Figure 58) the rooms along the north portico of the peristyle garden, Room F, contained finds of mixed usage. Elaborate wall painting, cupboards, a latrine, loomweights, toilet items, and storage vessels were all found in these rooms (Rooms I through M).271 This indicates multipurpose spaces for living, working, and entertaining. In addition, Room O was one of the main dining spaces for entertaining visitors (Room G may have been another). So a guest, entering from Room B and heading to the reception

270 Grahame 2000, p. 41.
space Room O, needed to pass by these multipurpose rooms. While guests may not have entered these spaces, they would still have been physically able to access them if they chose to do so. Thus, as in Greek houses there was a level of flexibility in the use of space, but unlike them, access into the reception spaces, at least Rooms O and F, would allow for access, at least theoretically, into non-reception spaces.

Although mixed with reception spaces, rooms which were not necessary for visitors to access, like the kitchen, were located to the sides of the visual axis from the main entrance (Figures 40, 46, 54, 61, 69), much as in Greek houses. But, unlike Greek houses, utilitarian spaces could have had their own exterior entrances as well as independent interior pathways (Figures 58, 59, 65 and 67). It was possible for those of the household to come and go without accessing the rest of the house. This may have been done to keep the activities of those of lower social status, particularly slaves, physically away from those of much higher status, the Roman family and visitors.\footnote{Wallace-Hadrill 1994, pp. 10–12.}

However, this also meant that there was less regulation of the movements of the inhabitants than in the Greek houses. In theory, the inhabitants of any status could have moved about the house, as well as into and out of it, without having to always pass through a main control space. The Casa del Sacello di Legno from Herculaneum and the Casa delle Pareti rosse from Pompeii are the exceptions to this (Figures 44 and 52). These structures had a single entrance on the opposite side of the atrium from the majority of the rooms of the house; therefore, the movements of the inhabitants into and out of the house could be controlled similarly to those of the Greek houses. However, unlike in Greek houses, the Casa delle Pareti rosse was distributive, so that access to some spaces from within the house was possible without passing through the central
circulation space. Furthermore, multiple entrances have been found in other houses from both of these sites, such as the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.

Physical access for visitors from the main entrance into the house could have been controlled through the courtyard/atrium space. According to Wallace-Hadrill, the houses of the Roman elite could be divided along two axes: from humble to grand and from public to private. Therefore, the further one physically went into the house, the more intimately acquainted one needed to have been with the head of the household and thus closer to him in social status. The rooms specifically intended to display the social status of the owner for visitors, and, therefore, accessible to the visitor, were highly decorated. Those rooms for the slaves and servants of the household were equally deep in the house, but along the intersecting axis; their spaces were left undecorated which further indicated their social status and the visual clue that these rooms were not meant for visitors.

Grahame, in commenting on Wallace-Hadrill, proposes that the decoration of the house did not direct the viewer in social behavior, but acted as markers for divisions and paths already established by the architecture, so that we must put more emphasis on the architectural plan rather than the decorative elements.

It seems to me that both Wallace-Hadrill and Grahame are arguing the same point since architecture and decoration influence one another; the arrangement of spaces may dictate where decoration may be applied, and decorations, such as balustrades or furniture, influences the arrangement of the space and its use. What both of these theories indicate is that access by outsiders was a key component in the arrangement of the Roman house with multiple spaces within the house in which inhabitants and visitors
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might have interacted. And, there were multiple levels of access for outsiders within the house, depending on their social status and degree of intimacy with the head of the household. This can be demonstrated with visibility analysis as well. In most of the examples there was a clear sight line from the entrance, through several rooms, to the back of the house, via wide doorways and windows (Figures 40, 46, 54, 61, and 69). In the House of the Skeleton from Cosa, the garden at the back of the house was only visible through a small doorway on the opposite side of the atrium from the entrance; it may not have been as visible as some of the other examples. And, in Casa degli Amorini Dorati visual access from the main entrance only allowed the outsider to see the reception space, Room E, on the opposite side of the atrium, Room B.

Even these variations on visual access from the entrance give the impression of accessing the entire house, although, as is clear from the access analysis, this was physically not the case (Figure 72). This visibility into the structure also gives the impression of openness to the activities of the house and demonstrates an emphasis on display. This visibility, furthermore, increases once the outsider is invited into the reception spaces, allowing him to see into spaces not on the visual axis from the front entrance (Figures 41, 47, 55, 62, and 70). Thus, the whole house appears open to the invited visitor. Those acquainted more closely with the inhabitants may have been allowed into the more deeply placed reception spaces of the house, like the dining room, which was often placed at the back of the house next to the garden. The emphasis in this general plan is clearly towards a hierarchy of access for the outsider, both visual and physical,275 and in contrast to the more introverted Greek house. The visibility in these
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structures, therefore, is a key element, even in the Herculaneum and Pompeian examples which resemble the arrangements of Greek houses.

**Construction Materials and Amenities**

Construction materials varied depending on what was available. In Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Ostia, brick or stone and mortar were most popular, but other materials were also used. At Cosa the houses were built of limestone, earth, clay, sand, sandstone, timber, and imported tufa and travertine.\(^{276}\) From all the sites were found wall plaster, often painted in some variation of what have been identified as the four canonical styles of Roman wall painting.\(^{277}\) Later in the imperial period, marble wall revetments become popular among the wealthier of the houses at Ostia. The floors were made of earth, clay, stone slab, tile, and tessellated or tile-chip mosaics in monochrome or polychrome designs. At Ostia and Pompeii there was a preference for geometric patterns and black, white, and red color palette.\(^{278}\) Water was supplied within the house by cisterns at Cosa, wells at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and both at Ostia. Aqueducts were constructed at the latter three sites and public fountains also served as an important water source. Eventually, in the imperial period, private citizens could pay a fee and attach their houses to the aqueduct water supply.\(^{279}\) This allowed for ornamental gardens, fountains, and private bath complexes to be added to the wealthier houses.
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III.B.2: The Evidence of Household Cult

In the previous chapter, I described in general the forms of the *lararium* shrine found in Roman houses. These forms varied from house to house and site to site, even though they all functioned as a centrally located shrine for all the gods of the household and were used by all the members of the household. At Pompeii, the wall painting shrine was the most commonly found form of *lararium* either alone or in conjunction with one of the other types; and, all five types occur in contemporary use with one another suggesting that the variation was not a result of shifting trends over time. At Herculaneum, niches, wooden *aediculae*, and pseudo-*aediculae* are found more often than the wall painting kind;\textsuperscript{280} again, these different forms are contemporary with one another and with the Pompeii samples. At Ostia, all five forms of shrines are known, but the majority was niches; there are only a few examples of the other four types. These examples range in date from the 1\textsuperscript{st} to the 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE.

At Cosa, many small *arulae* were found around the site in association with the houses.\textsuperscript{281} Because of their portable nature, these altars cannot be analyzed in context, but they do demonstrate that personal religion was conducted at the site. Although the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE phase of the House of the Skeleton did not contain evidence for household religion, the House of Diana in its early imperial phase, c. 50–60 CE, contained a small temple-like shrine to Diana in its garden which resembles a *sacellum*.\textsuperscript{282} Therefore, although the earlier example used in this study does not reveal anything about household religion at Cosa, there was evidence similar to that of Pompeii and Ostia.

\textsuperscript{280} Orr 1978, p. 1585.
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\textsuperscript{282} Fentress 2003, pp. 38–55.
The houses selected for this section reflect these variations in shrine form, but also the conformity to the lararium. From Pompeii, in Casa delle Pareti rosse was found a wall painted shrine depicting a Genius in a toga praetexta standing beside an altar containing fruit283 (Figures 56 and 57). On either side of the Genius stands a Lar in a green tunic and red pallium holding a rhyton and situla. They are placed on a yellow background and the whole painting is framed by a pseudo-aedicula structure. The structure consists of a masonry base painted dark red with two yellow serpents flanking another altar on which were placed two eggs and a pine cone. On top of the base stand two stucco-covered, stone columns with capitals, all painted yellow.

On the columns rests an architrave and pediment. The pediment was painted white with a red stripe border and on it was depicted a helmet, greaves, a shield, and a dagger which have been associated with the arms of a gladiator.284 On the base between the columns and the wall painted shrine were found a bronze lamp with a crescent moon heat shield and six bronze statuettes: Aesculapius, Apollo, Mercury, Hercules, and two Lares. The lamp may have served as an accommodation for sacrifice or there could have been portable altars placed on the base before the statuettes. The wall painting and the statuettes clearly indicate the deities honored in this shrine, which include the Lares and the Genius of the paterfamilias.

Also from Pompeii is the Casa degli Amorini Dorati in which was identified a sacellum shrine and a lararium. Both shrines were located along the porticos of the peristyle garden (Figures 61 and 62). In the southeast corner of the space was a recess in
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the wall which contained the *sacellum*, measuring 2m by 1.81m.\textsuperscript{285} The space was closed off by a wooden partition (Figure 64). On each wall of the recess were painted yellow panels with red borders. In each panel is represented a different Egyptian deity, either as an attribute or in full figure.

On the south wall was painted the full figures of Anubis holding a caduceus and a palm frond, a boy with a cornucopia identified as Harpocrates, Isis with a sistrum, Sarapis with a sistrum and cornucopia, an unidentified figure in blue holding a rod and a disk, another unidentified dark colored male figure, an unidentified object, and the end of a green table on which sits a metal krater. On the east wall were rendered a sistrum, a *patera umbilicata*, and an *ampulla* all suspended from a green garland, two cistas with moons and a coiled serpent all representing Isis, and below these were birds. On this same wall were markings from two small shelves, under which were painted serpents resembling the Genii Loci. Boyce considers these the remains of an *aedicula*.\textsuperscript{286} Within the recess were found an alabaster statuette, likely of Horus, a white marble statuette of an enthroned female identified as Isis, a lamp with a relief decoration of Isis, Harpocrates, and an unidentified Egyptian animal deity, and an *as* of Nero depicting the Temple of Janus. This *sacellum* was clearly dedicated specifically to the Egyptian deities. No altar or other accommodation for sacrifice was identified, but it may not be preserved like the partition and shelves.

The deities common to a Roman household were located in the pseudo-*aedicula lararium* along the north wall of the peristyle, between the doorways for Rooms I and J.

\textsuperscript{285} Boyce 1937, pp. 56–57, no. 220.
\textsuperscript{286} Boyce 1937, p. 57.
The Herculaneum example, Casa del Sacello di Legno, was named for the wooden *aedicula* found in the structure in 1934. It was burned and preserved in the destruction of the town in 79 CE. The *aedicula* was built in two sections (Figures 48 and 49). Although the lower section was not well preserved, Stephan Mols has reconstructed it as a cabinet with two hinged-double doors \(^{288}\) (Figure 49). The upper section was built to resemble a temple with two Corinthian columns *in antis*, but without a pediment or gabled roof. \(^{289}\) It does have an architrave as well as steps leading to the two double doors of the temple, which are similar to those of the lower section. \(^{290}\) Inside the little wooden temple were found a bronze statuette of Hercules and a marble statuette of a goddess, probably Venus. \(^{291}\) In the cabinet below the temple were found a statuette of a lion, jewelry, bone dice, and bronze coins. There was no provision for sacrifice preserved, but

\(^{287}\) Boyce 1937, pp. 57–58, no. 221.  
\(^{289}\) Mols 1999, p. 194.  
\(^{290}\) Mols 1999, p. 194.  
Mols suggests this could have been accommodated with a portable altar.\textsuperscript{292} Likewise, the absence of the Lares and the Genius may be because they were removed or destroyed when the house was abandoned and buried.

At Ostia, niches like the one found in the Domus della Fortuna Annonaria were the more popular form of shrine (Figure 71). This pseudo-\textit{aedicula} niche was located at the center of the south wall of the peristyle courtyard opposite the main entrance to the building.\textsuperscript{293} In it was found a statue of Juno or Ceres. It was possibly the \textit{lararium} of the house, and both Jan Bakker and Johannes Boersma suggest it was built to replace a previous shrine.\textsuperscript{294} The present niche was built at the beginning of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE, which places it at the chronological limit of this study, but still within it. This niche was revetted in marble, both inside and outside, and was crowned with a vaulted ceiling. It was constructed of brick and mortar. Accommodation for sacrifice could have been added with a portable altar before the niche. Although this shrine does not preserve evidence for the Lares and the Genius, numerous other \textit{lararia} from this site attest their continued significance into the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE. This example was selected because of the preservation of the entire house, but it also demonstrates my earlier observation that at Ostia by the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE it no longer seems to be a requirement to have Lares and the Genius in \textit{lararia}.

These are only four examples of the numerous household shrines found at all three of these sites. However, they represent the popular types for each site, as well as all four types of \textit{lararia}. Moreover, they demonstrate the continued use of \textit{lararia} from the 1\textsuperscript{st} to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE. All four examples contain images of the deities honored, but not

\textsuperscript{292} Mols 1999, pp. 59–60.  
\textsuperscript{293} Boersma 1985, p. 141; Bakker 1994, p. 236.  
\textsuperscript{294} Bakker 1994, p. 236.
accommodations for sacrifice. This necessity could have been satisfied by the use of portable altars, tables, and possibly lamps. The deities honored varied between shrines, as did the media of their representations. But, in three cases, there was a single shrine for all of these deities. In the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, there was a single shrine for the household gods as well as a second sacred space for gods special to the owner of the house. Still, both shrines were located in the same room quite close to one another.

III.B.3: Household Religion: Cult Evidence in Context

For the most part, shrines of Roman houses seem to have been placed where they could have been seen by visitors and be accessible to the inhabitants. In the Casa delle Pareti rosse, the shrine was not directly in front of the street entrance, but it was visible at the right side of the atrium from this entrance and it was easily reached once the visitor entered the atrium (Figure 54). Its location here also meant that it was easily accessible to the inhabitants as well since they had to pass through the atrium to exit the single-entrance house. The atrium, and more specifically the lararium, was along the most direct path between the kitchen, Room a, and the dining room, Room r (Figure 51). Therefore, everyone from slave to citizen had to pass by the lararium in the house to go about their daily activities.

Similarly positioned was the pseudo-aedicula niche found in the Domus della Fortuna Annonaria at Ostia. This niche was located at the center of the south wall of the peristyle courtyard opposite the main entrance to the building. In this position, it was visible along the main axis of the house from the outside (Figure 69), but it was also readily accessible to anyone entering the house as it was placed in one of the central

circulation spaces (Figure 65). Furthermore, it would have been visible from the reception room to the west (Figure 70). It would also have been accessible to the inhabitants as it was visible from the main hub of circulation, Corridor 12; to pass from one side of the building to the other, it was necessary to pass in front of this shrine and its predecessor. Therefore, its location also indicates use by the household and intentional visibility to the visitors.

Not quite as visible were the two shrines from the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Neither was visible from any of the entrances into the house (Figure 61), however, from the main dining room, Room O, and the reception space Room E the sacellum could be seen (Figure 62). The lararium remained in a blind spot until one entered the north portico. However, to pass from the main entrance of the house, Vestibule A, to the rooms around the peristyle, one had to pass the lararium; thus it was physically accessible as one travelled within the house. The south portico of the peristyle led only to an exedra, Room N, which is near the dining space; therefore, it is less likely that outsiders would pass that way. If so, the sacellum was more physically secluded than the lararium but, at the same time, also more visible.

Still, this was an open space and the sacellum was visible along the east portico where the entrance meets the peristyle, and possibly also visible from across the garden. Moreover, both of these shrines were in the most accessible space of the house and the one which controlled virtually all movement through it. Therefore, to the inhabitants these shrines were easily accessible. In addition, the majority of the rooms of the house were along the north side of the peristyle, which combined spaces with utilitarian finds
and those of personal care and daily life, so the inhabitants of the house probably had to pass the lararium as they went about their daily activities in the house.

However, at Herculaneum this visibility takes a different twist. The shrine from the Domus del Sacello di Legno was placed in the corner of Room 2 off the atrium (Figure 43). The finds from the room suggest it was used for sleeping and also for receiving guests. The shrine was not apparent from the front door, although visitors might have encountered it if invited into Room 2 (Figure 46). Placing a shrine in a less visible location appears in other houses at Herculaneum as well, such as on the upper floor of the Casa a Graticcio. Still, the rooms in which these shrines were located were spaces which were decorated and furnished to be flexible reception and living spaces. Therefore, while the shrine may not have been apparent to someone glancing in the doorway of a Herculaneum household, it was placed so that invited visitors would see it (Figure 47). But, in this room it was not immediately accessible to all the inhabitants of the household. They did not necessarily pass by it in their daily activities, but had to know of its presence in Room 2 in order to use it. In this way, its display aspect, as related to visitors, actually appears more prominent in spite of its lack of visibility from the main entrance and the courtyard.

III.B.4: Observations

Display appears to be an important element in the wealthier houses of Roman Italy that reveal themselves as open. At the same time, not all activities of all inhabitants could be observed, such as those of slaves. Therefore, the house only appears visibly open, while in fact it could have been just as physically closed as a Greek house, as

---

demonstrated by the average RRA for all these structures (Figure 73). Among the Greek examples, all but the house from Athens have an average RRA of just over 1, while all the Italian examples except Herculaneum have an average RRA of just under 1, and Casa degli Amorini Dorati has the lowest at 0.694. This indicates that although the Roman houses looked more asymmetrical in the access map, they were slightly more accessible than the Greek, with Casa degli Amorini Dorati the most accessible of them all. With multiple connections between rooms and more than one entrance, the level of control and centralization found in Greek houses could not be achieved in Romano-Italian houses, and was likely not desired by the inhabitants. This is also shown in the location of the reception spaces; those of the Roman house tend to be towards the back of the house, while those of the Greek were next to the entrance.

The shrines further reflect these different levels of access. The Greek shrines took many different forms, both permanent and portable. They were located around the house where the inhabitants needed them to be without accounting for visibility or accessibility for the visitors. And, while a few common household cults have been identified from literary sources, the deities found in archaeological contexts varied as much as the forms and locations of the shrines. The Roman shrines were typically singular and followed a certain level of standardization in form. They appear to have been fixed, although often they contained portable elements. They were usually in the most accessible space within the house and prominently placed for visitors to see. This display feature is further emphasized by the example from Herculaneum where accessibility for the inhabitants was decreased in favor of display for the visitor. The cults could also vary and included
many non-Roman deities as well, but at least in the 1st century CE, they also all probably contained the Lares and the Genius.

III.C: Greek and Roman Cultural Identities in Houses and Household Religion

The differences observed in the preceding sections between Greek and Roman houses and household cults extend from the differences found their cultural identities. The most important aspect of these identities for this study is their responses to the outsider, which I will now explore and compare with the archaeological material that has been discussed.

III.C.1: Greek Culture of Household Religion

Greek culture or cultures were varied and dynamic, and the province of Achaia included several political regions each organized around an urban center. Cultural identity in each of these poleis was related to a shared, legendary genealogy.\textsuperscript{297} Even within a single polis there were further genealogical divisions related to phratry, or tribal, descent groups.\textsuperscript{298} By extension, importance was placed on preserving kin groups to protect and perpetuate this identity. This is most apparent in a passage from Herodotus:

“…αὖτις δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἕνον ὀμαιμόν τε καὶ ὀμόγλωσσον καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματα τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἠθεά τε ὁμότροπα…”\textsuperscript{299} Here Herodotus points out two elements of Greek culture which are important for this study: preserving the kin groups and religion.

\textsuperscript{297} Hall 1997, pp. 34–66.
\textsuperscript{298} Hall 1997, pp. 34–66.
\textsuperscript{299} Herodotus 8.144.2: “And next the kinship of all Greeks in blood and speech, and the shrines of gods and the sacrifices that we have in common, and the likeness of our way of life” (trans. Godley 1921–1924, vol. 4, p. 153).
Two terms which have recently been discussed in the field of Greek religion and which are important for defining Greek culture in the household are “family”, or genos, and “household”, or oikos. These terms were mentioned in the previous chapter, but will now be defined. In ancient Greek literature there was often a distinction made in household cultic rituals between those concerned with the bloodline of the genetic unit, the genos, and those concerned with the protection of the property, food stuffs, and residents of a domestic space, the oikos. A ritual of the genos is exemplified by a passage from Isaeus’s oration Περὶ τοῦ Κίρωνος κλήρου in which the speaker defended his position as the valid heir to Kiron by stating he had participated in a domestic sacrifice to which neither slaves nor outsiders to the genos had been permitted; this distinguishes this sacrifice from ones mentioned in the previous line which were not described as being exclusive to the genos. As for a ritual of the oikos, in Plutarch’s Moralia, the author described a ceremony carried out in the home, as well as in public, in which a servant representing famine or plague was driven out of the house by the master who chanted “Ἔξω Βούλιμον, ἔσω δὲ Πλοῦτον καὶ Γγίειαν!” Both the servant and the master, who were not connected by bloodline but who dwelled together, participated in this ritual for the protection of those living in the house. Therefore, the terms genos, and oikos, cannot be used interchangeably.

For the purposes of this study in relation to religion, genos is used to refer to the biological unit and is part of the kin group, while oikos also includes those who were not

301 Isaeus 8.16.
302 Isaeus 8.15.
303 “Out with Hunger, in with Wealth and Health!” Plutarch Moralia 693F. This type of ritual is attested to in literature as early at the 6th century BCE. For more details see Faraone 2004, pp. 215–217; Bremmer 1983, pp. 299–320.
members of the *genos* but who also dwelled in the same domestic space as the *genos*, including slaves and dependents. The cultic practices of the non-*genos* members of the *oikos*, aside from their presence and participation in *oikos* cultic rituals, are currently unknown. Jon Mikalson does mention that slaves in Athenian literature were known to seek asylum at altars and sanctuaries in Greece and this may indicate that they had adopted the practices of their masters. However, knowing where one may flee for safety when in distress does not necessarily equal belief. Furthermore, these scenes were written about public sanctuaries and for citizens who understood the characters through the filter of their own beliefs and customs. It may be that the physical remains of personal slave religion either have not yet been identified or the nature of the evidence is such that it does not survive, i.e., objects made from organic material or ritual behavior which cannot be seen in the archaeological record. Furthermore, some of them were Greeks themselves from other poleis.

This distinction and preservation of kin groups is important in the context of this study because it was managed and reinforced through domestic architecture. Other literary sources also support the importance of preserving kin groups through their emphasis on the division of women from unrelated men in the house. As Michael Jameson points out, in Greek communities, the house was privacy, invisible to the outside world; and the house was how social and gender divisions were reinforced and maintained. No specific rooms of the house have been identified archaeologically as

---

305 Xenophon *Oikonomikos* 9.2–5; Lysias 1.9–10; Lysias 3.6; Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazusae* 414–417.
306 Jameson 1990b, p. 179.
solely female or male space.\textsuperscript{308} Even the andron, which has typically been identified as male space based on literary references, may also have been used by women when it was not being used for dining.\textsuperscript{309} However, as described above, Classical Greek houses across many sites were typically single-entranced structures arranged around a courtyard.\textsuperscript{310} This arrangement provided inhabitants the ability to control and restrict interactions between the kin group who occupied the house and outsiders.\textsuperscript{311} The architecture of the house confronted the outsider with restricted access, and this is consistent throughout Greek communities, indicating that it was an important element of Greek culture.

Another common element of Greek culture relevant to this study was religion. Most prominent in the archaeological record are the pan-hellenic sanctuaries and festivals which physically collected all the independent poleis together for one common cause. In addition to these larger, more obvious examples of a single Greek culture were the less prominent but equally important shared cultural practices of household religion. While not all elements of household religion may have been shared, there were definitely several important features for which there is evidence from several different poleis, whether from literary or archaeological sources.

These have been identified above in a few main cults of the household, such as Zeus and the Dioskouri, in the placement of shrines around the house to protect the household and the community from danger or miasma, and the visibility and accessibility of these shrines. This supports Michael Jameson’s interpretation of the Greek house as

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{308} Nevett 1999a, pp. 38–39; Goldberg 1999, p. 157; Cahill 2002, p. 150.
\textsuperscript{309} Nevett 1999a, p. 71 and p. 155.
\textsuperscript{310} Nevett 1995b, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{311} Nevett 1999a, pp. 173–175; 2002, pp. 82–83.
\end{flushright}
invisible to outsiders.\textsuperscript{312} Since this invisibility is an important feature in participating in Greek cultural identity, the location of the shrines and their lack of visibility to outsiders connect household cults with Greek cultural identity as it is expressed in domestic space. Therefore, the identity of the deities was a further element of Greek cultural identity articulated in household religion.

Thus, there was a shared culture of Greeks incorporated within the poleis cultures, which can be seen in the houses and household religion. In this study I have attempted to examine only those elements of household cult which appear to be generally accepted across pre-Roman Greece. When possible, I will also make note of more localized practices as well which would reflect a regional or polis-specific culture for the cities under examination. The persistence of local practices from pre-Roman Greece will further explain the different interpretations of, and reactions to, Roman culture found in these cities.

\textbf{III.C.2: Roman Culture of Household Religion}

Roman culture was equally as diverse and dynamic as Greek culture, however, modern scholarship until recently has described it as a single, homogenous entity acting upon other cultures in the process of Romanization. The idea of Romanization stems from our modern understanding of the Roman concept of \textit{Romanitas}. This is a perception found in Roman literature which has been used to define Roman cultural identity.\textsuperscript{313} To be Roman was not linked with ethnicity and kin relations, as Greek culture was, but with civil status. And membership was demonstrated through behavior

\begin{footnotesize}  
\textsuperscript{312} Jameson 1990b, p. 179.  
\textsuperscript{313} For detailed look at the literary references to \textit{Romanitas}, see Hales 2003, pp. 13–39. 
\end{footnotesize}
and conformity to moral standards.\textsuperscript{314} While these mores may have been redefined over
time, Hales points out, they generally seem concerned with \textit{fides, honos} and \textit{virtus}.\textsuperscript{315} Through morally correct action one might obtain Roman citizenship and cultural identity,
or, conversely, lose it through immoral behavior. Therefore, those living in Roman
society needed to live openly, demonstrating to the community that they were good
citizens upholding the moral standards.\textsuperscript{316} This is most apparent in the visual
accessibility of the houses of the Romans, which contrast with the invisibility of those of
the Greeks.

The basic unit of this Roman cultural identity was one’s \textit{familia}. This term was
not restricted to blood relatives, but encompassed all those connected with the
\textit{paterfamilias} through law, ownership, birth, and marriage. The term \textit{familia} has an
emphasis on place and most scholars seem to interpret the term as referring to the general
inhabitants of the house, or the household.\textsuperscript{317} Bodel points out that the literary sources
regarding this term vary from including all slaves, freedmen and kin regardless of social
status with “mutual affective ties and common collective interest” to exclusively referring
only to the kin unit or only to the slaves.\textsuperscript{318} These sources, while written from various
periods of Roman history all indicate that the term \textit{familia} is related to the physical house
and its inhabitants. Cato the Elder used the term \textit{familia} in reference to servants.\textsuperscript{319}
Vitruvius defined \textit{familia} as those in opposition to guests, therefore those inhabiting the
house without distinction of social status,\textsuperscript{320} while Nepos, like Cato, defined it as the

\textsuperscript{314} Hales 2003, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{315} Hales 2003, pp. 13–14.
\textsuperscript{316} Hales 2003, p. 1–2.
\textsuperscript{317} Bodel 2008, p. 248.
\textsuperscript{318} Bodel 2008, p. 248.
\textsuperscript{319} Cato, \textit{De Agri Cultura} 138–141.
\textsuperscript{320} Vitruvius, \textit{De Architectura} 6.5.1–2.
household staff.\textsuperscript{321} Ulpian provides a range of definitions for \textit{familia} such as property, persons legally bonded together, all persons by birth or by law subject to the \textit{paterfamilias}, kinship relations, and slaves.\textsuperscript{322} All these definitions are associated with the house and those dwelling within it, whether they are the servants keeping the house running or those individuals supported by the \textit{paterfamilias}, whose position, according to Richard Saller, is defined by place and not necessarily by blood.\textsuperscript{323}

For my research, the term \textit{familia}, with its strong connection to the physical house, is defined as those who dwelled within the same house and/or those who were dependent upon the \textit{paterfamilias} for their shelter, sustenance, and security. Saller discusses the Roman conceptualization of status distinctions and their dependence on the structure of the house looking specifically at archaeological evidence and epigraphy. “In Roman society a position of power was defined in terms of heading a large house rather than in terms of a position in a clan or other kin group.”\textsuperscript{324} The status positions of others were subordinate to the \textit{paterfamilias} from wife and children to freedmen and slaves, although, by the high empire, the power of the \textit{paterfamilias} may have been much reduced in practice.\textsuperscript{325} When a \textit{paterfamilias} passed away, if not before, the family unit was divided into their respective households with the male heirs as the new \textit{patresfamiliae}. This social framework seems to correlate with the definition of \textit{familia} derived from the literature.

Therefore, the primary venue for demonstrating Roman cultural identity is the home, and the response to the visitor or outsider is one of visual openness. For those of

\textsuperscript{321} Nepos, \textit{Atticus} 13.
\textsuperscript{322} Digesta 50.16.195 (Ulpian).
\textsuperscript{323} Saller 1994, pp. 75–80.
\textsuperscript{324} Saller 1994, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{325} Saller 1994, pp. 130–132.
the upper classes, who are the subject of this study, houses were “where the network of
social contacts that provided the underpinning for [the paterfamilias’s] activities outside
the house was generated and activated.” And, their houses were expected to be
arranged, decorated, and function as a venue for others to view their Roman activities,
including household cult practices. According to Vitruvius:

\[
\text{...nobilibus vero, qui honores magistratusque gerundo praestare debent}
\text{officia civibus, faciunda sunt vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristylia}
\text{amplissima, silvae ambulationesque laxiores ad decorem maiestatis}
\text{perfectae; praeterea bibliothecas, pinacothecas, basilicas non dissimili}
\text{modo quam publicorum operum magnificentia habeat comparatas, quod}
\text{in domibus eorum saepius et publica consilia et privata iudicia arbitriaque}
\text{conficiuntur.} \]

Romanitas then is not only the activities which are considered essential to be seen as
Roman but also the social expectation of others that one appears as Roman. As a result, houses found in the Italian colonies were arranged in such a way that
those passing the door of the household can see all the way to the back of the house,
through aligned doorways, windows, and colonnades. While the accessibility of the
house may have restricted parts, visibility was the main factor. Therefore, multiple
entrances and a distributive arrangement of the house were acceptable. Although
emphasis was placed on preserving the familia group, it was not as important to keep it
separated from outsiders. Instead, the emphasis was to keep slaves, those without civil
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327 Vitruvius, De Architectura, 6.5.2: “For the most prominent citizens, those who should carry out their
duties to the citizenry by holding honorific titles and magistracies, vestibules should be constructed that are
lofty and lordly, the atria and peristyles at their most spacious, lush gardens and broad walkways refined as
properly befits their dignity. In addition to these, there should be libraries, picture galleries, and basilicas,
outfitted in a manner not dissimilar to the magnificence of public works, for in the homes of these people,
often enough, both public deliberations and private judgments and arbitrations are carried out” (Rowland,
Howe, and Dewar 1999, p. 81).
328 See Hales 2003 for complete analysis of the relationship between house and ‘Romanitas’.
status, and their duties out of sight of visitors. This too was facilitated by independent
circulation paths and multiple entrances into the house. Furthermore, because of the
visual openness of Roman houses, there was no need to control the interactions between
inhabitants and outsiders, as with Greek housing. The interactions, theoretically, were
intended to be visible to everyone.

As a key element in Romanitas, participation in Roman household religion was
related to an individual’s social/civic status and role within the familia, in contrast with
the genealogical emphasis of Greek household religion. Roman society required its
members to maintain a shrine to household deities, such as the Lares and the Penates,
within their houses as an indication of that membership and of their status within that
society. Additionally, their wealth could have been demonstrated in the elaboration of
the lararium and their livelihood, civic status, or personal interests reflected in the chosen
Penates. Therefore, these shrines needed to be displayed to outsiders as well as be
accessible to the familia. Thus, unlike with Greek household religion, Roman household
cults typically were placed together in one shrine, the lararium, whose form followed
certain requirements, and which was located in a main circulation space, visible to
visitors and accessible to inhabitants.

Regarding this emphasis on display, the terms private cult and public cult need to
be defined as the distinction affects the Roman perception of domestic shrines. Pompeius
Festus defined public rites as those performed at public expense on behalf of the public
and the hills, rural districts, wards and shrines. Private rituals are those performed at the
expense and on the behalf of the individual person, familia, or gens. Most scholars seem
to turn to Festus for their definitions, in spite of the problems associated with this
work.\textsuperscript{331} However, as Bakker points out, public and private were not completely separate concepts in Roman religion.\textsuperscript{332} As evidence, Bakker cites the fact that the \textit{ius divinum}, the laws mentioned earlier which regulated the cults, was part of \textit{ius publicum}. Still, the public cult and private cult were legally separated entities. A dedication by the \textit{populus} was considered \textit{res sacra} and it was sacrilege to steal or defile it, while those of private individuals were not.\textsuperscript{333} Furthermore, public shrines were considered \textit{loca sacra} while private ones were \textit{loca profana}, therefore it was not illegal or sacrilegious to defile a private shrine.

Bakker looks more broadly at the issue and defines public and private as “things public are related to the whole community, whereas something private is restricted to one or more parts of the community”; therefore, “all cults of subdivisions of the \textit{populus} can be assigned to the realm of private religion, whereas all cults related to the whole community can be regarded as belonging to public religion.”\textsuperscript{334} Roman domestic cults, therefore, are private cults; their rituals are performed at the expense and for the benefit of the individuals or collection of individuals concerned, e.g., the household, and not necessarily the whole community. And, their shrines and offerings were not considered sacred by the whole community, only by the individuals; unlike in Greek domestic religion where rituals of the household protected the community as well as the inhabitants. This is further shown in the popularity of the Genius Loci in \textit{lararia}. However, Roman household religion was not independent from the community.

\textsuperscript{331} Festus (Sextus Pompeius Festus) in the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE abridged the encyclopedic work \textit{De Significatione Verborum} of 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE grammarian Verrius Flaccus. However, Festus’s work is only partially preserved and a great deal of it has been reconstructed from an 8\textsuperscript{th} century summary of \textit{De Significatione Verborum} by the Benedictine monk Paulus Diaconus. Therefore, what we have is a summary of a summary and to be used with some caution to reconstruct Roman religious practices.

\textsuperscript{332} Bakker 1994, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{333} Bakker 1994, p. 2–3.

\textsuperscript{334} Bakker 1994, p. 3–4.
Although the divine protection derived from Roman household religion was for the individual, the act of honoring certain deities in the home was an indicator of civil status within the Roman community and of participation in Roman culture.

**III.C.3: Observations**

The analysis of the Greek houses from Section A of this chapter agrees with the core distinction in the cultures themselves as interpreted from literary sources. Greek culture in literary sources valued the protection and preservation of the genetic group. From the evidence in this analysis, the inhabitants’, or kin group’s, spaces were kept separate from the reception spaces, and access to and from the former was heavily controlled by the central circulation space. Roman culture from the literary sources valued civil status over ethnic background, and this civil status was demonstrated through observed appropriate actions and *mores*. The houses considered in this analysis demonstrate an emphasis on display and the appearance of accessibility from outside the house; and there was more of a mixture of inhabited and reception spaces making control over interactions between the two groups, residents and visitors, appear less important. The flexibility of location, the visibility towards outsiders, as well as the cults honored by the shrines, are the three distinct differences between the household religions of Greek and Roman cultures, which will now be sought out in the communities where these two cultures come together. In doing so, the question to consider is how did these different groups affect one another?
Chapter IV: Delos: 166 BCE - 87 BCE

Delos provides important, earlier comparanda for this discussion of housing and household cults even though it falls outside the chronological range of this study of Roman Achaia. It had a substantial Romano-Italian population, which is well represented in the epigraphic evidence as well as in the unique religious features of shrines to the Lares Compitales.\(^{335}\) In fact, it was the earliest and largest Roman commercial settlement in this region.\(^{336}\) Thus, cultural change can be observed here in the houses and household cults on Delos which will provide a better understanding of the nature of changes in household cults of Roman Achaia.

IV.A: The Site

Between 166 and 87 BCE, Delos (Figure 74) was one of the most active and important ports in the Greek world, especially for Roman slave traders.\(^{337}\) After the expulsion of the native Delians in 166 BCE, the island fell nominally under the authority of Athens, although under the mandate of Rome.\(^{338}\) Delos was made a free port and drew traders from around the Mediterranean, especially after the destruction of Corinth in 146 BCE.\(^{339}\) In order to protect their interests, many of these merchants, originally from Syria, Phoenicia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Italy, established houses for themselves on Delos. In 87 BCE, Mithridates VI destroyed the port, killed the Roman and Italian
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\(^{335}\) Rauh 1993, pp. 22–41.
\(^{338}\) Bruneau and Ducat 1966, pp. 21–23; Rauh 1993, pp. 5–22.
\(^{339}\) Strabo 10.5.4; Rauh 1993, p. 6.
inhabitants, and enslaved the rest.\textsuperscript{340} During the following two decades the island was plagued by pirates, marking the end of its growth and prominence.\textsuperscript{341} Even after Sulla relieved the region of pirate troubles, those who remained on Delos were never able to return the city to its former glory and the settlement was eventually abandoned.\textsuperscript{342}

From the plethora of epigraphic evidence, in both Greek and Latin, it is clear that the ethnically diverse inhabitants of Delos were socially organized according to membership in religious associations. These associations honored deities specifically from their homelands, including Roman Mercury and the Lares Compitales. The four known Romano-Italian associations made up the largest of these organizations.\textsuperscript{343} But their members were not all Romans and Italians; they included Greeks and Easterners with Roman citizenship and Roman names, and Roman slaves protecting their master’s interests.\textsuperscript{344} However, regardless of their origins, the members of these four groups all associated themselves with being Roman. Taken together with the other known organizations and the variety of sanctuaries found on the island, it can be observed that the culture of this city was a mishmash. This had an important effect on the architecture of the settlement, including domestic architecture.

For Delos, it has been demonstrated, the inhabitants strove to maintain independent cultural identities in spite of the fact they lived apart from their original cultural groups and often interacted with others from different cultures.\textsuperscript{345} This is similar to how cultural interactions have been reconstructed by some scholars in Roman Achaia,
as discussed in Chapter I, with the Greek population maintaining its traditions and customs.

IV.B: The Houses

The houses excavated at Delos have been uncovered through the efforts of the École française d’Athènes for nearly 140 years. From the settlement, 111 houses have been identified and most date to this prosperous period of Delian history. The examples selected for more detailed analysis, when datable, were constructed in the late 2nd century BCE and abandoned or destroyed between 88 and 69 BCE. For the most part houses were arranged around a central courtyard, but how certain types of rooms were accessed varied from house to house. “Differentiation” in the houses has been much discussed in the work of Monika Trümper. Trümper has recognized that in general there was much more emphasis on display and status and a distinct separation of service/work areas from those of reception. This is in contrast to Classical Greek housing, like that discussed in Chapter III, where there was segregation between reception space and inhabited space and the interior of a house was invisible.

The emphasis on display does resemble the arrangements of Roman houses, suggesting that this particular Roman community on Delos may have had an impact on domestic space. However, I wish to explore in more detail whether this display aspect was universally accepted or if there was significant variation in the accessibility and visibility of these houses. Variation would be logical considering the different cultural backgrounds of the inhabitants of this community who had different understandings of
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348 Trümper 2007, p. 331.
the function of a house. Conversely, display would also provide a means of
demonstrating how one household culturally distinguished itself from another; its
frequency may be the result not of influence of a single culture, but a means of
highlighting the community’s diversity. These questions, furthermore, touch on the much
debated issue of for whom were these houses built and who actually lived in them,
whether merchants, elite families, or their slaves.349

**Layout**

Like Classical Greek houses, the primary courtyard was accessed from the street
usually through a vestibule or long corridor. Occasionally, these courtyards had
peristyles, and in a few instances a second courtyard was incorporated into the house.
*Pastas/prostas* covered areas, common in Classical Greek houses, are very rarely found.
The atrium courtyard which was popular in Southern Italy at this time has not been found
at Delos. Tanks found in the peristyle courtyards of many of these houses have often
been identified as *impluvia*, but these rooms have no other features in common with *atria*
from Italy. In fact, the peristyle courtyard common on Delos appears in Italy in the
imperial period, like in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (Figure 58).

Across the courtyard, opposite the vestibule, was often arranged a group of two to
three reception spaces, one of which was broader than the others. These have been
identified as reception spaces because of their elaborate decorations, such as tessellated
mosaic floors and wall painting. This main room was entered through a centered
doorway and gave access to the other room or two. But, as Trümper points out, these

2007, p. 333.
decorated spaces could also be found wherever there was space; “better an unfavourably positioned luxurious room than none at all.” Reception spaces located deep within the house, like these, were a feature seen in Roman housing, but not Greek.

The service areas of these houses were located at the fringes of these highly-decorated spaces, as far as possible from them and neither visible nor directly accessible from these rooms. They could be at the front of the house near the entrance (Figures 86, 102, and 109), at the corners between the decorated spaces (Figure 75), or in a completely separate wing of the house (Figures 92 and 118). The service rooms included latrines, bathing rooms, store rooms, workshops, and kitchens. The service rooms are distinguishable for their irregular shape, small size, and utilitarian features like waterproof pavements, drains, hearths, bathtubs, and the like. Houses could be two- or three-storied, although very little survives of the upper floors, usually only the staircase and some fallen remains. Some of the staircases are external or separate from the living area of the ground floor indicating that there may be more than one domestic unit in the same building.

Access and Visibility Analysis

Both Trümper and Nevett also identified a lack of control over movement within the houses. To explore this I have selected six examples from different regions of the city which have complete ground floor plans; five of these houses also contained evidence of household religion and will be analyzed in the next two steps of this study.
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350 Trümper 2007, p. 331.
351 Trümper 2007, p. 331.
352 Trümper 2007, p. 323.
353 Trümper 2007, p. 331–332.
354 Trümper 2007, p. 331; Nevett 1999a, pp. 164–166.
The Maison du Q. Tullius Q.f. has been selected for its plan and does not contain evidence for cultic practices within the house.

Looking at the access maps for these selected examples, there is clear variation in control over movement and in accessibility. The Maison du Dionysos (Figure 77) was symmetrically arranged around the courtyard and a little distributive, but the majority of rooms were three spaces deep from the carrier making them asymmetrical to the entrance. This resembles the houses considered from Italy above. However, all of the paths cross through the central courtyard which controls the house. There are two separate entrances into Maison du Dionysos, but both enter the courtyard, as in the example from Olynthos. Off the second entrance was a staircase to another floor and possibly a separate living space.

The Maison de Q. Tullius, on the other hand, has a comparable depth, but was non-distributive. Like the Maison du Dionysos, some rooms of this house were symmetrically arranged around the courtyard but in general the rooms were asymmetrical in relationship to the entrance. This house has a single control space, the Courtyard d (Figure 88), and a single entrance.

The Maison des sceaux has a different and more complex arrangement (Figures 92, 93, and 94). It has been planned as two independent wings which are symmetrical and non-distributive in relationship to each other. Therefore, everyone passing into and out from the house did so through the vestibule, Room η. Each wing, however, was asymmetrical and non-distributive, although the west wing was slightly more symmetrical than the east wing with Courtyard θ controlling access from all these rooms. Furthermore, the vestibule η, controlled access from the carrier space into the two wings.
of the house and between the two wings, but could not control movement within each wing.

The Maison de l’Inopos A had a similar depth of spaces and two different patterns of access and control in its arrangement (Figure 104). It seems that the rooms to the north and west were non-distributive and symmetrical, while those to the south and east were distributive and asymmetrical. The latter could be accessed from outside through a second entrance, Space k’, which communicated with four rooms entirely independent of the rest of the house.

A similar separate suite was also found in Maison des dauphins, however, it is accessible from the main entrance via the vestibule, Room a (Figures 109, 110, and 111). There is also a second entrance into this house, but it accesses the courtyard, Room d. The plan of the Maison des dauphins was shallower than the last two examples, with most of the rooms only two spaces removed from the exterior. This house was symmetrically arranged around the courtyard, but it is also distributive with several well integrated rooms (Figure 111).

The Maison des tritons resembles the plan of the Maison des sceaux with the rooms to the south arranged in a distributive, asymmetrical way, while those to the north and east were more non-distributive and symmetrical in plan (Figures 119 and 120). This south suite, arranged around Space AK’, also had its own separate entrance, and those within this space were able to come and go from the house and between these rooms without accessing the courtyard.

Thus, these houses represent the variation in level of control of movement within the structures. This is also clear when comparing the average RRA for the ground floors
of all these houses (Figure 133). Those of Maisons du Dionysos, de Q. Tullius, de l’Inopos A, and des dauphins are similar, with only slightly higher RRAs for Maisons de l’Inopos A and des dauphins which have multi-room suites almost completely separate from the rest of the house. The averages for Maisons des sceaux and des tritons, however, are significantly higher than the other structures on account of the completely independent wing of the house. Therefore, in some houses there was complete control over the movement of the inhabitants, such as Maison de Q. Tullius, while in others control was limited to only one wing of the house, as with Maisons des sceaux and des tritons. The remaining three houses have plans which vary between these two extremes.

When the functions of these spaces are applied to the results of the spatial analysis, it is clear that the independent suites and wings found in five of these houses were service spaces, while the non-distributive rooms around the courtyards were reception spaces. Therefore, although access for inhabitants in some houses was uncontrolled, the movement of visitors was highly controlled by the courtyard. This would have allowed interactions between visitors and inhabitants to be managed, keeping those in the service areas separate from those in the reception spaces. This supports Trümper’s argument for emphasis on display and segregation of service spaces.

The visibility in these structures further supports these observations. In the case of the Maisons du Dionysos, de Q. Tullius, de l’Inopos A, and des dauphins there was a direct line of sight from the front entrance to the back of the house (Figures 79, 90, 106, 113). In all four of these examples, the room visible at the back was a reception space. Whether there was visibility from the entrance or not, once inside the reception spaces of all four of these examples from Delos, the house appeared open to the visitors’ view.
whose line of sight would have penetrated the length of the house. While the rooms around the courtyard were visible to the visitor, the service spaces were not (Figures 80, 81, 82, 91, 107, and 115). In each house, wherever the service spaces were located, they were invisible from the reception spaces.

The exceptions were the Maisons des sceaux and des tritons. Because of the two independent wings of Maison des sceaux, there was no visibility from the entrance of the structure into the house (Figure 96). Once inside the reception space Room $\xi$, only the two rooms leading to this space were visible, Rooms $\mu$ and $\theta$ (Figure 97). The other rooms around the courtyard were not visually accessible to the guest; similarly, neither were the service spaces in the other wing.

For the Maison des tritons, the courtyard was surrounded by a 1.12m high wall with pillars set on top. While it would seem that this would allow visual access into the doors of the rooms around the courtyard, the shade created by the high parapet, the pillars and the floor above might have obscured this visual access (Figure 123). Therefore, on the visibility diagrams, I have accounted for the wall obscuring the visibility around the courtyard and if it did not. The visibility of the house from the entrance is limited (Figures 123 and 124). It appears that with or without the parapet wall, it would have been possible to see into the back of the house to the north, but it was limited to the courtyard and one of the reception spaces, Room AE. The visibility of this structure resembles that of the first four houses discussed above, where visitors could see through the house. The other reception spaces around the courtyard were not visible. However, from the carrier space it was also possible to see into the service areas of the house along
Spaces AK and AK’. Not all of the service spaces in this area are visible, but the fact that an outsider could see into some of them seems unusual for Delos.

From within the main reception space AE, the parapet and pillars might have continued to block visibility into these eastern rooms, but even without these features, visibility into the service suite to the south was obscured (Figures 125 and 126). Without the impediments in the diagram, there is slight visual access to the reception rooms to the east, but like the other houses in this sample, the service spaces were invisible from the reception space. Thus, Maison des tritons clearly exemplifies the display and segregation of Delian houses; from the entrance one reception space, the courtyard, and the service area are visible, but within the reception space, the service area is invisible and only the spaces intended for visitors could have been seen.

If one looks at the spatial and visual analysis, these houses have sometimes incorporated a level of visibility similar to that of Romano-Italian houses. What is missing from all these examples, however, is the hierarchy of space found in Italian houses. In the Italian examples outsiders could see through the house, but physical access into the deeper rooms of the house was based on their social status and relationship to the family. Moreover, in the Italian houses there was the potential to see certain service spaces as the visitor gained further access into the house. In this sample of Delian houses, once the visitor was inside the courtyard, the spaces intended for visitors were only a single space away. Meanwhile, the service spaces were concentrated into one area, which made it easy to control access between those in the spaces and outsiders, but also made them completely invisible.
It is possible nevertheless that integration of spaces such as went on in the Italian houses also happened on Delos, just not in one of the houses selected for this study. The accessibility and segregation of space resembles the practice of Greek mainland housing, with the spaces for guests easily accessible from the entrance or courtyard and the utilitarian rooms hidden from view. The division of space appears to be related to social status in terms of servant and non-servant rather than family and outsider. However, separation of family and outsider could also have been possible with the arrangements of these houses, if there was a non-servant family unit permanently residing in these houses.

Moreover, access and visibility varied among these Delian houses. Some houses were more visually open and ‘on display’ than others, such as the Maison des dauphins versus the Maison des sceaux. These variations may relate to who commissioned the construction of the house, whether it was an earlier house which was re-inhabited or a new structure of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE. These variations may also be explained in terms of the inhabitants, whether they demonstrated their cultural background through domestic display or through the lack of display. Furthermore, there is a large question whether the permanent residents in some of these houses were in fact the owners or slave agents who maintained the house for the owner to visit.\footnote{Bruneau and Ducat 1983, pp. 22–29; Rauh 1993, p. 231–249; Bruneau \textit{et al.} 1996, pp. 45–50; Trümper 2007, p. 333.} This may explain the strict segregation of the service area in its own wing or section of the house, since it might have been easier on a daily basis to maintain these few rooms and not the entire house. Variation in accessibility and visibility could, therefore, be the result of the variation in the population, not only culturally but also socially.
Construction Materials and Amentities

The houses were constructed of local stone, but no mud brick, up to at least the height of a second floor. They were decorated with plaster or mortar, sometimes painted. Wall painting was of the first style in many houses with a few examples of second style paintings found as well. The floors were decorated with mortar, clay, stone or tile slabs, and pebble, marble-chip or tessellated mosaics. The mosaics ranged from monochrome and simple bi-chrome borders to elaborate polychrome figural or geometric designs. Some of these, such as the Maison des comediens, have a mosaic plan which resembles an andron of the Classical period with an elaborate mosaic decoration in the middle of the floor surrounded on three sides by a plain, wide border for the kline, and a small geometric mosaic in front of the door like a doormat. But, geometric mosaics were also found which covered the floor like a carpet, such as in the Maison des masques, and resembled mosaics in contemporary Italy. Water was scarce on the island and the residences used a system of large cisterns and wells placed under the courtyard to supply them. Therefore, there were no fountains or other running water facilities within private residences.

IV.C: The Evidence of Household Cult

Of the 111 houses found on Delos, Birgit Tang has identified cultic evidence in 41.\textsuperscript{356} Five of the houses discussed above were selected not only because they had evidence of household religion but also because the types of household religious evidence found in them reflect the variety of the types found across Delos. These types include

\textsuperscript{356} Tang 2005, pp. 226–287.
wall paintings and niches, altars, apotropaia, as well as statuette, figurines, and objects related to cult.

**Wall paintings and niches**

From these 41 housing units, Tang has identified 27 with wall paintings associated with religion.\(^{357}\) Many of these have been called shrines to the Lares Compitales,\(^{358}\) making them the oldest known examples of *lararia*. Tang has classed these wall paintings into two groups.\(^{359}\) The first category is scenes of sacrifice with an altar, male figure, either in a toga with his hood up or a himation and wreath, and a servant sacrificing an animal. Sometimes there were games depicted with the prizes to win. The games were often boxing or wrestling. The second category is gods, heroes, or divine attributes, such as the club of Herakles or the caduceus of Hermes. Tang argues convincingly that the sacrificial scenes are related to the cult of the Lares Compitales which is attested in the epigraphic record, while the second category of paintings was related to the other deities also honored by the Compitaliastai.\(^{360}\)

This form of the Lares did not protect the same space as those found in the houses of Roman Italy. The Lares Compitales were protectors of the crossroads, not the household. And, most of the identified shrines from Delos were located just outside the front doors of these houses, at the crossing of two streets or alleys. They appear to have been intended to protect the crossroads and not the houses. Therefore, not all of these painted shrines found on Delos can be used for this study. Only two have been found
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\(^{357}\) Tang 2005, p. 54 and Table 11. Also see Bulard 1926a.
\(^{358}\) Bulard 1926a.
\(^{359}\) Tang 2005, p. 53.
\(^{360}\) Tang 2005, p. 53.
within the household that may be related to the benefit of the inhabitants. Tang also lists two others, but dismisses one as the result of an expansion of the house into the street and the other as too poorly preserved to be securely identified. I, furthermore, will dismiss another of these shrines, that in the Maison de Fourni, because the function of this building is uncertain. The one remaining interior Lares Compitales shrine identified was found in the Maison aux frontons (Figures 131 and 132). This house was not included in the analysis above because it is not well preserved; only five rooms of the ground floor remain with evidence for more spaces above. However, this one shrine, or possibly four shrines, indicates that Roman cult practices were conducted within houses on Delos. Furthermore, the Lares Compitales were distinctly Italian in origin and demonstrate the impact of the Italian community on Delos.

Other wall paintings which may be related to household cult have been found on Delos. In the Maison du Dionysos the wall painting in Room k suggests a household shrine. On two of the blocks from the walls of this room were painted garlands similar to those often associated with household shrines in Italy. In this room were also found two wall niches, but nothing has been mentioned in the publications to associate them with the wall painting.

On Delos, wall niches have often been identified as shrines because of their association with wall paintings. Therefore, I have placed these two forms of evidence together in one category. However, most of those niche-shrines were found outside the
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364 Trümper 1998, pp. 207–208 ; Tang 2005, p. 237. While the five houses which have been analyzed also contain evidence for an upper floor, their ground floor plans are still substantial enough for analysis, which is not the case with Maison aux frontons.
365 Charmonard 1906, p. 549.
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house at compital shrines. All six of the houses discussed above contain wall niches in various rooms of the house, and, except for Maison du Dionysos, nothing in the wall decoration or the finds has linked them with household cults. Those in reception spaces may have had a decorative function, while those in the service areas might have held lamps for lighting.

In addition to these wall niches, free-standing niches, similar to *aediculae*, have also been found. Two were uncovered in the entrance of the Maison des tritons\textsuperscript{367} (Figures 127 and 128). The first was of marble with a pediment carved at the top of it, the second was of poros without any decoration preserved. There is no supporting evidence that these were shrines except their similarity to *aediculae* shrines from Italy and the pedimental decoration on the marble niche invokes the idea of a temple pediment.

**Altars**

Altars also have been found associated with houses from all over the city on Delos; according to Tang’s catalog there are 24 houses with altars. Most of these were outside the front door and part of the compital shrines. However, a few were located within the houses themselves. In the vestibule of Maison du Dionysos, near the entrance to the courtyard, were found marble revetment fragments painted with combat scenes as well as stucco reliefs of boukrania (Figure 83). The excavators reconstructed these fragments into a small altar.\textsuperscript{368} The scene is similar to those of Tang’s first category of sacred wall painting and boukrania are usually found on altars.
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\textsuperscript{368} Chamonard 1906, pp. 531–536.
One such altar with boukrania was found in the courtyard of the Maison de l’Inopos A. \(^{369}\) It was a circular altar measuring 0.55m high and 0.45m in diameter and carved from marble. Another boukrania altar was found \textit{in situ} in the courtyard of Maison des tritons. \(^{370}\) This one was rectangular in shape, measuring 0.645m high, 0.79m long, 0.67m wide on a base 0.875m long and 0.75m wide (Figure 129). This marble altar was placed in front of a niche in the wall of the courtyard, although no finds associate the two features. A second marble altar was also found \textit{in situ} in this courtyard to the south of the rectangular altar (Figure 130). It was a round marble altar placed in the niche created by closing the passageway connecting this house with its neighbor, Maison des comédiens. \(^{371}\)

In addition to these altars from the analyzed houses, an inscribed altar was uncovered in House B of the Peribolos Street. \(^{372}\) The inscription dedicates the altar to Artemis. \(^{373}\) However, only five rooms of this house have been excavated. Therefore, it cannot be used in the next step of this analysis. Another inscribed altar from a household context was found in House III of Îlot des bijoux, but its find spot is unrecorded. The altar was dedicated to Zeus Kynthios in its inscription. \(^{374}\) These two additional examples with their dedicatory inscriptions demonstrate the continuation of traditional Greek deities in household cult.

\(^{369}\) Couvé 1895, p. 476 n. 6, p. 509.
\(^{373}\) \textit{ID} 2370, “Εὔπορος | καὶ Κλεωδίκος | Ἀρτέμις | χαριστήριον”.
Figurines, plaques, and objects associated with deities

In her catalogue Tang records Lares Compitales shrines, altars, and apotropaia which she generally defines as reliefs and mosaic motifs of phalli, symbols of the Dioscouroi and of Herakles, and one sign of Tanit. She has identified eight houses with this category of religious material, a few of which also have compital shrines in front of the house. As mentioned in Chapter II, in Greek tradition the Dioskouroi and Herakles could have been invoked to protect the household, typically at an entrance.

In addition to these I also add depictions or symbols of a deity, such as a terracotta figurine or statuette, herms and hekataia, and objects related to cult practices such as incense burners. I have only included objects which were clearly divine images or have been identified as cultic objects through inscriptions, symbols, or imagery; those too fragmentary to indentify or those without these attributes have been left out. I have also left out all those objects which were not specifically found within a house, so those found in the streets and alleys around houses are excluded. By adding these objects to those identified by Tang, the number of houses with such evidence increases to nineteen.

From each of the five example houses, at least one object from this category of finds has been identified. In the Maison du Dionysos a club of Herakles was carved into one of the wall blocks of Vestibule b, on the wall the space shares with Room n near the entrance to the space (Figure 84). A statuette of Cybele enthroned, similar to those found in Roman Athens and the Piraeus, was also uncovered in the courtyard of the Maison du Dionysos (Figure 85). While there is no corroborating evidence to suggest this statuette was cultic, the similarity between it and those later found in household cult
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contexts in Achaia cannot be ignored. In addition, a statue of Poseidon was also uncovered in the courtyard as well.\(^{377}\) Similarly, in the courtyard of Maison de l’Inopos A, a statuette of Athena enthroned\(^{378}\) (Figure 108), another of Aphrodite loosening her sandal,\(^{379}\) and the head from a terracotta Herakles were found.\(^{380}\)

Meanwhile, in the Maison des sceaux, a columnar marble incense burner was found as well as a terracotta incense burner,\(^{381}\) a votive relief depicting a sacrifice to Artemis,\(^{382}\) and the base for a herm.\(^{383}\) The marble incense burner was inscribed all around with the names of the following deities: Zeus Pasios, Poseidon, Apollo, Herakles, and Artemis\(^{384}\) (Figure 100). Another marble incense burner was also uncovered in the courtyard of the Maison des tritons, but it was not inscribed.\(^{385}\)

As for the relief from Maison des sceaux, the scene depicts two men making a prayer-like gesture towards a circular altar bearing incense (Figure 101). Next to them a smaller figure, likely a servant, leads a pig to the altar. The altar is decorated with boukrania and garlands. On the other side of the altar stands Artemis carrying a torch right while looking over her shoulder at the altar to her left. While the messy slaughter of a pig may not have occurred within the house, it is possible this is a scene from a public sanctuary or shrine brought into the house to augment the smaller, household sacrifices or to recall the piety of the inhabitants in order to bring about the protection of the goddess.

\(^{381}\) Siebert 1988, p. 763.
\(^{382}\) Siebert 1988, p. 765.
\(^{383}\) Siebert 2001, p. 98 and R. XVIII
\(^{384}\) Siebert 1988, pp. 763–765. Incense burner is Delos A7725: “Δι Πασιών | Ποσειδών | Ασφαλείαν | Απόλλονι | Προστάσιμον | Ηρακλέω Αλίσσον”.
The markings of a rectangular bronze pillar remain on the top of the elegantly carved base for a herm that is not preserved (Figures 98 and 99).\(^\text{386}\)

The Maison des dauphins contained the only example not drawn from Greek or Roman cultural backgrounds. The sign of Tanit was rendered in the black and white mosaic of the vestibule of the house. This symbol suggests Carthaginian religious practices (Figures 116 and 117).

Thus, it appears that the deities honored within these houses as well as the forms of the shrines were a mixture of both Greek and western origins. The traditional Greek gods and heroes seem to have been more prominent in household religion than gods from other cultures, including Italy. In addition, there are the examples of Cybele who appears to become a popular household deity in the Roman period in Achaia (see below). Still, there was at least one example of a domestic lararium and the sign of Tanit. From the further evidence found there were also a few examples of Egyptian deities, specifically Isis and Harpocratos. Even if all of these non-Olympian deities were in their Romanized form, all together they number only a handful in comparison to the examples of Herakles, Zeus, Athena, and Hermes.

This does not necessarily mean that the worshippers were all Greek, however, as these deities were also honored in Roman tradition as well. But, the predominance of Olympian deities and heroes is important to note against the observations made about the layout of the houses. The houses in general exhibit an emphasis on display, a behavior associated with Roman cultural identity; however, the deities honored within them and the forms of these shrines, in general, are those of Greek tradition. Therefore, it would seem the inhabitants were attempting to bridge the two identities. The question then is

\(^{386}\) Siebert 2001, p. 98.
whether they were trying to appear Roman and maintain Greek traditions, or to appear Greek using Roman means of identification, or if this display could be a natural development in a culturally diverse community. To address this, the evidence of household religion needs to be analyzed in context.

**IV.D: Household Religion: Cult Evidence in Context**

For most of the Delian houses there were multiple pieces of possible cult evidence scattered around the house. In some cases they were on display in the courtyard or at the entrance to the house. In other cases, they were located in areas not likely to be visited by outsiders. And, in several of the houses, evidence could be found in both display and non-display locations.

From Maison du Dionysos, there were three finds which may have played a role in household religion and were likely used where they were found: the fragments of a wall painting depicting a garland, the fragments of a possible altar, and the club of Herakles on the exterior wall. The remains of the possible altar were found in the entrance between the vestibule and the courtyard; however, which side of the entrance was not recorded. In this location it was likely one of the first things observed from the front door (Figure 79). In both Greek and Roman traditions altars could be located in the courtyard; the fact that it was near the entrance and probably visible from the street may demonstrate the desire to display it and the activities around it, or the need to protect a vulnerable liminal space between the house and the outside world.

More secluded was Room k with the wall painting of a garland. Looking at the visibility diagrams, this room was only slightly visible from the reception spaces (Figures
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80 to 82). It is easily accessible from the courtyard and from Room l, which may have been a reception space (Figure 77). In this position, if there was a shrine in Room k, it was not likely intended to be seen by visitors, but was easily reached by the inhabitants who knew where it was located. The last and only secure piece of evidence for household religion is the apotropaion at the secondary entrance to the house, Room b (Figure 84). It could be seen by those passing the house on the street. In this position, an apotropaion could protect the entrance which was less visible from within the house. If all of these finds were cultic in nature, then in the Maison du Dionysos shrines for protecting liminal spaces like doorways and courtyards were found. If the more speculative evidence is removed, leaving only the club of Herakles this remains still evident. This suggests Greek household cult practices.

Similarly the evidence from Maison des sceaux was divided between liminal and inhabitants’ spaces. The incense burners were found in Room ν, probably fallen from an upper floor as they were found 0.15m above the ground; therefore, they are not helpful in this analysis. The votive relief, on the other hand, may have been found where it was originally located. It was discovered in the northeast corner of Room ω, set against the east wall on top of a pile of ashes.388 As the house was destroyed by fire, it is possible the relief was placed on some kind of wooden support, like a table, which burned causing the relief to fall to the floor. In this location, it was accessible to those in this service area of the house (Figure 94). Room ω was a storage area, as indicated by the pithoi found in it, and the northeast corner of this room was visible from the entrance to Room τ, a work room (Figure 93). If it was a household cult object, as the relief scene suggests, in this

location it seems intended for the inhabitants of the house, mainly the servants, and might also have served to protect the stores and livelihood of the household.

In contrast to these more intimately located elements of cult, the herm was located in the center of Courtyard θ, which was the control space for all of the reception areas (Figure 94). Any visitor entering this space would not only see but have to walk past the herm. In this place, the herm protected the liminal space of the courtyard, but also indicated to visitors that the owner identified with household cult traditions from Greece. This does not mean that they were necessarily Greek in origin, but the use of herms to guard this space would connect the owner with Greek customs and the Greek past giving him certain prestige.

In Maison des tritons, almost all of the finds related to household cult were located in display areas which were also liminal spaces. The first elements encountered were the two niches found near the main entrance to the house. In this location it might be assumed they were compital shrines, however, this entrance was not near a crossroad. The entrance to the house is along an alley; the entrance to the alley would be a more appropriate location for a compital shrine. These niches would have been visible and accessible to outsiders, and accessible to the inhabitants from both the service area and the reception area (Figures 123 to 126). As discussed in Chapter II, in Greek household cult traditions, sometime apotropaic shrines were set up in niches at entrances to protect the household but also to keep pollution from the household away from the community.

In the courtyard of the Maison des tritons there were the two altars placed almost side by side. They were visible from the side through the main entrance to the house and accessible to anyone in the courtyard (Figures 120 and 123 to 126). They were not
directly accessible from the service area, but those moving from there into the rest of the house had to pass by them. Therefore, they seem to reflect an emphasis on display rather than easy access for the inhabitants, similar to Roman traditions. However, located in the courtyard, they may also be interpreted as part of the Greek tradition.

This ambiguity can also be observed in the Maison de l’Inopos A. From this house also came an altar found *in situ* in the courtyard. In this location it would have been visible and accessible to anyone in the household as this was the control space for the house (Figure 104). Those in the service area could also access this space through Room k and would pass by it traveling from the service area to the other spaces of the house. From the vestibule, it would have been one of the first things encountered when a visitor entered the courtyard, but it was not visible from the carrier space (Figure 106). It was placed just outside of the visual range from the main entrance. In this position it was displayed to those invited into the house (Figure 107) and accessible to everyone dwelling within the house, but was not accessible to anyone passing by. Again, the location of this altar next to the main entrance to the courtyard from the street suggests an emphasis on display of the altar and its associated activities, but at the same time protection of the boundary between the house and the outside world.

Unlike the other structures, the Maison des dauphins has only one feature which may relate to household religion. This is the Sign of Tanit mosaic in its vestibule. This was not a centralized shrine, but an apotropaic symbol to protect the household. In this position in the vestibule, it also associated the owner with the western Mediterranean since the symbol was Carthaginian in origin.
This analysis of household cult evidence in context has revealed that the inhabitants typically maintained the Greek tradition of shrines and apotropaia located where they could best help the inhabitants, the house, and the stores. But their houses also reflected an emphasis on display. Through this openness in the household arrangements, the intimate Greek traditions may have ended up on display, whether intentionally or not. In many cases it seems that household cult practices both displayed the inhabitants’ religion and were utilitarian. This may be the result of the inhabitants need or desire to engage in both cultural worlds; to demonstrate Greek practices in a Roman way.

This can be further supported by the location of public compital shrines near the entrances of many houses on Delos. Three houses from this sampling have Lares Compitales shrines near their main entrances: the Maisons du Dionysos, du Q. Tullius, and des dauphins. That in front of the Maison du Dionysos remains as a wall painting only. That before the Maison du Q. Tullius was an unpainted altar; it has been identified by its location. At the Maison des dauphins the main entrance is flanked by two niches with wall painting and two altar bases, although only one altar survives. While not household religion, they do suggest the identification of the inhabitants of the neighborhood, if not the house itself, with the Compitaliastai and Romano-Italian culture. On the visibility diagrams these shrines, since they are not household cult, are indicated by a yellow square (Figures 79, 90, 113). Furthermore, it is interesting to note the combination of compital shrines outside houses with more traditional Greek elements of household religion within the houses.
IV.E: Observations for Delos

Identifying household cult evidence is not an easy task, and neither is interpreting the cultural identity of the inhabitants based on this evidence, especially in a settlement whose indigenous population was replaced by a cosmopolitan trading community composed of other Greeks, Italians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, and others. Yet, the criteria set out in this study to distinguish Greek from Roman cult practices, such as the configuration of space in houses, the selection of deities and cult paraphernalia as well as their position in houses, proved helpful. In combination with a contextual analysis, it revealed new insights.

In terms of the houses, it is perhaps surprising to see that even in a cosmopolitan settlement as on Delos the houses tend to conform to Greco-Roman forms both with respect to housing types and permeability. Compared to earlier Greek houses, the houses on Delos tend to have more and bigger reception spaces and seem to provide more visual access than in earlier Greek housing. These reception spaces occupy a larger portion of the houses than in earlier housing and are placed opposite the main entrance. But, the houses continued to follow earlier Greek patterns of access. Access to most of the reception spaces was directly from the central circulation space, and the movements of a visitor in these spaces could be easily directed and controlled from this single space. Service or utilitarian areas, on the other hand, were segregated so that visitors would not encounter them even visually, except in Maison des tritons where the service area was visibly penetrable from the entrance, but not from the reception spaces.

It seems as though the owners of these houses were trying to participate in practices like those of Roman society through open display, but at the same time to
maintain the invisibility of the daily activities that has been taken to characterize Classical Greek societies. This is not to say that in Roman houses service activities were not also separated from reception spaces, but these activities took place in spaces which could have been visually accessible to visitors as they moved from the entrance of the house to the reception spaces. This was not so in the houses of Delos.

This selective visibility may perhaps be a means of expressing cultural identity although not necessarily that of the Roman, as can be demonstrated with the forms and locations of features related to household cult. In terms of the forms of shrines, although the earliest evidence for lararia has been found on Delos, objects associated with Greek household cult seem to have prevailed, as did Greek deities worshipped. There were a few examples of non-Greek deities and forms of shrines from across the site, such as the one lararium and the deity Tanit, but the majority seem to have come from Greek traditions.

As for location, in many of the houses of Delos there were multiple shrines in different locations throughout the house, an important element of Greek traditions. There were some features, such as the votive relief in Maison des sceaux, that were only accessible to its inhabitants. And, some of these were also placed where they might have protected foodstuffs or the inhabitants’ livelihood. Others which were more visibly positioned, such as the clubs of Herakles, needed to be visible to the outside world in order to fully deploy their protective powers; therefore, their visibility is not for display but for their religious function. Other visually prominent features, like the altars, could be interpreted as displayed but they were also both accessible to the inhabitants and located in a liminal space, like the altar from Olynthos.
Therefore, within the most of the houses either Greek or more ambiguous Greco-Roman practices and cult related features can be observed. This indicates that although the houses were more visually accessible, like in Roman housing, the household religion was either distinctly Greek in nature or cannot be associated specifically with Roman traditions. Thus, the visual openness of the houses cannot be connected with a Roman cultural identity since Roman cultural practices, such as those of household religion, were not identified in these displayed spaces.

To sum up, the inhabitants of Delos did not aspire to be Romans at home, as both Greek and Roman characteristics, and Carthaginian to a certain extent, may be observed in the houses and household cults on Delos. It is tempting to use the concept of cultural indifference that has been coined for Roman Achaia (see Chapter I) to explain the clear continuation and dominance of Greek practices not only in the arrangement of the houses but also in the cults and rituals of the houses. However, I do think that this is too simplistic as it down plays the equally important multicultural nature of the settlement of Delos. I have suggested that the wide spread feature of the visual openness of the household, a Roman characteristic, was widely adopted in houses on Delos in order to display the cultural associations of the inhabitant and his household, whether they were Greek, Roman, or Carthaginian. As mentioned above, maintaining one’s cultural background through religious associations was important to the inhabitants of Delos in the 2nd century BCE. Given the diversity of the community, the likelihood of interacting with those outside one’s association was high.

Furthermore, the majority of the securely located household cult evidence was altars, and neither the altars nor their functional contexts can provide clear evidence for a
specific cultural identity. Therefore, it is possible that the population of Delos was more varied in their household cults and rituals although using more generic forms of shrines and cultic features. More importantly, there is not only evidence on Delos for Greek, Roman, and other household religions and household elements, but also that the different cultural groups used household cults to define their self-images and values. The community of Delos was not only cosmopolitan but also multicultural.

IV.F Expectations for Roman Achaia

In Roman Achaia, I expect the identification of household cult evidence will be equally challenging, but also fruitful. There should also be a variety of responses to the interactions between Greek and Roman cultures. There may be some houses which maintained the traditional invisibility found in early periods, and others which, like those of Delos, incorporated a more open, visually accessible plan, but still controlled physical access for visitors. The household cult features should also reflect this variation, not only in form but also in location and intended audience. Not every city will resemble Delos but, like Delos, we may expect differing domestic expressions of cultural identity as different populations come to live alongside one another.
Chapter V: Case Studies in Roman Achaia

The degree to which the people of the Roman province of Achaia integrated aspects of Roman culture is still debated. While some scholars have argued for the perpetuation of Greek culture with only superficial adoption of Roman public structures and political institutions, other studies of more personal aspects of daily life such as graffiti, onomastics, funerary monuments, and houses have made a strong case for the introduction of aspects associated with Roman culture into all levels of Greek culture.\footnote{Spawforth 1996, pp. 174–175; Millis 2010, pp. 30–3; Rizakis, Zoumbaki, and Kantirea 2004 and 2001; Flämig 2007; Nevett 2002; Papaioannou 2002 and 2007; Bonini 2006.} However, these seemingly contrasting perspectives are not mutually exclusive but demonstrate that some elements of Roman culture seem to have been more fully integrated in Achaia than others. Furthermore, studies like Flämig’s and Papaioannou’s have demonstrated that the type of elements of Roman culture and the degree to which they were integrated also varied among cities within Achaia. Therefore, I discuss in this chapter evidence for household religion in five different cities in Achaia with the idea of tracing levels of cultural interaction in houses, ranging from full incorporation of Roman household religion to a lack thereof. This level of integration of elements of Roman household religion will then be used to gauge the reaction of the inhabitants of the house towards Roman cultural identity; that is, whether they associated themselves with Rome or not, and to what degree.

While studies have already been conducted on the houses of Roman Achaia, they have not considered how the structures, once built, were used. Patterns of behavior are just as important for understanding cultural interaction as the cultural materials
themselves. Household religion is a specific set of behaviors with distinctive physical remains. However, household cults cannot be discussed in isolation to measure the integration of Roman cultural elements. Consequently, special attention will be given on the household level to the construction, layout, and decoration of the houses under discussion and the use of spaces in the house. In terms of the cities under discussion, the discrepant experiences that may have determined the willingness of the community, or at least individuals in the community, to behave like a Roman at home will be considered, including the presence of a large Roman community, the political and historical stature of the site, and preexisting domestic structures.

V.A: Corinth

As the capital city of the province of Achaia, Corinth will be the first city considered in this study. The Roman period at Corinth traditionally begins with the establishment of the colony, Colonia Laus Julia Corinthiensis, by Julius Caesar around 44 BCE, although the Romans were active in Corinthian politics and festivals from much earlier. In 146 BCE, Mummius sacked and burned the city, and subsequently Rome took control of the territory of Corinth, dividing the land up and selling it.

390 My thanks to the staff and scholars of the American School of Classical Studies Corinth Excavations for their assistance with this project and for access to excavation records and materials in the Corinth Museum.
391 Walbanks 1997, pp. 97–98 discusses the evidence for Julius Caesar’s involvement and the date of the re-founding.
392 Wiseman 1979, pp. 450–462; IG IX2 i.241. Embassies were many times sent to Corinth beginning with the Illyrian War in 228 BCE. The literary sources for this period are mainly Polybius and Livy. The former was alive during these events, and even participated in some of them. He wrote his historical work while living in Rome having been sent there as a political hostage. The latter lived nearly a century later at the time of the founding of the colony at Corinth, and relied on Polybius when he wrote his history of the previous century. Thus for this historical overview, they can be relied upon. Polybius 2.2–12, 9.39.1–3, 11.5.1–9, 18.11.1–12.1, 18.44–45; Livy 26.24.7–14, 29.12.8–15, 31.47, 32.3–25, 32.32–40, 33.14–15. Also relevant are Zonaras 8.19; Appian 10.7–8.
393 Walbanks 1997, pp. 95–96 and 99; Strabo 8.6.23; Diodorus Siculus 32.4.5, 32.27.1; Cicero, ad Familiares (from Servius Sulpicius Rufus to Cicero) 4.5.4.
destruction of the city itself was described as a complete obliteration, but this was most likely poetic and rhetorical devices used by ancient authors. The excavations at Corinth have shown that the site continued to be occupied, although significantly reduced in size, and legally and structurally no longer a city.\textsuperscript{394} Little is known about the domestic architecture from this interim period, but it was most likely simple structures of reused materials or renovated buildings.\textsuperscript{395} Therefore, this study considers the establishment of the colony as the beginning chronological limit for Roman Corinthian domestic architecture.

Roman Corinth was initially occupied by colonists from Rome who appear to be mostly freedmen, by Roman businessmen working in the eastern Mediterranean, and by Greeks from the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{396} In two recent studies about the population of early Roman Corinth, Anthony Spawforth and Benjamin Millis have demonstrated through onomastics, epigraphic language, and graffiti that much of the population appears to have had Greek cultural backgrounds, either as former slaves of Greek origin, as prominent local families, or as Roman agents who had been working in the East long enough to assume Greek customs and language.\textsuperscript{397} But many living in Corinth also had Roman names, especially related to elite families in Rome, and used Latin in public and funerary

\textsuperscript{394} Roebuck 1951, pp. 82–84; Williams 1978, pp. 22–23; Williams and Russell 1981, pp. 34–40; Edwards 1981, p. 199; Romano 1994, pp. 57–104; Walbank 1997, p. 97; Romano 2000, pp. 85–88. Cicero also mentioned people living there when he visited as a young man in \textit{Tusculanarum Disputationum} 3.22.53; Wiseman 1979, p. 493 argues that passages from Cicero’s \textit{de Lege Agraria} talking about the fertile land of Corinth indicates that people were still farming this land.

\textsuperscript{395} Millis 2006 addresses the identification of the “miserable huts” located in the area of the forum which had been dated to this intermediate period, but which he argues are more likely to have been from the early colony period.

\textsuperscript{396} Strabo 8.6.20–23, 17.3.15; Pausanias 2.1.2; Appian 8.136; Wiseman 1979, p. 497; Engles 1990, pp. 66–71; Walbank 1997, pp. 97–99; Romano 2000, pp. 101–103; B. Millis (pers. comm.); Millis 2010, pp. 13–35.

Millis argues that funerary inscriptions were intended to be public displays as well, and, therefore, he turns to graffiti from walls, furnishings and pottery, among which Greek outnumbered Latin 25:1. This indicates that in their personal lives, the inhabitants of Roman Corinth identified themselves with Greek culture. According to Millis, this is not to suggest that the Greek population adopted a veneer of Roman culture, but that the population of Roman Corinth “was composed of a group which was able to maneuver effectively in both the Greek and Roman worlds…adjusting to the context and to what was most appropriate or expedient in any given circumstance.” Still, important for my study is the suggestion that many chose Greek language and customs for their personal lives, but were able to participate in Roman customs as well.

After the colony was established, Corinth sided with Octavian in 31 BCE and was rewarded in 27 BCE when he made it the capital of the new province of Achaia. This meant Roman officials would have been established in the city as well to protect imperial interests. According to Spawforth and Millis’s studies, these were likely freedmen from prominent families in Rome. The city appears to have prospered during the subsequent periods owing to its two ports and its administrative status. Evidence for this can be seen in the numerous building and restoration projects at the city’s civic center, in the large, opulent houses which have been uncovered in and around Corinth, and in the establishment or re-establishment of the many sanctuaries and the

---

398 For more on funerary monuments, see Flämig 2007, esp. pp. 158–166, no. 41–55.
401 Millis 2010, p. 31.
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Isthmian Games. The excavations at Corinth have demonstrated that the colonists restored several cults of the Classical and Hellenistic city at the same sites they occupied before, most notably Demeter and Kore on the slopes of Acrocorinth, Apollo on Temple Hill, Aphrodite on Acrocorinth, Asklepios just outside the city walls, and Poseidon at Isthmia. Dirk Steuernagel has proposed that this was a way for the local elite to recall their Hellenic past. But, the archaeological evidence also makes clear that in the restored sanctuaries, the practices of these cults were changed. Furthermore, they added new public cults important for a Roman colony such as Venus, Hermes, Klarion Apollo, the Capitoline Triad, and the Imperial Cult. Here, in the sphere of civic religion and public cults, again, there was a clear combination of Greek and Roman traditions as observed in the language and names of the population.

Under the Flavians, the colony was re-founded Colonia Julia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis in order to re-divide and redistribute the land possibly to accommodate a larger population than originally expected and to extract more taxes. During the reign of Hadrian, it appears there was much building activity and renovation in the domestic spaces of Corinth. There are several theories as to why this happened. One obvious possibility is related to this new division of land. Another factor may have been a destructive earthquake which damaged many buildings, as Charles Williams suggests, or a sudden economic boost which several scholars have observed across the province. It may also have been related to the new aqueduct built by Hadrian making water from
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Lake Stymphalos available for private use, which Papaioannou also points out.\footnote{Papaioannou 2002, p. 98.} Regardless of the cause, this sudden development in domestic construction provides a subdivision within the Roman period. And it is from this period, roughly the late 1\textsuperscript{st} to 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE, that most of the evidence for this study dates.

Finally, many houses appear to have been abandoned and destroyed some time in the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} or early 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE. Traditionally it is thought that this abandonment is the result of the invasion of the Herulians around 267 CE; however, there is no evidence for this.\footnote{Wiseman 1979, p. 508.} Williams has suggested that there was a massive earthquake at the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE which may have been responsible for much of the damage.\footnote{Williams and Zervos 1982, p. 118; Williams and Zervos 1987a, pp. 22–23.} Alcock has demonstrated that there was an economic decline and settlement restructuring across Greece at this time;\footnote{Alcock 1993, pp. 217–220.} it is possible that hard economic times led to the abandonment of some houses and the lack of resources to rebuild after a disaster such as a fire or earthquake. There were still individuals living and working in Corinth in the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century and onward, but there was less building and renovation; therefore, the period of the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} to 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE serves as the chronological end point for this study.

V.A.1: The Houses

Most of the houses remaining at Corinth were inhabited from the late 1\textsuperscript{st} to the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE. There are two structures which securely date to the beginning of the colony found in the forum area, CORIN014\footnote{The identification numbers are composed of the first five letters of the name of the site followed by a three digit number. See Appendix A for the more commonly known names and a short bibliography for each of these houses.}, and under CORIN001 in Panayia.
Field, CORIN002. Earlier structures in general were probably either demolished and removed to make way for the newer constructions or were built into the later houses. This is demonstrated by the fact that many of the late 1st and 2nd centuries CE structures sit directly on bedrock or prehistoric remains, such as CORIN005 and CORIN003, and that others, like CORIN001, incorporated and covered over early Roman period buildings. The remains of fourteen domestic structures are currently known, having been excavated by the American School of Classical Studies and the Greek Archaeological Service. These can be found in Appendix A under CORIN001 through CORIN014. I have also added CORIN015 to the catalogue for Corinth which will be part of the discussion about household religion, but was not a domestic structure. The houses, in general, are not concentrated in a specific area of the excavated site, ranging from nearby the ancient city center to along the road to Lechaion, and from Anaploga region in the west to the vicinity of Nea Korinthos in the northeast (Figure 134). They vary in size and status from villa urbana to units of two to four rooms.

In addition to these structures, in the following analysis I have also taken into consideration houses from the surrounding Corinthia region. Four examples have been uncovered from Kenchreai (KENCH001 through KENCH004) which date from the 1st through 4th centuries CE and beyond, and two from Stymphalos (STYMP001 and STYMP002) which date from the late 1st century BCE to the mid-1st century CE. Both of these sites had strong connections with Corinth and will help to create a well-rounded sampling. Excavations at Stymphalos have revealed that although the city suffered partial destruction and abandonment in the mid-2nd century BCE, around the time of
Mummius at Corinth, it was re-inhabited in the mid-1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE.\textsuperscript{416} The excavators suspect this is related to the re-founding of Corinth nearby,\textsuperscript{417} although they do not suggest who was living there. The two houses uncovered at the site were destroyed and abandoned suddenly in the mid-1\textsuperscript{st} century CE, possibly by an earthquake.\textsuperscript{418} This means that these two structures, along with the one from Corinth, will inform our understanding of the early Roman period housing in the Corinthia. Kenchreai, on the other hand, while there is evidence for a small community there in the Hellenistic period, the port was founded by the Romans.\textsuperscript{419} Its population was extremely diverse, composed of eastern and western traders and immigrants as well as individuals from Corinth with mercantile interests.\textsuperscript{420} The four houses from Kenchreai are contemporary with the majority of structures from Corinth, but only one, KENCH001, has been fully published. Its phases 5-7 are contemporary with the houses from Corinth and will provide a further example for understanding planning and accessibility.

Access and Visibility Analysis

Three houses in the Corinthia region have been uncovered from the early Roman period, roughly the mid-1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE to the late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE. From Corinth, CORIN014, also called the Roman Cellar Building, is composed of four rooms with a wide entrance way from the street (Figure 165). This structure lacked a courtyard, but had a large cellar space with two wells and much storage space. There is easy physical

\textsuperscript{416} Williams \textit{et al.} 2002, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{417} Williams \textit{et al.} 2002, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{419} Rife 2010, pp. 396–400.
\textsuperscript{420} Rife \textit{et al.} 2007 is a population study using the cemeteries found there. The diversity of this population is also alluded to in reference to the cults found at Kenchreai in Rife 2010, pp. 431–432.
access from the street into any of the three rooms on the ground floor. This structure has too few rooms for a meaningful access analysis. Visually, however, one could look from the street into Room 3, with the stairwell to the basement, but Room 2 is more obscured (Figure 166). The evidence from this structure suggests a combination of work or commercial space with living quarters and likely no accommodations for entertaining guests.

At Stymphalos, both houses STYMP001 and STYMP002 were arranged around a courtyard (Figure 181 and 187), but only STYMP001 is preserved enough to make a meaningful access analysis. The overall arrangement of STYMP001 was asymmetrical and distributive with most of its rooms three spaces from the carrier point, but up to five spaces deep (Figures 182 and 183). The arrangement of STYMP002 may have been more non-distributive, but it is difficult to say without its entrance or other rooms (Figure 188). STYMP001 does not resemble the Greek houses studied in Chapter III, although its RRA is comparable with Olynthos and Halieis (Figure 189), but instead those of Delos. In addition to the depth and distributiveness, this similarity is because there appear to be two different access patterns in this structure. The three rooms in the northwest corner of the courtyard, opposite the two entrances, were arranged more symmetrical, non-distributive, and shallow with easy access from the courtyard. Those rooms to the east, which were around the entrances, were distributive and asymmetrical. This similarity may be because the house had been originally constructed in the Hellenistic period and was reoccupied in the mid-1st century BCE. However, the reuse of structures is reflective of the types of housing found at the beginning of the Roman period.
Unlike in the Delian examples, rooms around the courtyard are not visually accessible from the outside (Figures 184 and 185). There is a long narrow corridor which looks into the side of the courtyard, and possibly into the side of Room 6, but not into the middle of the spaces where the activities of these rooms would be most prominent. Even from the secondary entrance, visibility is obscured by the wall dividing Rooms 12 and 13 from Rooms 10 and 11. Reception space within this house has not been identified; however, the entrance to Room 3 from the courtyard may have had columns in antis as well as a cobbled floor and traces of red plaster.421 It is possible this was used for outsiders and, therefore, I used this space to examine the interior visibility. From within this possible reception space, visibility was still limited to the courtyard of the house and Room 4 (Figure 186). Rooms 6 through 8 and 10 through 13 remained invisible along all visual axes. Therefore, although this house in plan resembles the houses of Delos, the position of the doorways made it more visually restrictive like its mainland predecessors.

As for the eleven later houses in this sample, these were arranged around a central court, sometimes an open or colonnaded courtyard (CORIN001, CORIN005, and KENCH001) but more often an atrium style space (CORIN001, CORIN007, CORIN008, and CORIN009). None of these houses are fully preserved in plan (Figures 135, 140, 141, 142, 147, 152, 154, 161, 164, and 177), but enough of CORIN007 and CORIN008 have been found to construct a justified access map (Figures 143 and 148). In terms of accessibility and planning, both of these houses were asymmetrically arranged and distributive, like STYMP001. CORIN007 had two entrances and CORIN008 may have had two, although on the justified access map space 5 has been treated as part of the structure and not an outside space. Similarly, the western rooms of KENCH001 were

421 Williams et al. 1998, pp. 270–274.
also arranged asymmetrically, but were non-distributive with a specific path from the entrance through the spaces of this wing (Figure 178). In terms of RRA, CORIN007 and CORIN008 are more comparable with Maison des tritons and Maison des sceaux than any of the other earlier examples (Figure 189). These two Delian houses were the least accessible of the houses discussed in Chapters IV, owing to their completely separate areas of activity, much like in CORIN007. Such a segregation of spaces would have made dividing visitors from inhabitants and controlling their interactions possible, as would be expected in a Greek house.

Although the two houses from Corinth may have had multiple entrances and distributive arrangements like Roman houses, they lack the axial arrangement of rooms which would allow direct visual access from the main entrance into the house beyond one or two reception spaces (Figures 145 and 150). Instead, the plans are more visually restrictive to reception spaces, even within these spaces themselves. From within the reception space of CORIN007 there is almost nothing of the rest of the house visible from either of the two entrances to this room (Figure 146). As for CORIN008, none of the rooms have been identified as reception spaces; therefore, I considered the atrium for a space in which the inhabitants and visitors would have interacted. From this location as well, there is almost no visibility into the rest of the house (Figure 151). This is completely unlike the visibility patterns in the houses of Italy or Delos, but more akin those of pre-Roman Greece. In KENCH001, visibility from outside the house was restricted as well (Figure 179), but within the reception space of this west wing, most of the wing was visible (Figure 180). This wing, however, does not seem to have allowed
visual access into the rest of the house, and thus corresponds with the observations made in CORIN007 and CORIN008.

In terms of behavior, visitors were restricted, even visually, to the main hub of the house and kept away from the inhabitants’ activities. Furthermore, the inhabitants could not have easily accessed the visitors in reception spaces without having to pass through the courtyard, but there appears to have been less of an emphasis on controlling their behavior from this single vantage point. This is indicated by the fact that while the plans of the structures demonstrated independent mobility for the inhabitants as in Roman housing, there was still much control over their interaction with visitors; something similar to Greek housing. Thus, in plan, accessibility, and visibility, Corinthian housing reflects similar findings to that of Millis and Spawforth’s population studies; that is, the population could participate in both Greek and Roman customs, but seem to favor Greek customs at home.

This, of course, is a very small sample of near complete houses. It is possible these three houses and the other three early Roman houses are not indicative of the typical Roman Corinthian house. However, given the similarities in access and visibility between the early Roman period examples and those of the high Roman period, and between the well-decorated house of CORIN007 and the less wealthy looking house STYMP001, it seems logical to suggest that other houses from Corinth had similar arrangements, access for visitors, and visibility for outsiders and guests.
Construction Materials and Features

Previous studies of the domestic architecture at Corinth and its decoration have revealed elements of western influence. In general, these buildings were constructed of local stone and mud brick, as were the structures at Stymphalos. CORIN010, which was constructed of various stones with mud brick superstructure, also had shared façade with CORIN015 which used *opus quadratum* in its foundation and *opus reticulatum* of rubble, brick and cement for the lower walls with mud brick for superstructure. In addition, the party wall of these two buildings was of *opus africanum* and their roof tiles found in the destruction debris are Roman Lakonian tiles of a type common in Sicily. However, the façade wall mirrored that of the side of the theater across the street from it and these buildings were part of a larger industrial and commercial district.

Therefore, CORIN010 represents a different type of housing from the others known from contemporary Corinth and may be an example of apartment style or rental housing for shop keepers or those of the less affluent classes. However, the use of brick for domestic structures is not completely unknown in this region. KENCH001 was built almost entirely of brick around a rubble and mortar core.

Many of the dwellings were decorated with wall paintings some of which resembled Pompeian Third Style painting. In the more opulent ones was also found marble revetments on the walls (Appendix D) and *opus sectile* on the floors (Appendix C), forms of decoration which are reserved for the wealthiest homes in Roman Italy from

---

424 Another structure from this category is CORIN014, but it is from the beginning of the colony and built of poros blocks, rubble and mortar.
425 Scranton Shaw, and Ibrahim 1978, p. 82.
426 Lepinski 2008; Gadberry 1993.
the late 1st century CE onward. Most also contained mosaics which Waywell has argued reflect trends in the Mediterranean region, although developing more slowly than elsewhere. In addition to mosaics, floors of tile, stone, cobbles, pebbles, plaster or lime, and dirt have also been found (Appendix C). Additional adornments included marble thresholds, bath complexes, fountains, gardens, decorative sculpture and columns (Appendix E). Private baths, fountains, and interior gardens indicate the presence of running water in the houses, another element associated with Roman influence (Appendix E). Thus, the houses exhibit some elements which were made possible by the Roman aqueduct, but the floors and walls were decorated in styles common in that region at the time regardless of any direct connection with Roman.

In conclusion, direct Roman cultural influence may be seen in the incorporation of atrium-like rooms and water features; however, the arrangement of the structures is more reminiscent of Delian houses of the Hellenistic period and the visibility resembles that of pre-Roman Greece. Since the owners of these houses chose to display Roman decorative features, but to arrange and use the houses in accord with Greek customs, I would expect that the household shrines follow a similar pattern. A few might appear Roman in form but for the most part followed Greek traditions of location, deities, and intended users.

V.A.2: Evidence of Household Cult

From the fourteen houses found at Roman Corinth, five have evidence for domestic cult activities. These are CORIN010, CORIN011, CORIN001, CORIN002 and

---

427 Fant 2007, p. 340. According to Clarke solid panels of marble reflects the decorative style of the Severan period (Clarke 1991, p. 346), but it was still rare.
428 Waywell 1979, p. 321.
CORIN006. None of the houses from Stymphalos have evidence, but KENCH001 may have some evidence. The types of evidence identified at Corinth are potential cult rooms or *sacella*, wall paintings, hearths, altars, votive or foundation deposits, and figurines or lamps with images of or related to deities. In addition to these five dwellings, CORIN015 has evidence of being a communal “household” *sacellum*, comparable with such structures from contemporary Ostia. Niches and (pseudo-) *aediculae* have not been identified in domestic spaces, but may be suggested by some of the evidence.

**Cult Rooms or Sacella**

There are two potential cult rooms found within these Roman Corinthian houses. In CORIN006, the excavators uncovered a room which they identified as a cult room, possibly with wall painting. The finds from this room included a poros stone altar, terracotta figurines and twelve terracotta masks. These finds are highly suggestive of cult activities, and if this was indeed a private house, than it is possible to interpret this as a cult room or *sacellum*. While not a typical form of shrine, these cult rooms were not unusual in houses of Pompeii and Ostia. Furthermore, although we do not know who the figurines depicted, the presence of masks calls to mind the cult room from the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii and the Dionysiac Mysteries. Still, without more information, this identification depends completely on the interpretation of the excavators.

---

429 TAPA 1997, p. 70.
430 TAPA 1997, p. 70.
431 The description of this structure is very brief and does not include the finds from the rest of the building. The identification of this as a house appears to be based on the presence of an atrium-looking room.
432 Casa degli Amorini Dorati (VI, xvi, 37), Domus Popidi Prisci (VII, ii, 20) and the Casa di Giuseppe II (VIII, ii, 39) in Pompeii dated to the 1st century CE and Domus del Protiro (V, ii, 4-5) from Ostia dated to the 3rd CE.
The other possible cult room was found in CORIN001, in the smallest of the rooms uncovered, Room A9, located to the north of the atrium, Room A2, and to the west of the fountain room, Room A8 (Figures 135). It is uncertain how it was accessed from the surrounding rooms as the walls were robbed out and the room was located on the edge of the excavated area. Fragments of wall painting were found in the destruction debris of the room and have been reconstructed and studied by Sarah Lepinski.\(^{433}\) Room A9 was decorated with floral and possibly swag motifs. The large floral frieze was of wide red, white and pale-yellow bands with red round flowers, probably poppies, woven among green and yellow leaves on a white ground. And, the possible swags were thick red garlands with green leaves and yellow ribbons on a white ground. As mentioned earlier, red flowers, ribbons, and garlands are all common elements in painted lararia.\(^{434}\)

Furthermore, one section of the fresco fragments found preserves a corner which may have gone around an architectural feature from the room, such as a window, bench or niche.\(^{435}\) Additionally, Lepinski has noted that the wall painting in this room was done differently from that of the rest of the house in a “quick and sketchy” manner;\(^{436}\) still, the type of plaster used is similar to the other painted plaster found in the house.\(^{437}\)

Along with the suggestive decoration, the room held nine marble statuettes of deities fallen on the floor before the east wall of the room (Figure 137). According to Lea Stirling, the condition of the statuettes indicates they were cared for right up until their deposition;\(^{438}\) that is, they were found broken but complete in a layer of wall plaster,

\(^{433}\) Lepinski 2008, pp. 72–73 and pp. 78–79.
\(^{434}\) Boyce 1937, pp. 11–12.
\(^{435}\) Lepinski 2008, p. 73.
\(^{436}\) Lepinski 2008, p. 73.
\(^{437}\) S. Lepinski (pers. comm.).
fresco and burned roof tile. All the pieces which are missing can be explained, either because they were made from wood, were removed or, in the case of one Artemis, lost in a robber’s trench. The figures include two of Artemis, a Roma, a Europa/Sosandra, a Pan, a Herakles, a Dionysus, and two of Asklepios. Stylistically, they range in date from the late 1st to the mid-3rd or early 4th centuries CE and may represent a collection maintained by generations of a family of worshipers. This is supported by the presence of duplicate images of Artemis and Asklepios; multiple versions of the same deity have been found in lararia in Italy and in lararial caches from Germany. The decoration and the sculptures together led Sterling and Lepinski to suggest that this room may have been a sacellum. Given the similarity between the decorations of this room with sacella from Ostia and Pompeii and the lararium-like cache of statuettes, this is plausible.

CORIN015 contains a third potential cult room at Corinth, although it was not a domestic structure. Williams has suggested this structure may have been intended to serve as a shrine for those living in the immediate area, as one observes in courtyards and corridors of contemporary apartment buildings at Ostia; these examples from Ostia were used in lieu of individual household shrines for renters who could not alter their rented spaces to accommodate a shrine. The Corinthian shrine was composed of two rooms, Rooms 1 and 2 (Figure 167), located immediately to the south of CORIN010.

---

442 Stirling 2008, p. 130; Lepinski 2008, p. 78.
443 Williams 2005, pp. 243–247: In the final phase of the building, the exterior door to Room 1 acquired a door or doors and the entrance to Room 2 was blocked. The room was turned over to industrial or commercial activities with a press, a hearth, and storage pithoi (Williams 2005, p. 242), and the shrine may have been reduced to Room 1 (Williams 2005, pp. 240–242).
Both CORIN010 and CORIN015 share the same chronology and similar construction techniques. Debris found in the excavated rooms of CORIN015 also indicated that there was a second floor to the building. Therefore, there were other activities within the same structure surrounding the shrine, likely commercial and possibly also poorer class housing.446 Room 1 of the structure was entered through a wide, distyle entrance off of the alley to the east of the building. Immediately to the right, opposite the entrance, was a niche in the west wall of the room cutting into the jamb of the doorway between Room 1 and 2 (Figure 169). The niche (0.52m high, 0.37-0.38m wide, and 0.12m deep) was arcuated and framed with a plaster moulding. Between the moulded-frame and the side wall of the niche was painted a red band. Inside the niche was plastered white and painted with flowers, swags and ribbons.

The floor of the niche was flat and projected out past the surface of the wall and the frame. This niche appears to have had all the elements mentioned by Boyce as being indicative of a niche *lararium*: flowers, swag, ribbon, the colors, the floor, the arched top, the moulded frame.447 Unfortunately, the objects that would have been placed in this niche are not preserved, but given how closely it resembles parallels in Italy, it is possible it was a *lararium*-like shrine. A terracotta rattle in the shape of a dog was found on the floor immediately below the niche and may have come from it (Figure 170).

Another wide doorway, this time without columns, led to Room 2, which was significantly bigger than Room 1 and was the main room of the structure. Its walls were decorated with frescos with white ground divided into panels by fine red bands and Corinthian columns on a red background (Figure 168). On the door jambs were painted
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446 I.e., the shopkeeper or his slaves could have slept on the floor of the commercial spaces or on the second floor.
447 Boyce 1937, pp. 10–12.
various birds and in each of the panels on the walls a figure of a deity. On the north wall
was painted Herakles, Demeter/Hera/Amphitrite, Zeus/Poseidon, and Athena. A standing
figure in a tunic, possibly Artemis or Anteros, was found on the east wall. And, on the
south wall were two Erotes and Aphrodite. Below the figure on the east wall was the
graffito “ΑΝΤΕΡΩΣ”. The west wall was cannibalized for building materials and any
figures depicted there are now lost. The excavators place these frescos in the first phase
of the room, dated by Laura Gadbery to the end of the 2nd CE.448

Williams has hypothesized that Rooms 1 and 2 formed a neighborhood shrine to
Aphrodite.449 To support this he mentions first that the niche in Room 1 was decorated
with roses, which were significant for Aphrodite.450 Second, the depiction of Aphrodite
on the wall of Room 2, that of Aphrodite Hoplismene, is particular to Corinth with her
sanctuary on Acrocorinth.451 In addition, her flesh was highlighted with gold-leaf, unlike
the other divine figures452 and the graffito “ΑΝΤΕΡΩΣ” may be referencing a son of
Aphrodite.453 Furthermore, a life-size statue of Aphrodite was found in the street outside
CORIN015. It was reused in the building of a later wall along the street after CORIN015
went out of use. Williams suggests that such a large and heavy statue would not have
been moved very far from its original position and replaces it in this room.454 And
finally, Aphrodite was prominent in the figurines found in CORIN010 and in Buildings 1
and 3 below the terrace wall on which CORIN010 and CORIN015 are found.455 Also
recurrent were Cybele and Isis, both of which were often connected with Aphrodite.

450 Williams 2005, p. 236.
452 Williams 2005, p. 237.
453 Williams and Zervos 1988, p. 130.
Thus, this space may have been a *sacellum*, probably for the surrounding dwellings similar to the Sacello del Silvane at Ostia used by those living and working in the Caseggiato di Diana and Caseggiato dei Molini (dated late 2nd to 3rd CE).

At Ostia, some apartment buildings and complexes had a communal domestic shrine in a central, communal space such as a courtyard or corridor to serve all the residents of the neighborhood. I would like to suggest that this was a possibility from CORIN015, however, the key deities for such shrines, the Lares and the Genius, were lacking. It is possible they were depicted on the now lost west wall or were represented in another way, such as in the niche at the entrance. The *sacellum* from Casa degli Amorini Dorati discussed in Chapter III also depicted a specific collection of deities without the traditional Roman household gods, but there was also a *lararium* located nearby which included the Lares. Looking at traditions of earlier periods in Greece, Aphrodite in her own right was an important deity to the household as a protectress of fertility, marriage, children, and wives, and may continue to be so here. Her Roman equivalent is also important in the Roman world not only in similar capacities but also as the patroness of the Julian family. However, as Williams has discussed, this particular Aphrodite depiction, Aphrodite Hoplismene, is specific to Corinth in the pre-Roman period. Even if this structure was not a communal household shrine, it does appear to indicate at least a neighborhood affinity for traditional Corinthian deities rather than imported ones.

---

456 Bakker 1994, p. 54: Insula dei Dipinti (I, iv, 4) and Casseagggiato degli Aurighi (III, x, 1) both have pseudo-edicula in a central communal area, the former in a garden and the latter in a corridor of the upper floor. Both examples date to the late 2nd or early 3rd centuries CE.
Wall Painted Shrines

There is only one dwelling at Corinth with a potential wall painting shrine, CORIN010. The excavators have not identified this structure specifically as a domestic space; however, there was a significant amount of domestic pottery found in the second phase of this building and a hearth from the third and fourth phases.\footnote{Williams 2005, p. 227 and p. 230; Williams and Zervos 1986, p. 154.} There was also a tiled work surface with an associated terracotta pipe built against the west wall of Room 3 from early on in the building and a large storage pithos was installed in the floor of Room 4 by the third phase. Considering the location of the building in a commercial area and the access from East Theater Street, it is possible that this building served as both domestic and commercial with the shopkeepers or their slaves living as well as working there, such as contemporary buildings from Ostia and from early imperial Pompeii.\footnote{For example Buildings III, vi, 3 and I, IX, 1 dated to Hadrianic period from Ostia and Buildings IX, 1, 4 and IX, 1, 27 dated to the 1st century CE from Pompeii.} The building was destroyed at the end of this phase by a massive earthquake and was abandoned.\footnote{Williams 2005, p. 243.}

The evidence for the wall painted shrine can be found in Room 3. The walls of this room in the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} to early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE phase\footnote{Williams 1987a pp. 27–28.} were decorated with white fresco background with swags of greenery and fruit tied with red and ochre ribbons. Also, from this room came fresco fragments with a yellow background depicting small images of Hermes, Herakles and a Lar.\footnote{These fragments are unpublished and I am most thankful to Mr. Williams for his permission to mention them in my study.} These Williams restores as a wall painted shrine or lararium possibly from a niche on the lower course of the east wall to the right of the...
doorway (Figure 155);\textsuperscript{464} however, there is no evidence for such a niche remaining. Such deities would have been typical in \textit{lararia} from Italy,\textsuperscript{465} although the two Lares were usually depicted along with a Genius. We do not have all of the painting fragments and it is possible if this was a \textit{lararium}, the other Lar and Genius are missing. In the same room was located a hearth at the center of the south wall and an Aeolic column capital in marble\textsuperscript{466} of a size and scale comparable with those used on (pseudo-) \textit{aediculae} or an aediculated niche in Campania and Ostia. Williams suggests it may have come from such a shrine, or else it is possible that it came from a window or piece of furniture.\textsuperscript{467} He, thus, reconstructs a shrine on the east wall\textsuperscript{468} with the figures painted within the space marked by the capital, whether an aediculated niche or an \textit{aedicula}. It is also possible that it was simply a wall painted shrine with the column capital or other portable element serving as an altar.

**Hearths**

Although there are fourteen houses known at Corinth, only two of them contain hearths. No braziers were identified in the excavations in the Roman levels, which would have been the logical alternative to permanent hearths.\textsuperscript{469} The two hearths which do survive in domestic contexts are found in the CORIN002 and CORIN010. The hearth of CORIN002 was found in Room B13 and was semi-circular in shape and lined with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{464} Williams 2005, pp. 234–235; C.K. Williams (pers. comm.).
\item \textsuperscript{465} Boyce 1937, p. 102, pp. 104–105, and pp. 106–107; Boyce identified 13 depictions of Hercules, 20 of Mercury, and 66 of Lares from Pompeii, however this material is a century older than that at Corinth. Bakker 1994, pp. 92–93: At Ostia, the only depictions of these deities come from commercial contexts, but they are attested to in private shrines from these location which are contemporary with the evidence from Corinth.
\item \textsuperscript{466} A-1986-5.
\item \textsuperscript{467} Williams 2005, pp. 234–235.
\item \textsuperscript{468} Williams 2005, p. 234; C.K. Williams (pers. comm.).
\item \textsuperscript{469} Tsakirgis 2007, pp. 225–231.
\end{itemize}
tile.\textsuperscript{470} It was placed against the east wall of the room, which was subsequently robbed out. The finds related with the floor associated with the hearth and those under the floor date to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, indicating its final usage. No votive offering was found with this hearth, but in both Roman and Greek practices, the hearth could have been honored as the embodiment of Vesta or Hestia.

The second hearth, from CORIN010, was located in Room 3, near the wall painting discussed above, and dated to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE. The hearth was rectangular with a thick bed of gravel/crushed stone for holding heat, a common technique found in Campania, according to Williams.\textsuperscript{471} The hearth was replaced without a curb\textsuperscript{472} in the final phase of the structure, along with the floor in a later renovation. In this later phase, figurines and lamps depicting Aphrodite, two seated dogs, Athena, Cybele, and boats specific to Isis cult were found on the associated floor (Figures 157 to 160). It is possible they were connected with the potential wall painted shrine or with the hearth; in the latter case they support the identification of the hearth as part of household cult practices.

\textbf{Altars}

Two altars are known from domestic contexts at Corinth; one from CORIN006 and one from CORIN011. In addition to these two I add the Aeolic capital found in CORIN010, which might have been used as an altar. The altar from CORIN006 was made of poros stone, but the publications do not describe it further. The other altar from CORIN011 is a rectangular limestone altar with a flat top on which are signs of

\textsuperscript{470} G.D.R. Sanders (pers. comm.).
\textsuperscript{471} Williams and Zervos 1986, p. 154.
\textsuperscript{472} Williams 2005, p. 230.
burning\textsuperscript{473} (Figure 162). It is decorated with a moulding around its base and on the face are horns carved in the corners over a triangular pediment. It was found reused in the foundation of a basin placed in the same room with a 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE mosaic. It cannot be said for sure if the altar comes from this house and where in the house it was used. However, it is a monolithic limestone block measuring 0.77-0.68m in height and 0.37m in width; it is, therefore, large enough that it would have been difficult to carry very far to be reused in the basin.\textsuperscript{474} The altar itself was decorated in a way not specific to either Greek or Roman traditions. Its large size is more comparable with altars from public cults rather than private, but it was crudely cut with simple decoration from poor quality stone, all of which suggest it was not from a public shrine. It might reflect the homeowner’s attempt at conspicuous consumption and/or a larger group of worshippers, such as might have inhabited a substantial villa and work in its commercial space. An example of a large, private rectangular altar can be found in the Domus di Giove Fulminatore (IV, iv, 3) at Ostia.\textsuperscript{475} This altar measures 0.57m in height, 0.43m in width, and 0.39m in depth and is dedicated to Jupiter the Thunderer.

Given the lack of altars found in primary contexts at Corinth, it will be useful at this time to also consider altars from secondary contexts such as wells and walls. Although we cannot say whether these are definitively from domestic contexts, they can provide a clearer sense of what such altars from Corinth could have looked like. According to the catalogued objects in the museum, there are 13 small altars, or

\textsuperscript{473} A-1982-2.
\textsuperscript{474} In fact, the altar was left on the site and not taken to the museum for storage.
fragments of them, dated to the Roman period. They were found in secondary contexts from the area to the east of the theater, in the southwest area of the Forum, from a modern house wall, from the area of Anaploga, and in the area south of Oakley House; all of these locations were residential areas in the Roman period. Most of the altars are rectangular in shape, but four are cylindrical and one is conical. The conical shape suggests to me the Greek cult of Apollo Agyieus, whose conical altars were placed outside the main entrance of a house as protection. Ten are made from limestone, one with stucco preserved on it, and three are of white marble. When the top surface is preserved, there is usually some accommodation made for sacrifice, whether there is a lip around the top or a bowl carved out of it, and a couple of them have signs of burning. All are decorated with a molding around the crown and/or the base, but several have decorations on the side. Three have horns, one of which is a boukrania with swags. Another has a crescent moon over an eight-point star, both of which are under a garland, on two faces and an eight-petal rosette on the other preserved face. And, a third motif found is of triglyphs.

When we look at these stone altars from secondary contexts, the one from CORIN011 does not stand out except for its size; it is rectangular, of limestone, with a
molded base and horn decoration. There is not enough of a sample to determine if it was
typical of household altars in Corinth. However, some of the altars from Delian houses
were similar in shape and many of them were decorated with boukrania. That from the
Maison du tritons is furthermore comparable in size, shape, and decoration (Figure 129).
There was also another similar altar from Ostia found in the Domus Fulminata (III, vii, 3-
4), dated to c. 65-75 CE. It was decorated with boukrania and a slight depression on the
top as well; it, however, is round instead of rectangular.\textsuperscript{490} Therefore, based on this
evidence, the domestic altars from Roman Corinth are not formed or decorated in a
manner specific to either Greek or Roman household practices, but could accommodate
the needs of either tradition.

\textbf{Figurines, plaques, and lamps associated with deities}

The most plentiful potential evidence for cult, in general, and domestic cult in
particular, at Corinth are representations of the deities, especially terracotta and stone
figurines. As I have already mentioned above in CORIN010, as well as Buildings 1 and
3 and CORIN015, from the area east of the theater, many figurines and depictions of
deities were uncovered. These images include dogs, Aphrodite, Athena, an Isis devotee,
Harpocrates, Bes, Cybele and a devotee of the goddess, Attis, Matrona, and Artemis
(Figures 157, 158, 160 and 170). Also included in this category is the large incense
burner with the image of Cybele (Figure 159) and boat shaped lamps associated with the
worship of the Egyptian deities. Figurines were also found in CORIN006, along with
twelve terracotta masks which suggest an association with Dionysos. And, from
CORIN001 were the marble statuettes of two Artemis, Roma, Europa/Sosandra, Pan,

\textsuperscript{490} Bakker 1994, p. 222, no. 42.
Herakles with Telephos, Dionysus, and two Asklepios found in Room A9 (Figure 137). Furthermore, a small stele with a lion and the name “ΔΙΟΝΥΣΕΣ” was found in the drain associated with the basin built on the altar from CORIN011 (Figure 163). Papaioannou has identified this plaque as a type found in lararia, without further explanation.\textsuperscript{491} It is small in size, measuring 0.133 m by 0.088 m, and portable. Since it was found in a drain it is uncertain if it came from the house itself, but this is possible and it clearly has a connection with a deity. Finally, in the preliminary reports of the excavations of CORIN005 and CORIN014 are mentioned figurine fragments as well as a mask from CORIN014’s cellar. While these are not identifiable with specific deities or securely with household worship, they are noted here for their potential. With the exception of the figures from CORIN001, CORIN010, and possibly CORIN006, none of these representations were found in locations suggestive of cultic activities in either Greek or Roman traditions. They are mentioned here for their potential to function in a shrine but are not included as indicators for cult activities.

Moreover, from KENCH001 were found several figurines, vessels, and lamps with erotic, Dionysiac, gladiatorial, and mythological themes appropriate for the worship of Aphrodite, which led the excavators to suggest the house was the temple to Aphrodite mentioned in Pausanias II.2.3.\textsuperscript{492} However, as Joseph Rife has demonstrated, this is more likely a seaside villa and the lamps, vessels, and figurines do not necessarily indicate cultic activities.\textsuperscript{493} They may be decorative and utilitarian, but a few may also be related to household worship. Unfortunately, a full list and description of these specific finds cannot be added to this sample, but the preference for Aphrodite is significant. In

\textsuperscript{491} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 155–156; Williams and Zervos 1983, p. 20, no. 56, pl. 9.
\textsuperscript{492} Scranton et al 1978, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{493} Rife 2010, pp. 400–401.
addition, by looking through the lamp catalogue for Kenchreai, it is noteworthy that from the lamps which came from Area C, the same region of Kenchreai as KENCH001, there were five gladiatorial scenes, four erotic scenes, two Aphrodite, one Eros, eight grape clusters, and one thyrsos, as well as twelve other lamps with other depictions including Herakles, Artemis, and a Nereid. Thus, among the images related to deities there appears to have been a preference for themes related to Aphrodite and Dionysos.

In addition to these images from domestic contexts, three depictions of deities were also found in a commercial building located in Panayia Field. Two were terracotta figurines, one of a young Eros and the other of a bearded male (Figures 171 and 172). The third was a marble statuette of Aphrodite (Figure 173). It is possible that in a commercial space these were worshiped, but they may also have been available for sale, possibly for a household shrine.

There are also numerous finds from secondary deposits which may have once come from a domestic context. Although we lack the context of their intended function, they can help provide a more complete picture of who was probably worshipped by the Corinthians. This analysis is based on the work of Lydia Herring-Harrington in 2007 to catalogue the Corinth Excavation Museum’s terracotta figurines. This catalog includes 783 terracotta figurines, 161 of which were dated, either securely or probably, to the Roman period. Most of these finds come from wells, manholes, and fill deposits from the forum area. Therefore, it is likely that they were discarded after they went out of their

494 Williams 1981.
496 Broneer 1947, pl. LXV n. 29.
497 MF-9034a-c and MF-9035; Broneer 1947, pl. LXV n. 30.
498 S-2548.
499 This was an unpublished study done for use by the American School Corinth Excavations.
primary use. To these were added 49 terracotta, metal, stone and faience figurines found in *Corinth* XII and 64 marble statuettes from the ASCSA Digital Library for the Corinth Excavations and *Corinth* IX. The sampling for this analysis totals 274 figurines.

From this sample, the majority of anthropomorphic figurines were not necessarily identifiable with a particular deity, which is to be expected given their fragmentary conditions and use in fill. However, those that can be identified include nine Aphrodite, six Eros, six satyrs, four herms, two Artemis (possibly three), a Pan, a Herakles, a Cybele, a hekataion (Figure 176), a Julius Caesar (Figure 174), an Antoninus Pius (Figure 175), a Serapis, a possible Tyche, and an Apollo. In addition, there were 96 terracottas of animals. When they can be distinguished, these animals include 16 birds, two boar, eight doves, ten dogs, seven snakes, one stag, 23 horses without a rider, two lions, two sheep, one cow, one calf, two bulls, three rams, four roosters, two rabbits and one rabbit mold, and one turtle.

The most popular deities appear to have been Aphrodite and her son, Eros, and the most popular animals are birds, especially doves, and horses. If some of the animal figurines referred to deities, then, these findings coincide with the public cults available at the site. Aphrodite, who is associated with the dove, and Poseidon, associated with the horse, were the two tutelary deities of both Classical and Roman Corinth. Bellerophon, also associated with horses, especially winged-horses, was an integral part of the foundation myth of the city. The other popular type of figurine seems to have been satyrs, who were linked with Dionysos; these would have been connected with theater and entertainment for which the city was a major center. Snakes and dogs were also among the more common animal figurines in this sample. Snakes were related to
Asklepios who had an important healing sanctuary at Corinth. Snakes, as Genius Loci and Zeus Ktesios, were also important for protecting food stores in both Roman and Greek households. Furthermore, dogs had several associations, one of which is Isis. This association was highlighted by Williams in his analysis of the finds from the area east of the theater.\(^{500}\)

The material found in the houses of this study reflects the prominence of Aphrodite and Isis. However, given Aphrodite’s popularity among the figurines in secondary contexts and her presence in KENCH001 and CORIN015, it is probably safe to say that Aphrodite, at least, had general popularity in household religion in the Corinth. All of the images identified are deities that have been identified in pre-Roman Greece. Cybele and the Egyptian deities may also have been associated with Roman culture as they were also common cults in Rome and the Bay of Naples. However, Cybele was known from the Archaic period in Greece\(^{501}\) and the Egyptian deities from the Hellenistic period.\(^{502}\) Therefore, they cannot be used as a marker for Roman cultural identity. The only figurines which can be associated directly with Roman culture are Roma and the busts of Julius Caesar and Antoninus Pius. These can be associated with the imperial cult, but only the Roma comes from a domestic context. Like the wall painting, there is a limited amount of integration of Roman deities within household contexts.

\(^{501}\) See Naumann 1983 on Cybele in Greece.  
\(^{502}\) See Mikalson 2010, pp. 188–189; Larson 2007, pp. 175–176; and Barrett 2011 on Egyptian deities in Greece.
Votive Deposit

One final discovery which might also be connected with domestic religion is the votive deposit found under the floor of CORIN002 (Figure 139). The deposit consisted of a complete tortoise skeleton, a lamp of the Augustan period, and a coin dated 44-40 BCE. The intention of this deposit is unclear, but one hypothesis is that it was a votive foundation deposit like those found in Classical Athens. The Athenian examples contained pottery, lamps, and burnt bones from mammals, but not reptiles. Thus, the presence of the tortoise is unusual. However, looking at literary sources, the tortoise has been associated with female modesty, the house, and Aphrodite. Given the preferences for Aphrodite already observed in Corinthian household religion, it is possible that this votive deposit was connected with her worship. A survey of Italian houses, both earlier and contemporary, has only found one house from pre-Roman Pompeii with two ritual deposits of young pigs in the courtyard. Given the comparanda I am inclined to think that this comes from a Greek tradition, possibly imported from Athens. However, the tortoise is problematic for this comparison and it may be indicative of a local, Corinthian custom.

Aediculae, Pseudo-Aediculae, and Niches

The evidence for these types of domestic cult features at Corinth is speculative; only CORIN010 has evidence of a potential (pseudo-) aedicula or niche, which has

---

503 J. Herbst (pers. comm.).
505 Pausanias 6.25.1; Lawson 2007, p. 117.
506 Clarke 1999, pp. 90–92. Thank you to Dr. Michael MacKinnon for his help with faunal deposits in Italy.
already been discussed above. These forms of household shrines are the most popular in Roman Italy and it is for this reason that their absence at Corinth is noteworthy.

The manifestation of household religion appears to have varied from house to house, even within the same time period. That which can be tentatively identified resembles in some way Roman household cult forms. There are three potential cult rooms or sacella and one example of wall painting resembling a lararium. Aediculae and pseudo-aediculae have not been found yet at Corinth, but may be another interpretation for the wall painting.

Other aspects of household religion, in keeping with the criteria of Chapter II, have also been found which do not necessarily relate to Roman household religion, but are more secure evidence. These include the two hearths and the altar. All of the altars have been found in secondary deposits, although the one found in CORIN011 is likely from that house originally. Both hearths and altars would be expected in either Greek or Roman traditions of domestic religion. Furthermore, there is the votive foundation deposit which resembles practices found in pre-Roman Athens.

The representations of deities or objects associated with their worship were common at Corinth and are found in eight of the buildings under discussion. Figurines would be expected in both cultural traditions of household religion, however, terracotta and stone figurines had multiple functions such as decoration, and using them solely as evidence for domestic religion is unsound. The nature of these images tended to be local deities that were part of the city’s traditions before the Roman period; there are only three examples of western imports, Roma and the busts of Julius Caesar and Antoninus Pius.
Even this, though, is not part of a Roman tradition. The worship of the imperial cult and Roma was something which developed earlier in the Greek world, especially in Asia Minor and the islands, out of the traditions of the Hellenistic ruler cult and of divine honors for important civic benefactors, including Roman officials, which was widespread in the Greek world by the 1st century BCE.  

V.A.3: Cult in Context

Thus, some of the evidence preserved appears connected to Roman practices and some with either. The votive foundation deposit is more closely associated with Greek traditions. However, looking at the evidence in context reveals that the nature of domestic cult was more local. For this the relationship that the evidence has with the structure must be considered in order to understand how and by whom these features and objects were accessed and seen. Due to their relative completeness, CORIN001 and CORIN010 will serve as examples for the others although CORIN001 does not have a complete enough plan for access analysis. It must be kept in mind, however, that these were not economically and socially equivalent dwellings; one was an opulent villa urbana (CORIN001) and the other a humbler dwelling (CORIN010). Therefore, CORIN001 will be useful for comparisons with the majority of the other houses in this study, and CORIN010 can be compared with the few lower status houses which have been identified in Roman Achaia. The houses themselves, as discussed above, had Roman elements incorporated in them and a Roman looking plan, but the accessibility and visibility through the space for the inhabitants and visitors suggest behavior closer to

Greek practices. Therefore, the accessibility of the shrines and their intended participants should be similar.

The potential cult room or *sacellum* of CORIN001, located in Room A9 is small and remotely located within the house, although between the two peristyles, which is not in keeping with Roman traditions of conspicuous display of *lararia* (Figure 135). To address this Stirling suggests that these statues were kept elsewhere in the house, either as objects of worship or as decoration, and moved here later.\(^{508}\) However, the remoteness of their location is in fact not that remote; they are positioned exactly between the two main rooms of circulation in the house, A2 and A8. The way the statuettes were found fallen on the floor of Room A9 suggests that there was not an entrance from Room A8 immediately into A9, but the walls between A9 and A5, A3 and A11 are all robbed out. It is possible that A9 was accessible from A2, an atrium, via Rooms A4 and A5 or via Room A3, or else, from Room A8, a highly decorated fountain room, via Room A11.

This atrium and the fountain room were elaborately decorated with mosaic or stone slab floors and marble-lined tanks. This indicates that they were probably meant to be seen by visitors, likely as reception spaces. Yet, the statuettes were not placed in these spaces, they were at least one space removed, possibly even three spaces removed from these reception spaces. While we do not know where the main entrance to the house was, within the house the possible cult room was in a position to be accessible from two of the main areas of circulation. However, its location also suggests that it was not something immediately apparent to visitors to the house; therefore, it may have been intended for the use of the residents and therefore accessible, but not for display to visitors.

---

\(^{508}\) Stirling 2008, pp. 130–131.
As for the deities worshiped, Aphrodite appears along with Dionysos and Asklepios who were important divinities for Corinth, as well as other deities commonly associated with households. Two exceptions to this are Europa, who may also be indentified as Aphrodite/Sosandra, and Roma. Stirling points out that they were probably associated with the civic life of the head of the household since they are similar to images from public temples related to political office. If these were meant to be Europa and Roma, they would also demonstrate the Roman custom of Penates as related to the employment of the head of the household. However, the other deities were known from pre-Roman Corinth and continued to be important into this later period. Therefore, the deities and the location suggest practices found in pre-Roman Greece, but the collection of deities together in one location and the potential connection between them and the political career of the head of the household indicate Roman customs. This again reflects a familiarity with both Roman and Greek culture. Roman in the aspects related to public life, such as the worship of Penates, especially those connected with politics, the decoration of a reception space to be an atrium, and the collection of deities possibly in a single shrine; and Greek in those aspects of private life, such as the specific non-political deities in the collection and the location of the potential shrine for use of the household, but not displayed for the visitor. It is curious, however, that a Roman looking shrine which has the potential to reveal the head of household’s Roman cultural identity would be out of view of the visitors to whom these mores were expressed. This may reveal the Corinthian perception of “Roman” which will be addressed at the end of this section.

A similar mixture of Greek and Roman customs can be seen in the humbler CORIN010 (Figure 155). Room 3 in particular contains several indications of domestic cult from different phases of the building. This analysis of the context of cult evidence focuses on the final phase of the room roughly the late 2nd or early 3rd century CE. In this phase the hearth was located along the south wall of this room, roughly in the center, and it could have been honored as the embodiment of Vesta or Hestia. In this location it would have been accessible to those permitted in Room 3, as we would assume the inhabitants of the structure would be. However, the hearth and its associated activities would not have been visible from outside Room 3 through the entrance, unless one was standing along the north wall of Room 4 or stood in the doorway. Therefore, it was clearly intended only for the inhabitants (Figure 156).

Also, from this room came the fresco fragments which may be the remains of a lararium either as niche, wall-painted shrine, or a free-standing structure like an aedicula. Given the find spots for the fragments, the possible shrine was likely placed in the east wall of Room 3 facing the hearth. If so, it would not have been visually accessible from outside of Room 3; therefore, one would need to be permitted into Room 3 before being able to observe or use the shrine. And, one would also need to know to turn left to see it. In this inconspicuous location, this shrine appears intended only for the inhabitants.

In the destruction debris of this final floor level near the hearth were found the eight lamps and eight images of deities discussed above. All of these deities were appropriate for Penates, and, as has been mentioned, multiple depictions of the same deity have been found in lararium groups in Italy. Where the figurines were originally located is uncertain, but they may have been associated with the wall painting.
Therefore, Room 3 of CORIN010 contained what appears to have been a typical Roman
domestic shrine located in the largest room and most likely the main room of the
structure, but in a corner of the room accessible only to the inhabitants, who had
knowledge of its existence.

It must also be kept in mind that this is a small two to three room structure in a
busy, cramped, commercial area near the center of the city. This is not the typical
location for a wealthy elite who would be the one expected to participate in the Roman
social and political system, for which a prominently placed Roman-like household shrine
could have been a part of that participation. It is also less likely that such a dwelling
would be anticipating visitors. So then, why was such a shrine found in this structure?
One possibility is that the owner or inhabitants were Italian or Roman and continuing
their traditions. Another possibility is that this was rented space and the shrine was
installed by the owner for the tenants of the building as is found in courtyards in Ostian
apartment buildings, although not in individual apartments as is the case here. A third
possibility is that such a feature was a symbol not of Roman culture and the social and
political systems, but a symbol of economic status or local prominence. But, as with
CORIN001, it is strange to place a status symbol in a location only accessible to the
inhabitants.

In Classical Greek tradition, domestic cult materials were placed in kitchens,
storerooms, etc. for the use and protection of the inhabitants and their activities. Being
accessible to outsiders was not a concern and often such access was heavily restricted by
the planning of the building; this is the case with CORIN010 which was only accessible
in this later phase through Room 4 from the alley to the east. This may be the result of
the nature of humbler housing, but may also reflect a cultural norm. Furthermore, there was the possible communal shrine next door in CORIN015, which could have also served the needs of the inhabitants. Also, the type of hearth and the wall painting might indicate either a direct connection with Italy or the Romano-Italian descent of the inhabitants.

V.A.4: Observations

There does not seem to be much evidence from the known domestic structures for household religion, but there are also not many houses preserved either. The more securely identifiable evidence, hearths and altars, were generally Greco-Roman, while the less secure evidence closely resembles forms associated with Roman culture. Considering the political and economic history of the site, as the capital of the province and one of the main hubs of transaction between Rome and Achaia, it is logical that there would be a Roman presence and influence in the domestic contexts, especially by the late 3rd century CE when these houses and their shrines were destroyed or abandoned. It seems Roman Corinthians, or at least the ones we have evidence for, were incorporating elements of Roman domestic practices into their traditional activities. The evidence for these elements consists of the following: wall painting fragments which suggest a *lararium*, a Penates-style collection of statuettes, including a Roma, found in a room which resembles a *sacellum*, and a *lararium*-like niche which was part of a neighborhood shrine that is comparable with communal domestic shrines in Ostia. Granted these are not strong pieces of evidence, but they do suggest the incorporation of Roman household cult practices into the houses of Roman Corinth.
However, the locations of the shrines resemble Greek traditions, and, therefore, their accessibility and visibility. The deities worshipped within the shrines were important in pre-Roman Corinth, but were also found in houses of Roman Italy; therefore, they cannot reveal much with regards to the integration of Roman household cults. What this household religious evidence does suggest is that those identifying with Roman culture seem to be doing so without the element of display. This could mean that to be Roman was something to hide or, more likely, that it was seen as a personal choice, not a social requirement. It could also be that to Corinthians there was no expectation of a displayed shrine; therefore, it was not necessary to see it to identify the person as Roman. This could mean everyone was seen as Roman regardless of personal associations or that it did not matter. This interpretation suggests that there was a completely opposite response to Roman and Greek cultural interaction from that seen on Delos.

The houses in which this evidence was found further support this integration of two cultural practices since they incorporate Roman architectural elements with local materials, building techniques, accessibility, and visibility. Furthermore, this conclusion also agrees with the prosopographical studies of Roman Corinth, which have identified a population participating in both Greek and Roman customs and traditions, favoring Greek at home and Roman in public. Is this typical of a Roman Achaean colony or is this unique to Corinth? I will now turn to Patras for comparison.
V.B: Patras

Within the province of Achaia, the other Roman colonial city was Patras,\textsuperscript{511} named \textit{Colonia Augusta Achaiaca Patrencis}. Although not the capital of the province, its position at the entrance of the Corinthian Gulf made it a strategic location for travel and trade between Greece and the West from the Hellenistic period onward.\textsuperscript{512} Under the empire it was made one of the regional administrative centers for the province;\textsuperscript{513} therefore, in several ways it is comparable with Corinth.

While the area of Patras had been inhabited since the Mycenaean period, it did not become a major city until the Hellenistic period. In 280 BCE it was named the head city of the Achaean League.\textsuperscript{514} And, when Corinth was destroyed in 146 BCE, Patras became the major port of call in the Corinthian Gulf for trade with the west\textsuperscript{515} and military operations in the east,\textsuperscript{516} although it lacked a good natural harbor.\textsuperscript{517} Patras was, therefore, prosperous in the later Hellenistic period and grew in terms of physical size and population with immigrants and merchants.\textsuperscript{518} According to the archaeological remains, the Hellenistic city occupied the upper town, which was located to the south of the acropolis,\textsuperscript{519} and the lower town just below a natural ridge,\textsuperscript{520} which corresponds with the modern streets Agiou Georgiou and Athanasiou Diakou (Figure 190). However, the

\textsuperscript{511} The \textit{ΣΤ'} Efoeia of Prehistoic and Classical Antiquities kindly provided access to excavation records and photographs from Patras.
\textsuperscript{512} Petropoulos 1999, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{513} Rizakis 1997, p. 15; Rizakis 2010a, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{514} Polybius 2.41; Strabo 8.7.1. Polybius 2.41–71 gives description of structure and history of the Achaean League until Rome’s involvement.
\textsuperscript{515} Petropoulos 1999, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{516} Rizakis 1989, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{517} Rizakis 1989, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{518} Papapostolou 1991, p. 305 mentions the monumental burials of the Hellenistic period as an indicator of the prosperity of the city; Petropoulos 1999, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{519} The acropolis has not been excavated, but it was located where the Frankish fortifications are now preserved.
\textsuperscript{520} Papapostolou 1991, p. 305.
Roman city continued to use the same roadways, public spaces, and residential areas and, therefore, the earlier remains are rather fragmentary. Many of the houses in this study whose construction is dated to the early Roman period incorporated foundations and even walls from Hellenistic period buildings, making it difficult to study these pre-Roman structures.

Unlike Corinth, the Romans never destroyed Patras during the tumultuous 2nd and 1st centuries BCE; even after the city harbored Antony and Cleopatra against Octavian in 31 BCE.\textsuperscript{521} Thus, when the city was founded as a Roman colony, it already had an established urban plan and infrastructure. Still, under the Romans the city was greatly expanded and, as Rizakis discusses, changes were gradually made to the urban structure in the early years of the colony.\textsuperscript{522} The impetus for these changes was a sudden increase in population. Augustus founded a veteran colony at Patras either immediately after the battle of Actium or in 16-14 BCE during Agrippa’s visit to the East.\textsuperscript{523} The emperor also imposed a synoecism from the surrounding towns and villages.\textsuperscript{524} Both of these actions greatly increased the population of the city and caused a need for more facilities and housing. The emperor also gave economic control over the regions of West Lokris and South Aetolia, on the opposite side of the Corinthian Gulf, to the Patreans.\textsuperscript{525} These regions were thus part of the synoecism, as the cities there were made economically dependent on Patras; therefore, their populations migrated towards the opportunities available in Patras.\textsuperscript{526}

\textsuperscript{521} Petropoulos 1999, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{522} Rizakis 2010b, pp. 131–135.
\textsuperscript{523} Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{524} Strabo 8.7.5; Pausanias 7.18.7; Petropoulos 1999, pp. 39–40.
\textsuperscript{526} Rizakis 1997, p. 15.
With control of both coasts of the Corinthian Gulf, Patras was able to draw port fees and revenue to financially support itself as it expanded.\footnote{Rizakis 2010b, p. 130.} The emperor also granted the city the rights to exploit the resources of the lake of Kalydon,\footnote{Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, p. 22.} which aided its capacity to support its new population. Additionally, the surrounding countryside was centuriated and turned over to large farmstead complexes which supplied the city and supported its textile industry.\footnote{See Petropoulos and Rizakis 1994; Pausanias 7.21.14 on textiles.} Other key industries of Patras included glass, jewelry, and lamp production.\footnote{Petropoulos 1999 on lamp industry; Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, pp. 52–55.} The Roman city grew to fill in the area between the upper town and the harbor and westward. However, in the early colony the areas occupied previously were left relatively unchanged in terms of street system and buildings.\footnote{Papapostolou 1991, pp. 305–306. And the cemeteries were moved to the east.} Changes which were made to the old city included a new, paved main road from the old city to the harbor that altered a few of the traffic patterns of the older area.\footnote{Rizakis 2010b, p. 134. Rizakis 2010b, pp. 149–150 describes some of the other the changes made to form the Roman city street plan.} As for the newer parts of Patras, better harbor facilities were built to accommodate the influx of trade and travelers.\footnote{Rizakis 1989, p. 181. For evidence of travelers see Cicero \textit{ad Atticum} 102.1 (5.9.1), 125.3 (7.2.3), 414.1 (16.6.1); Cicero \textit{ad Familiares} 120.2 (16.1.2), 124.2 (16.5.2), 125.2 (16.6.2) (citations in parentheses are older references which are cross listed with the new numbers in the newest Loeb edition).} And, certain key Roman institutions, such as the \textit{aedes augustalium}, were added to the political and religious life of the early colonial city.\footnote{Rizakis 1998, pp. 39–40.}

It is likely that it was under the Julio-Claudians that the Temple of Olympian Zeus was converted to a Capitolium by the addition of Athena/Minerva and Hera/Juno.\footnote{Pausanias 7.20.3; Rizakis 2010b, p.134.} Pausanias also states that the cults of Artemis Laphria and Dionysos Kalydonios were
brought into Patras from Kalydon by Augustus in the synoecism.\textsuperscript{536} From epigraphic evidence, we know that Artemis Laphria was the tutelary deity of the Roman Patras and her cult was associated with the imperial cult through the alternative identification of Diana Augusta.\textsuperscript{537} These were not the only two deities transferred in the synoecism. Other cults of Artemis and Dionysos, and possibly one of Cybele and one of Demeter were brought to Patras from the surrounding towns.\textsuperscript{538} The Romans also introduced the cults of Apollo,\textsuperscript{539} Nemesis,\textsuperscript{540} Mithras,\textsuperscript{541} Asklepios,\textsuperscript{542} and possibly Sarapis and Isis.\textsuperscript{543} The archaeological evidence for these cults is located in the areas of the lower town, near the harbor or the later Stadium-Theater, where the new part of the city was constructed.

As a colony, Patras was populated by relocated locals, veterans of the X and XII Legions, Italian merchants, indigenous wealthy landowners, and immigrants from the East.\textsuperscript{544} There is limited epigraphy from Roman Patras, but what has been uncovered has been studied and published first by Jules Herbillon in 1929 and more recently by Rizakis. From this body of evidence which spans the 3rd century BCE to the 3rd century CE, the proportions of Greeks to Roman citizens in the city are unclear, although in 1929 Herbillon’s work suggested an even division of the population.\textsuperscript{545} Since then many more inscriptions have been uncovered and published in Rizakis, Zoumbaki, and Kantirea’s two volume series on Roman personal names in the Peloponnese. This work has shown

\textsuperscript{536} Pausanias 7.18.8–7.18.12.
\textsuperscript{537} CIL III, 499 and 510.
\textsuperscript{538} Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, pp. 28–37.
\textsuperscript{539} Rizakis 1998, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{540} Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{541} Herbillon 1929, pp. 75–85; Petropoulos 1999, pp. 41–42; Rizakis 1998, p. 40; Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, pp. 31–35.
\textsuperscript{542} Rizakis 1998, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{543} Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{544} Petropoulos 1999, pp. 41–42. Both Papaioannou 2002, p. 165 and Petropoulos 1999, p. 42 mention the attraction of scholars to the famous library at Patras in the 2nd century CE as well.
\textsuperscript{545} Herbillon 1929, pp. 171–178. As of 1929, Herbillon identified 66 Greek names and 67 Roman names from inscriptions found in Patras.
that from the region controlled by Patras, 270 Roman names have been found in
inscriptions, 184 of which were found in the city itself, and 22 Roman names were found
on lamps from Patras. These volumes do not provide a catalog of Greek names for
comparison, nor the names of Patreans mentioned in inscriptions from other cities.
However, this does reveal that the practice of taking and of maintaining Roman names
did play a role in the identity of the inhabitants of Patras, whether of Greek or Italian
ethnicity. Rizakis has also pointed out that civic inscriptions from Patras were written in
Latin while private dedications and epitaphs were in Greek, similar to the evidence
from Corinth. Focusing on the early colony, epigraphic and literary evidence has also
suggested that the inhabitants were segregated into Romans of Patras and Patreans.
There were separate administrative and judicial systems, bilingual inscriptions, and
separate cemeteries. Further discoveries from Patras may help clarify this more.

Beginning under the Flavians and continuing through the 2nd century CE, the
urban structure of the city was dramatically changed and monumental Roman buildings
were incorporated into the city. This can be seen in the areas of the Roman Odeion and
the Roman Theater-Stadium complex (Figure 191), which were constructed in the 2nd
century CE over previously residential and industrial areas. An aqueduct, monumental
nymphaeum, and a hexagonal temple to Hadrian were all built as well, and a new forum
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547 Rizakis 1989, pp. 185–186.
548 Pausanias 7.18.7; Strabo 8.7.5 and 10.2.21; Rizakis 1997, pp. 25–26; Papaioannou 2002, p. 161. Also
see Woodhead 1959, pp. 279–282 and Woodhead 1960, p. 83 for bilingual inscriptions set up by Patras at
Athens.
416; Strabo 8.7.5 and 10.2.2; Pliny NH 4.11.
550 Rizakis 2010b, pp. 139–143;
may have been constructed to replace the older agora.\textsuperscript{552} Furthermore, new port facilities were built which increased the amount of people and goods passing through the harbor.\textsuperscript{553} All these changed not only the urban plan but also the available amenities of the city. As a result there was an explosion of elaborate private architecture in this period from luxury villas to monumental tombs resembling those found outside of Rome.\textsuperscript{554}

Therefore, by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE Roman culture was prominent in this city, as seen in many aspects of Patras such as the deities of the public temples, the style of funerary monuments, the materials used to build the houses, and the construction of an aqueduct and sewer system under its paved streets.\textsuperscript{555} The cause of this shift may be explained by an influx of Italian immigrants, particularly merchants, from the Vesuvius area after the eruption of 79 CE.\textsuperscript{556} But others have proposed that it was related to economic prosperity\textsuperscript{557} and imperial favor.\textsuperscript{558} Also, in this later period, literary and epigraphic sources stop distinguishing between Romans and Patreans, calling everyone Patrean.\textsuperscript{559} Rizakis considers this epigraphic change an indication of a unified, Roman identity, and attributes it to imitation.\textsuperscript{560} Yet, he also sees a continuation of Hellenistic traditions along with new Roman spaces and features.\textsuperscript{561} He calls Patras neither a Roman nor a Greek city, but a mixture of both.\textsuperscript{562}

\textsuperscript{552} Rizakis 2010b, p. 147. Rizakis disagrees with this argument put forth in Petropoulos 2009c.
\textsuperscript{553} Petropoulos 1999, pp. 42–43.
\textsuperscript{554} Petropoulos 1999, pp. 42–43; Rizakis 2010b, pp. 139–140. For more on funerary monuments, see Flämig 2007, esp. pp. 184–212, no. 90–176.
\textsuperscript{556} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 164–165.
\textsuperscript{557} Papapostolos 1991, pp. 311–315; Petropoulos 1999, pp. 44–45.
\textsuperscript{558} Rizakis 2010b, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{559} Rizakis 1989, p. 183.
\textsuperscript{560} Rizakis 2010b, pp. 150–152.
\textsuperscript{561} Rizakis 2010b, pp. 150–152.
\textsuperscript{562} Rizakis 2010b, p. 152.
Finally, in the second half of the 3rd century CE, there is a disaster visible across the site. It has been attributed to either the Herulians in 267 CE or to an earthquake around 300 CE. Whatever the cause may have been, there is visible destruction in many of the buildings of Patras at this time and a clear economic decline in the 4th century CE.

V.B.1: The Houses

A total of 157 houses which date to the Roman period have so far been indentified through rescue excavations by the Greek Archaeological Service. Distinctions between early and later Roman are often difficult to establish because of poor preservation and the need to excavate quickly. Instead, excavators date these houses generally to the Roman period based on the construction techniques, the plans, and the finds, such as pottery, lamps and coins. Any distinction between earlier and later is made based on building phases and often cannot be connected with a specific time period. However, when it is possible to date the structures more specifically, those with the most complete remains were dated to the late 1st or 2nd centuries CE, related to the restructuring of the city at that time. Earlier structures are known, but they are fragmentarily preserved. A few of the houses continue in use into the Late Roman and Early Byzantine periods as well, sometimes making earlier phases more difficult to understand. There are several with near complete published plans which are clearly datable within the time frame of this study. It is for these reasons that I will not compare earlier houses with later, as I did for the Corinthia, but will make observations about houses of the colony in general.

---

563 Petropoulos 1999, p. 45.
Furthermore, unlike Corinth, there are comparatively very few complete Roman period houses excavated from the region around Patras and from Aetolia, which was under Patras’s control. However, given the large sample size from Patras itself, it is not necessary in this case to supplement the evidence with that from the surrounding region. The few structures from the region are primarily agricultural facilities which likely housed those working the farm and possibly the farm owner. Therefore, these structures are included in the database as well (AIGIO001 through AIGIO004, KALYD001, KAMAR001, KASTR001, KATOA001, KATOA002, MIDIL001, PARAL001, and VOUNT001).

The houses of Roman Patras are PATRA001 through PATRA157 in Appendix A. These have been found mostly in the center of the modern city, where much modern construction has been conducted, although a few have also been found along the coastline and to the northeast of the modern center city. The latter have, for the most part, been identified as farm houses and agricultural processing buildings;\textsuperscript{565} this suggests that they lay just outside the ancient city proper. Within the city proper, the two residential sections, the lower or new city and upper or old city, were separated by the ridge running along the modern streets Agiou Georgiou and Athanasiou Diakou. On a modern map, the lower city of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods was roughly delineated by the modern streets of Korinthou to the west, Georgakopoulou to the north, Tsamadou to the south, and the ridge to the east (Figure 190). During the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century restructuring of the city, the lower city was expanded towards the harbor and along the coastline. The upper city remained within the boundaries of its Hellenistic period terraced hillside around the

\textsuperscript{565} See Stavropoulou-Gatsi 1998, p. 115: The Aguia region had a series of farm houses along the N waterfront zone of the city continuing to outside the boundaries of the city, along the possible location of the ancient coastal road.
acropolis. Even today, it is possible to see the two distinct areas of the city in the modern street plan (Figure 191).

The known houses of the upper and lower cities after the restructuring appear to have been large, middle to upper class structures, judging from their size, features, and decorations. Papaioannou has pointed out that the decorations of the houses in the upper city were more elaborate and expensive than those found in the lower city, suggesting the elite lived there.\(^\text{566}\) Unlike at Corinth, a residential area for the lower classes has not been identified, although the earlier Roman period houses found under the Roman Odeion were mixed with industrial facilities.\(^\text{567}\) This might have been similar to the area east of the theater at Corinth which also combined tavernas, workshops, and housing. Unfortunately, these structures are not well preserved since they were destroyed to build the Odeion. It is likely the lower classes, in general, lived in the lower city where they were near the harbor and where several workshops have also been uncovered.\(^\text{568}\)

Papaioannou has demonstrated that there is no clear cultural distinction in the houses of Patras, as the literary and epigraphic evidence would suggest. There does not even appear to be distinct neighborhoods of Greek houses and Roman houses.\(^\text{569}\) In general, the housing from this site was similar across the city. This is in part because most of the evidence follows the restructuring of the city in the 2\(^\text{nd}\) century CE when there was no longer evidence of two different categories of inhabitants. It is possible that in the early colony the colonists lived in the newly constructed areas in the lower city.

---

\(^\text{567}\) Petropoulos 1999, p. 43.  
\(^\text{568}\) Papapostolos 1991 identifies the lamp making workshops, which are all located in the lower city.  
\(^\text{569}\) Papaioannou 2002, pp. 172–174. Papaioannou does mention that Greek courtyard houses were found outside the city proper, but these have agricultural and industrial elements, which suggests that this area was the farmland or industrial areas of the town and not a specific ethnic section.
possibly with some elite colonists moving into existing structures in the upper city, while those who had been there before remained in the older parts of the city. This would make sense even without evidence for two distinct categories of inhabitants since the newer residential areas were built to accommodate the new inhabitants and there is no record of actions which turned the established inhabitants out of their homes.

**Layout**

Papaioannou has specifically classified the type of houses common in Roman Patras as **atrium/impluvium houses**.\(^{570}\) Identifying an atrium style house is a much debated issue involving questions about the types of roofing, the arrangement of the other rooms, the identification of an impluvium, and the classification of this type of structure outside of Pompeii.\(^{571}\) However, nearly half of the houses identified did contain at least one room with an impluvium-like tank\(^{572}\) (Appendix E). These tanks were often lined with plaster, terracotta tiles, and/or marble slabs, and connected with pipes which drained to the main sewers of the city or brought water into the tank, possibly from the aqueduct. Many of these tanks had evidence for columns around them, suggesting that there was an opening in the roof over the tank. The rest of the rooms of these houses seem to have been arranged around the room with the tank. Furthermore, some of the houses had a separate room which was an open air courtyard in addition to these rooms with tanks. These open courtyards, however, were not usually centrally located in the house. Also, a few houses have been found with more than one room with a tank; these rooms were

---


\(^{572}\) 72 houses out of the remains of 156 houses; 17 of these 75 have more than one tank, which are contemporary with each other.
decorated with mosaic floors as well as the marble-lined tank, which suggests these were reception and not utilitarian spaces.

Although the prosopography of Patras does not indicate that Romans outnumbered Greeks, the public structures of the city reflect Roman types and uses of space. Furthermore, numerous elaborate Roman-like tomb monuments have been found, overtly reflecting the deceased’s desire to appear Roman in public. Therefore, I am more inclined to agree with indentifying the influence of the atrium-style house tradition in Patras, more so than other cities in Greece, as there is a strong Romano-Italian influence in the public sphere as well. The use of *atria*, especially in those houses with multiple *atria*, may indicate a social/civic status associated with having and maintaining such a space, instead of the cultural function of an atrium in a Romano-Italian house, as at Corinth. This would indicate a type of translation of the space by the local community rather than a massive Roman population.

One final note about these *atria*-like houses; several have been identified as houses in the preliminary reports primarily because of the presence of atrium-like rooms. Other structures which might have been houses were not described as such. While there were probably other criteria for identifying a house, this is not always made explicit in the reports. I have attempted to include all structures that appeared house-like in the descriptions and plans with or without an atrium. However, at none of the other cities in this study were so many atrium-like rooms identified, and, therefore, I do feel confident in saying that this was a more common type of central space in Patrean houses.
Access and Visibility Analysis

None of the houses from Patras have been completely uncovered or preserved (Figures 192 to 298). However, nine of these houses have multiple rooms preserved, placed around an atrium-like space. From this sample, two houses, PATRA038 and PATRA060, have been uncovered sufficiently to attempt access analysis. Not all of the rooms have been uncovered, but these can be conjectured in the plans based on the size of the *insulae* in which these houses have been found (Figures 207 and 243). Both of these are distributive in arrangement, but PATRA060 is deep and asymmetrical (Figure 244) while PATRA038 is shallow and symmetrical (Figures 208 and 210). These difference may be the result of PATRA060 being a large house with three *atria* and a courtyard and PATRA038 being one of at least two dwellings within an *insula*. However, it is the distributive nature of these two houses which resembles those of Roman Italy. Also, PATRA038 maintained two entrances into the house in both of its building phases, although the location of one of these entrances changed in the second phase (Figures 208 and 210). This second entrance in both phases was from one of the alleys which ran along the side and behind this house and entered into a space which may have had a utilitarian function. Thus, this structure further resembled Roman Italian houses in its multiple entrances located at opposite sides of the house.

Since PATRA060 is not fully preserved to the north and south, RRA cannot be calculated for its rooms. However, PATRA038 can be reconstructed in both of its phases for calculations (Figures 209 and 211). In both phases, the courtyard, Room 4, remains the controlling space of the house, but in the second phase the house becomes more asymmetrical and less accessible with the addition of the corridor, Room 3. In
comparison with the houses already analyzed, PATRA038 in both phases was significantly less accessible than the three houses from the Corinthia, and it resembles Roman housing more closely, as well as four of the six Delian examples, than it does Greek housing (Figure 299).

In addition, the other seven houses have sufficiently preserved plans to make some observations but some lack exterior entrances and some lack many of their interior doorways (PATRA031, PATRA039, PATRA042, PATRA055, PATRA069, PATRA132, and PATRA142) (Figures 202, 214, 216, 223, 256, 287, and 292). It appears that these houses were also for the most part distributive in plan (Figures 203, 215, 217, 224, 256, 288, and 293). This indicates that inhabitants in one area of the house could move about unchecked by those in another area of the house, like in Roman and Delian houses.

Where preserved there seems to be usually only one entrance to the house (PATRA031, PATRA038, PATRA055, PATRA060, and PATRA132), with PATRA038 as the exception. Since the sample of houses is so small and fragmentary, it cannot be said for certain if either way was more typical for Patras. Therefore, in order to leave the structure, those moving about freely within the house still had to pass through the central circulation space. It could be argued that these houses all had a second entrance which has not been preserved or uncovered. However, most of these structures, like PATRA055 and PATRA132, were integrated into *insulae* with structures surrounding them; it is more likely that PATRA038 with alleys on two sides and a main street on a third side was the exception. Therefore, the frequency of single entrances should not be overlooked.
As in Roman houses, some houses had entrances, whether primary or secondary, that did not lead directly into the atria or central courtyard. PATRA055 has a porch between the entrance and the courtyard (Figure 223), while PATRA060 has a corridor or small room (Figure 243). In PATRA038 the secondary entrance led into a back room in the first phase and a corridor in the second phase, but the main entrance in both phases led directly into the central courtyard of the house (Figure 207), as did the possible entrance into PATRA132 (Figure 287). These entrances, thus, resemble entrances of pre-Roman housing in Greece. This demonstrates a variety of practices in the planning of the structures.

In spite of these Roman looking rooms and overall arrangements, the visual access into and through these houses resembles more closely Greek practices. All of the entrances to these houses did not align with any of the doorways within the house (Figures 212, 245, and 289) similar to what has been observed at Corinth and in earlier Greek housing. Even in PATRA038, visual access into the house was restricted from all three doors. One door entered a room in the northwest corner of the house which had a door to the south into the courtyard, but it was not visually aligned with the outside and there was no visual access into the rest of the house. The door to the west, opened when the former door was blocked, entered a corridor, which was created with the doorway leading into the north side of the courtyard. The main entrance led directly into the courtyard but was opposite the wall of the atrium and had limited visual access into this room (Figure 212). In all cases, this restricted visibility indicates that there was an internal focus for these houses, not the display typically associated with Roman houses and seen in Delian houses. Visibility analysis diagrams from the reception spaces
confirm these observations (Figures 213, 246, and 247). This feature suggests Greek practices rather than Roman in spite of the Roman appearance and arrangement of the structures.

**Construction Materials and Features**

The construction of these houses is a mixture of Roman brick techniques like *opus reticulatum*, *opus mixtum*, and *opus testaceum* which combine fired bricks with broken terracotta tiles, small stones, and reused materials held together with mortar (Appendix D). No houses remain which consist of a stone socle with a mud brick superstructure⁵⁷³ as in other Greek cities; instead there are a few houses which reuse the Hellenistic foundations and, occasionally, lower parts of walls. To these the Roman building techniques are added.

The floors of the houses of Roman Patras are paved with tiles, either whole or broken, stone slabs, mosaic, plaster, rubble and mortar, and pebbles (Appendix C). Also, it is possible that some of the floors were unpaved, although, these are not clear in the reports. The mosaics were mostly in black and white, or black, white, and red, in geometric patterns. There are a few examples of polychrome mosaics, which usually are figural or vegetal. These follow trends observed throughout the Mediterranean during the Roman period,⁵⁷⁴ although the popularity of black and white over polychrome is a trend observed in Italy rather than in the Eastern Mediterranean. This may be a result of the connections between this city in particular and Italy, since polychrome continued to be the more popular choice in the other sites of this study.

---

⁵⁷³ PATRA060 has evidence of mud brick underneath it from a Hellenistic period building.
Wall decorations in these houses are poorly preserved. There are a few houses where fragments of painted plaster were found in the destruction layer and a few others with remnants of fresco on the walls. Only two contain enough fragments to distinguish the decoration. One of these, PATRA053, was in an architectural style like Pompeian Second Style. The second, PATRA082, will be discussed below since it is likely related to a possible shrine. A few other houses have evidence of marble wall revetments and one has evidence of a wall mosaic (Appendix D). The Pompeian Second Style painting, marble revetments and wall mosaic indicate Roman influence on the houses, but, except for the wall mosaic, these were also found at other sites in Greece. This suggests that these types of wall decorations were popular at this time across Achaia, and not necessarily a result of the strong Romano-Italian influence observed in Patras.

Other embellishments in these houses include colonnaded tanks, marble-lined tanks, marble thresholds, gardens, and fountains (Appendix E). While these features have been observed in the other houses from across Roman Achaia, they were not found in the same proportional quantity as in Patras. Furthermore, many of the houses that have been identified had evidence of pipes which connect not only with a main sewer line under the street outside the house but also with intake lines from the street. This is a unique feature in Greece and is indicative of the Roman influence on the urban structure of the city. These pipes, fed by the Roman built aqueduct, made the gardens and fountains in these houses possible.

Thus, the construction, accessibility, and decorations of these houses reflect a clear importation of ideas from Italy, more so than any other city in this study, including
Corinth. Papaioannou also makes a further important observation. She has identified the atrium house type in the neighborhood of the Greek cemetery as well as in the neighborhood of the Roman cemetery. Thus, this type of house was used by Greeks and Romans alike, and cannot be used to indicate the identity of the inhabitants or homeowners. Therefore, it has been argued that this city was clearly Romanized, supplanting the traditional structures and behaviors of the local population. However, all of these elements do not necessarily reflect acceptance of Roman culture by all the Patreans. The houses which could be examined appear to have been distributive in nature, but some had single entrances which allowed access into and out of the house to be controlled at a single point. In some houses this control space was the courtyard or atrium, in other there was a vestibule or corridors which while adding a level of asymmetry, or distance, between the exterior and the courtyard or atrium also allowed for more control between outsiders and inhabitants. Furthermore, the visual access from outside the houses and from reception spaces was restricted in all cases which could be studied. Therefore, the activities of the inhabitants may have been less Roman than their surroundings would indicate.

V.B.2: Evidence of Household Cult

Of the 157 houses in this sample, 14 have evidence relating to domestic cult. This evidence includes a possible cult room, hearths, altars, niches, mosaics with cultic themes, and representations and objects related to deities.

---

576 Petropoulos 1999, p. 42.
Cult Room or Sacellum

There was one potential cult room or *sacellum* identified from a house in the upper town, PATRA057. Off the southeast corner of the atrium of this house was Room 7 (Figure 228). Inside this small square space were found five terracotta figurines, a sandaled foot-shaped lamp, and a carved marble table leg (Figures 229 and 230). The figurines represent an Eros, a half-nude older male with large ears and a conical hat, a headless female in a short chiton (possibly Artemis or an Amazon), another headless female in a short dress with boots, and a third female in a full gown stepping forward on a pedestal (Figures 232 to 237). The moulded lamp was of a type dated from the 1st-3rd centuries CE and numerous in the Roman world (Figure 239). Francesca L’hoir connects these sandaled feet-shaped lamps with the worship of Sarapis and the honoring of the dead. The sandal, called a *lingula* type, is an Italian type as well, not appearing in the Greek world until the 2nd century BCE and then only in Asia Minor where the Romans established a colony. By the date of this lamp, however, this sandal type might have been more common in the Roman world. The marble table leg formed a griffin paw at the bottom and was found sitting on the dirt floor of the room, possibly one of two legs.

Moreover, there is some circumstantial evidence to suggest that this was a place of worship. First, the marble-lined doorway and the marble table leg suggest this was an important space and its activities were worthy of these refinements. However, within this space were found small terracotta figurines, which, if they were only decoration, would

---

577 Papapostolou 1984a, pp. 68.
be a poor accompaniment to the marble fixtures. In addition, these figurines represent at least two different deities and one of them probably twice. This duplication is something which has been observed in Roman lararium groups. As for the lamp, Stewart has suggested that lamps could have been used in place of altars to burn oils as offerings to the deities.\textsuperscript{581} The sandaled foot-shape of the lamp might be connected with the cult of Sarapis, but even if this is not the case, as Stewart has discussed, lamps without religious iconography could have been used in religious contexts.\textsuperscript{582} In addition to the lamp as an altar, the table itself could have served to hold the figurines or at least the offerings made to them. The room itself is very small, measuring roughly 1.5m by 1.5m, and would have been filled in large part by the table and its contents. Such a space, although decorated, would not have been appropriate in size for receiving and entertaining guest. Its size was similar to storage rooms or exedra; a storage space is another possible identification for its function. However, its thin west wall, which was likely a balustrade or parapet, suggests that there was something displayed in the room rather than stored. Although none of this evidence is definitive proof of a cult room or sacellum, this identification is distinctly possible.

**Hearths**

Four houses from this sample contained hearths. In the east part of PATRA030 was found a layer of terracotta tiles with strong traces of fire, which the excavators interpreted as a hearth space.\textsuperscript{583} There were no finds mentioned from the surrounding area, and there is nothing distinctly Roman or Greek about this hearth as described.

\textsuperscript{581} Stewart 2000, p. 10; Stewart 2003, p. 197.  
\textsuperscript{582} Stewart 2000, pp. 8–9; Stewart 2003, pp. 195–196.  
\textsuperscript{583} Kotsaki 1993b, p. 149.
PATRA119 contained two square hearths whose sides were built of curved Corinthian tiles set in mortar.\textsuperscript{584} This suggests the inhabitants were using whatever materials were at hand for this feature. It is uncertain whether these were contemporary or successive or where they were located within the structure.\textsuperscript{585} If the two hearths were contemporary, it is possible that one was ceremonial and the other utilitarian, depending on their locations in the house and any finds associated with the hearths. They could also have served to accommodate a larger household, but this would depend on the original size of the structure, which is unknown. The house was well-appointed in both of its identified phases, with marble slab floors in the early Roman period and mosaics in the second Roman phase; it is possible they had the means for a ceremonial hearth and a utilitarian one, or that one or both of these hearths had multiple functions.

The third house with a hearth was PATRA082.\textsuperscript{586} Here a partial circular hearth was uncovered but nothing is mentioned about its construction or location. More details were given for the hearth found at PATRA062.\textsuperscript{587} Here a hearth was found in the northeast corner of the atrium contemporary with its floor, which belongs to the second Roman structure of the site. It was built of tiles and mortar with walls 0.16m thick and 0.25m deep. To the south of this hearth along the east wall of the atrium was part of a second circular hearth and a storage pithos. It is not stated whether this was contemporary with the Roman structure or if it belonged to the early Roman building underneath. This location of the hearths in the sheltered part of the atrium or courtyard

\textsuperscript{584} Papapostolou 1979e, pp. 358–360.
\textsuperscript{585} Papapostolou 1979e, pp. 358–360.
\textsuperscript{587} Dekoulakou 1983a, pp. 100–102.
was something found in early Roman housing in Italy\textsuperscript{588} and in earlier Greek housing.\textsuperscript{589} Thus, the hearths from Patras do not necessarily display any imported influence from Italy. Furthermore, because of their association with Hestia and Vesta they may have been part of household cult whether the inhabitants followed Greek or Roman practices.

**Altars**

The evidence for altars is scarce and difficult to interpret at this time because without corroborating evidence it is not possible to definitively distinguish an altar from a statue base. There is one possible altar, which has been identified as such, found in a house, PATRA062 (Figure 249). In the earlier phase of the building, underneath the later tank of the atrium, was found a rectangular brick-built structure with an associated smaller rectangular brick-built structure 0.30m to the north (Figure 248).\textsuperscript{590} Both were paved with marble slabs, tiles, and stones and covered with mortar. Inside the smaller structure were found miniature vessels, which modern scholars typically associate with cultic ritual. The excavators interpreted the larger structure as an altar and the smaller one as a base for offerings because of the collection of miniature vessels.\textsuperscript{591} It is also possible that the larger structure was a statue base with the smaller structure as the altar. However, aside from the miniature vessels which are significant, there is nothing else to suggest cult, such as painted decoration on the feature, an inscription, or other related objects. The pottery also helped date the feature and building phase to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century

\textsuperscript{588} Foss 1997, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{589} Permanent hearths were usually found within a sheltered space with a flue, but near the courtyard, to keep the house heated in winter, such as at Olynthos, Athens, and Halieis.
\textsuperscript{590} Dekoulakou 1983a, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{591} Dekoulakou 1983a, p. 102
The function of the room is unknown as only a few remnants remain from this earlier structure under the atrium. It is likely that the earlier building was an early Roman period house. However, important for this study, it is uncertain if this feature was in a central room of circulation or in a more isolated part of the house.

Altars are not well preserved in domestic contexts at Patras. This may be because of the fragmentary nature of the preserved remains or the use of portable altars which were removed when the houses were abandoned. Based on the one from PATRA062, permanent altars did exist but do not appear to have been the norm.

**Wall painting, niches and aediculae**

No *aediculae* have been found at Patras, which is surprising given how closely the houses themselves resemble those of Pompeii and Herculaneum where *aediculae* were one of the more popular and elaborate forms of household shrines. Niches have been found, however, in four of the houses from Patras. The first two of these were found in PATRA096, located in the south limits of the excavated part of the house. They were placed side by side next to a niched tank (Figure 275). These were probably part of a fountain or nymphaeum in the private house, even though no pipes were recorded from these niches. In the public and sacred spheres, nymphaea were closely connected with the worship of the nymphs. In private homes, however, fountains, including those with grottos, were a common feature among the wealthy in Roman Italy, who used water
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592 Dekoulakou 1983a, p. 102.
595 Longfellow 2011, pp. 9–13 (on Greek fountains) and pp. 13–19 (on Republican fountains).
features as a means of displaying their social status.\textsuperscript{596} It is uncertain whether these
domestic fountains or nymphaeae held a religious function as well; it is likely a personal
choice of the head of the household.

Niches with an associated pipe were found in PATRA082 along the east wall of
the larger excavated space.\textsuperscript{597} However, to the north of this, in a gamma-shaped space
with elaborate mosaics, was found painted on the wall an enthroned female figure below
another, smaller niche (Figures 267, 268, and 269). This niche was painted with a floral
motif of rosettes and ivy leaves. The enthroned figure was preserved from the waist
down and did not have any distinctive attributes; therefore, the figure cannot be
identified. Of the cults known from Patras, Cybele,\textsuperscript{598} Hera/Juno,\textsuperscript{599} Tyche,\textsuperscript{600} and
Demeter\textsuperscript{601} were usually enthroned in their iconography. The semi-circular niche was
narrow with a marble slab floor which projects beyond the edge of the niche. To the east
of the niche is another painted figure, which might also be connected with the niche
(Figure 270). This figure is less clear in the excavation photographs and may be a
reclining human figure or a running animal. Regardless, with the associated enthroned
figure and the floral motif, this niche bears a strong resemblance to those of Pompeii and
Ostia which were used as lararia.

The next house which contained a niche is PATRA063.\textsuperscript{602} In a room with a
marble-lined tank, which may have been a fountain, was a semicircular niche in the wall
opposite the fountain. This room was located to the west of the atrium of the house, and

\begin{itemize}
  \item Longfellow 2011, pp. 27–28.
  \item Papapostolou 1984f, pp. 77–80; Papapostolou 1985h, p. 86; Kotsaki 1995, p. 127.
      41–42.
  \item Pausanias 7.20.3; Herbillon 1929, pp. 97–98.
  \item Papapostolou 1988c, p. 182; Papapostolou 1988d, p. 182.
\end{itemize}
including the atrium was one of three rooms with tanks. The decoration of the space suggests that it was a reception area. There is no other description to go along with this niche, but it is possible it could have served as a shrine or for a decorative sculpture.

The final two niches were found in PATRA110 (Figure 282). The first of these was located in the central courtyard of the house. This central courtyard was entered from the street by three wide, marble steps. The niche was roughly centered between two entrances to the space to the east of the courtyard. The excavators suggest that this niche was used for a statue. There is no other description provided for the niche. It is possible that it was for a statue or for a shrine, or both. The second niche of this building was to the south of the courtyard, in a room two spaces removed from the courtyard. Here was a much deeper, circular niche with evidence of burning. The excavators hypothesize that it was used as a cooking facility. In that capacity, it could have taken on the role of a hearth and, therefore, may have had a household cult function as well.

**Figurines, plaques, and lamps associated with deities**

From seven houses came figurines of deities or cult related items. Terracottas of a grotesque, an Eros, and three headless females, two of which resembled the dress of Artemis, were found in PATRA057 (Figures 233 to 237). Artemis was the tutelary deity of both pre-Roman Patras and Roman Patras and several different cults to her have been recorded. In addition, a marble satyr head from a small herm was also found in PATRA057 (Figure 238). Since it was not mentioned with the finds of the potential
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603 Panagiotopoulou, Platonos, and Matsas 1987c, pp. 144–147.
605 Papapostolou 1984a, pp. 68.
sacellum, it may have come from elsewhere in the house. If it was not decorative, it suggests multiple shrines in the house, as in the Greek custom. Furthermore, in the north tank in PATRA060 was found a headless, heavily damaged statuette of Aphrodite and a headless nude youth. Again, these are possibly decorative, but small sculpture may also have been used in shrines (Figures 57 and 137). All of these deities found in the houses of Patras were worshipped in Greece prior to the Roman period. No Lares or Genius have been identified in Patras to indicate specifically Roman household cults.

As for other items which refer to household cult, there was a votive plaque found in PATRA028. This plaque depicted a bearded man facing right and wearing a cloak on his right shoulder and a fillet on his head. To his left was the end of a garment of another figure which placed its left hand on the shoulder of the man. This plaque was found in the fill of the house, and its original location is unknown. In another structure, PATRA129, a phiale was found in the fill of the tank of the atrium. This vessel type is exclusively for worship in both Roman and Greek traditions. It, therefore, demonstrates that some kind of cultic activity took place in this house, possibly even in the atrium.

Finally, there are two houses with mosaic floors which have depictions related to cultic activities. In Room 1 of PATRA078, there was a geometric mosaic with a central panel. The panel held the image of a square, stone altar with a burning fire on top of it. The altar, similar in proportions and shape to the physical altars discussed above, was decorated with a boukranion (Figure 262). Flanking the altar were a rooster and a goose with a sacrificial knife next to the animals. Above the altar were ribbons. Based on the altar with a burning sacrifice, the knife, the animals chosen, the boukranion, and the
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606 Dekoulakou 1983c, p. 106.
607 Papapostolou 1984e, p. 76.
608 Papapostolou 1984e, p. 76.
ribbons or fillets, this mosaic appears to depict a scene of sacrifice. Located in a house, it might have shown one of the activities which took place in this house. However, the actual function of the room and its position within the house are not known as the house itself is poorly preserved.

The other mosaic comes from one of the two rooms preserved of PATRA075.609. This mosaic is geometric with a border of boxes. In the boxes images of rosettes, pelti, kantharoi, and boukrania alternate. The rosettes, pelti, and kantharoi are often used to decorate mosaics and are not necessarily cultic. Rosettes could have this association though, especially in combination with boukrania. The two are often depicted with garlands or ribbons on altars and around shrines, both public and private. It is possible this border may allude to domestic cult activities in this house.

Since the evidence from houses is scant and inconclusive regarding the nature of the household deities worshiped at Patras, I have looked for other depictions of deities or cultic scenes from other contexts at this site to get a fuller understanding of the deities that were significant for the inhabitants of Patras. Six figurines from other contexts have been published in the excavation reports. From these six, three are fully clothed female figurines from the Sarma Collection610, one is a nude male figurine from the same collection, one is a terracotta figurine of Aphrodite from a Roman tomb at Odos Agios Nikolaos 63611, and one is an enthroned terracotta female with an animal at her side and a cornucopia in her arm from a Roman workshop building612. But, this sample does not reveal much about the nature of household worship in Patras either, only that Aphrodite
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611 Papastolou 1979g, p. 346, pl. 217.
612 Agallopoulou 1979m, p. 403 and p. 406, pl. 260.
and probably Cybele were honored in personal worship.⁶¹³ At this time a more quantitative study of depictions of deities, like that conducted as Corinth, is not feasible. However, a survey of objects, mosaics, large sculpture, vase painting, and lamps published in preliminary excavation reports is informative.⁶¹⁴ There appear many depictions of Dionysos,⁶¹⁵ Herakles, and water related deities like Tritons and nymphs in mosaics, large sculpture, vase painting, and lamps found at Patras.

There were also images on lamps of Athena and Attis, although not as abundant as Dionysos or water-related scenes. And, in Petropoulos’s catalog of lamps from Patras the following depictions are found: Cybele, Attis, Athena, Hermes, Eros, Eurypylus, Tyche, Artemis, Herakles, Asklepios, satyrs, grapes or grape vines, gladiators, erotic scenes, and fish or men fishing⁶¹⁶. The most repeated themes are related to Dionysos (satyrs, grapes), to Aphrodite and Eros (Eros and erotic scenes), and to Cybele (Cybele and Attis). All of these deities were popular in the Mediterranean in general and in pre-Roman Greece, although according to Rizakis and Petropoulos, the cults of Cybele and of the Egyptian deities were brought to Patras by the Romans.⁶¹⁷ Other deities like Diana

---

⁶¹³ The tomb and the workshop are both contexts in which the figurines would have been related to personal worship rather than an offering at a public sanctuary. The workshop, located in the northern part of the ancient city near the harbor, could also indicate the production of the figurine and not any cultic function in this context.


⁶¹⁵ Dionysos’s importance at Patras is also highlighted with reference to coins in Agallopoulou 1991, pp. 211–216.

⁶¹⁶ Petropoulos 1999.

and Mercury, could have been interpreted as the Greek Artemis and Hermes as well, and, therefore, cannot be used as evidence of Roman influence. Mithras, a deity closely associated with the Roman army and which did not also have a Greek counterpart,\textsuperscript{618} has been attested at Patras, but still not within a domestic context. Therefore, the deities found within household contexts so far reflect those honored in the city in general and do not represent any specific Roman household cults.

Based on this analysis of household religion, there is very little, if any definitive evidence of household cult. The most secure instances are the possible sacellum from PATRA057 and the painted niche from PATRA082, both of which are uncertain identifications at best. If these two features were in fact remnants of household religion, they mirror the strong Romano-Italian influence seen in the houses themselves. However, two tenuous examples do not indicate a preference for Roman household religion over Greek. Still, I will use these two features for the next step in the analysis to understand more about their location and use.

\textbf{V.B.3: Cult in Context}

Because of the state of preservation of PATRA082 and PATRA057, formal access and visibility analysis cannot be conducted. However, enough of their structures remain to make a few meaningful observations. The painted niche in PATRA082 and the sacellum in PATRA057 were found just off a highly decorated space and an atrium respectively. They were not \textit{in} these reception spaces, but to the side, and both were likely physically inaccessible when not in use.

\textsuperscript{618} Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, p. 37.
In the case of PATRA057, the house appears arranged around an atrium with a marble-lined tank in the center which preserves bases for four pillars at each of its corners (Figure 228). The possible *sacellum*, Room 7, was entered by a marble threshold measuring over a meter wide with markings for a door (Figures 229 and 230). The threshold block does not appear to have been reused. To the west of this doorway stood the marble block set at the end of a thin wall, only one brick thick; the same thickness as the block. This was likely part of the frame for the doorway for Room 7 but also for one of the entrances from the atrium into Room 6; therefore, without the block and thin wall, this would be a nearly two meter wide entrance way. The remains of the wall behind the block were not wide enough to support a wall to the height of a room. Either this formed a low parapet wall or was the foundations for a balustrade. In either case, this low wall made Room 7 visibly accessible from Room 6 to the west, a narrow corridor like space with multiple entrances to the atrium. It could also be partially visible from the atrium through the doorway to the west of the door jamb (Figures 231 and 232), if the door was closed between Room 7 and the atrium. Of course, this could also be obstructed by a curtain or screen for which physical evidence is not preserved.

Physical access to Room 7 from the atrium, however, was restricted by a door. If the door was closed, the low wall would have prevented ‘interaction’ from Room 6. The wide doorway, which occupies almost the entire north wall of the room, when opened would have allowed the maximum number of people in the atrium to view into it. Furthermore, viewers could also stand in Room 6, segregated from those in the atrium. Although, it is tucked away in the corner, it is also located off the central circulation room of the house, whose decoration suggests it served as a reception space. It is feasible

---

619 M. Papaioannou (pers. comm.).
that it was accessible to all in the house, but only when the doors were open. When closed, it would have been only visually accessible through Room 6, but not physically. If this was a shrine, this is an interesting juxtaposition between the intimate Greek traditions and the conspicuous Roman traditions.

Looking at the plan of PATRA082, its lararium-like niche was blocked from the larger reception room by a dividing wall, placing this potential shrine in a narrow corridor-like space, although also a highly-decorated space (Figure 267). It is possible that the dividing wall was added later and the niche went out of use, however, the pattern of the mosaic floors in this corridor space follow the dividing wall suggesting they were laid afterwards. If this space went out of use, why would the floors have been decorated in this way and the niche decorated with wall painting. The decoration suggests that it would have been viewed by visitors, but the remoteness supports the idea of the inhabitants only. This potential shrine also combines display and seclusion.

Therefore, although the houses are not well preserved it can be suggested that the potential shrines appear to have been placed with access from more public areas of the house in which visitors were likely to be, but this access is impeded by depth, doors, or low walls. Also, they are not near the utilitarian spaces of the house, so they do not appear to have been exclusively intended for the inhabitants. Papaioannou similarly observed this location of the shrines and suggested that the Greek cults found in the courtyards of Patrean houses were pushed to the corners when their location was taken over by impluvia.\(^{620}\) However, this explanation suggests that the shrines were less important to the inhabitants. If we consider the location without an understanding of the practices, then this appears to be true. But, if we take into account that in the Greek

Tradition shrines were not intended for visitors and were located in liminal spaces, like courtyards, and in the Roman tradition the location of the shrines was meant to display them to visitors but not necessarily provide access to them, location would suggest either tradition.

V.B.4: Observations

It is not unexpected that there were two potential shrines found which resemble Roman practices since there is so much evidence of Roman influence in the construction, decoration and amenities of the houses. Yet, it is surprising that more have not been identified. In addition to these two, the altar, hearths, and several depictions of deities and cultic motifs reveal household cult was conducted in the house but it is impossible to tell more about who worshipped and where. This last element of household cult does perhaps imply that the deities worshipped in the home were not specifically Roman, but Greek or Greco-Roman. There were no Lares or Genius found at Patras in either primary or secondary contexts. This seems to support the assumption that the inhabitants of Patras worshipped Greek gods but in mixed forms of shrines, with two examples which look Roman and the rest more generic Greco-Roman. This ambiguity is also apparent in the location of the shrines, visible at times in reception spaces, but not necessarily directly accessible.

Given the evidence discussed above, I would agree with Rizakis\textsuperscript{621} that Patras was a mixture of both cultural identities and suggest that it was very similar to Corinth in cultural identity and composition of the population. Like Corinth, I think it is a familiarity with both cultures and an ability to participate in both equally. Such

\textsuperscript{621} Rizakis 2010b, pp. 150–152.
adaptability would have been necessary in a city which was composed partly of Romans and which was expected to participate in the wider Roman administrative and economic world, but at the same time was also populated from, and needed to relate to, the Achaean communities around it. They may have succeeded in maintaining traditions within the new social and political structures. Furthermore, like at Corinth, if one identified with being Roman, how they expressed their Romanness at home may have been less about display and more about the way in which they worshipped. The question then is, were these other communities in Roman Achaia, therefore, different from the colonies?

V.C: Messene

One community in Roman Achaia which can help address this question was the inland city of Messene. Located in the Peloponnese to the south of Patras, this community was formed in the late 4th century BCE. After Sparta was defeated at the Battle of Leuktra in 371 BCE, the Theban commander Epaminondas sought to resettle the region of Messenia whose inhabitants had supposedly been driven out three centuries earlier by Sparta. He established the city of Messene on Mount Ithome as the head of the state of Messenia. Here, this city was strategically placed at the center of the Messenian homeland, not only for its defensible position but also for its cultural significance as an important site of Messenian resistance towards Sparta in the fifth century BCE.

---

622 Thank you to Professor Petros Themelis and his staff at the Restoration and Excavation Project of Messene.
623 For Messenian diasporas see Diodorus Siculus 11.84.7–8, 12.44.3, 12.60.1–2, 13.48.6–7, 14.34.2–6, 14.78.5–6; Polybius 4.33. For resettlement see Diodorus Siculus 15.66.1–67.1; Strabo 8.4.8; Pausanias 27.5–27.11; Luraghi 2008, pp. 209–248.
624 Roebuck 1941, pp. 3–4.
Over the course of the next 150 years, this region attempted to establish its ethnic identity and to be considered a major state in Hellenistic Greece. Nino Luraghi has made clear in his study of Messenian identity, that there was much political contention between the city of Messene and the region of Messenia, with each community attempting to exert its autonomy rather than follow Messene. It is likely that the region was nominally held together as a federation rather than a city-state. However, those in Messene strove to create a united Messenian cultural identity through cults, institutions, and public buildings which highlighted heroes and deities from all the areas of Messenia and their common history. It is uncertain how Messene as religious and cultural center of Messenia was perceived by the rest of Messenia, but those in Messene clearly wished to define themselves as Messenian.

During the wars of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, the city itself maintained an isolationist stance towards Mediterranean politics and military action, but some of the other Messenian towns went their own way. Messene was only involved in military action or political alliance when directly threatened. The other key element in Messenian politics was to always do the opposite from Sparta. It was this anti-Spartan sentiment which brought Messene onto the losing sides of the Roman civil wars, choosing first Brutus and Cassius and then Anthony and Cleopatra. As punishment, Augustus took away the much contested bordering territory of Dentheliatis and gave it to
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628 McDonald and Rapp, p. 94; Luraghi 2008, pp. 266–269.
630 Polybius 22.10, 23.17; Luraghi 2008, pp. 252–266.
632 Luraghi 2008, pp. 265–266.
Sparta. However, in the end, Messene made itself a loyal follower of Rome, as evidenced by the many inscriptions, although in Greek, and imperial statues, which were found in the excavations of the agora area.\textsuperscript{633} It was allowed a certain level of autonomy within the provincial system, to maintain its timocratic government and to continue to mint its own coins.\textsuperscript{634} In return the city of Messene, as the cultural, political, and economic center of the region, honored the emperors with statues, dedications, and the imperial cult, as well as with their loyalty and taxes.\textsuperscript{635}

Under Tiberius and later emperors, the region regained the territories it had lost, and its elite citizens, such as the families of the Saethidae and of Aristomenes, were able to gain Roman citizenship and to climb high in the international hierarchy of Roman politics.\textsuperscript{636} These families and their positions in international politics are memorialized in inscriptions and funerary monuments found at Messene.\textsuperscript{637} The Saethidae themselves not only achieved senatorial status but by the mid-2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE one of the family members also served as consul.\textsuperscript{638} While this was only as \textit{consul suffectus}, or a mid-term appointment, such evidence does indicate the socio-political level to which Messenians were able and willing to rise within the empire. There is much evidence for the local elite acquiring Roman citizenship, or at least associating with Roman culture, most especially in their \textit{nomina}. Within the Saethidae family, names such as Tiberius Claudius are found with the Messenian cognomen. In Rizakis, Zoumbaki, and Lepenioti’s catalogue of Roman names in the Peloponnese, 354 Roman names were found, mostly with Greek

\textsuperscript{633} E.g., \textit{SEG} 41.328; Themelis 2010, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{634} Themelis 2010, p. 96 (on mint) and p. 98 (on government).
\textsuperscript{635} \textit{IG} V.1, 1432; \textit{IG} V.1, 1433; Themelis 2010, pp. 95–96.
\textsuperscript{636} Luraghi 2008, pp. 294–295; Themelis 2010, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{637} E.g., \textit{IG} V.1, 1450; \textit{IG} V.1, 1455.
\textsuperscript{638} \textit{CIL} III, 495.
cognomina, in inscriptions from the region of Messenia. However, as with Patras, this catalog does not include Greek names or those of Messenians found abroad. In addition, there is also evidence attesting to Romans themselves living in Messenia and being active members of the community. This is most especially prominent in the ephebic lists found in the gymnasium of Messene, where a special tribe had been established by the end of the 1st century CE for Romans and foreigners.

Through survey and excavations, several Roman style villae rusticae have been located in the region of Messenia, which has been cited as evidence of Roman estate owners participating in the primarily agricultural economy of the region. Whether these were Romans, Messenians with Roman citizenship, or Messenians with aspirations to citizenship cannot be determined. However, this evidence does attest to the continuation of the agriculturally based economy of Messenia from the Hellenistic period onward. Although Messenia suffered some economic hardship along with the rest of Greece in the 1st century BCE, its agricultural economy recovered and grew under the Principate. Unlike Corinth and Patras, Messene did not experience a building boom in the 2nd century CE, but it did maintain its size and prominence in the region to the end of the 4th century CE.

A key factor in Messene’s resilience was its self-sufficiency. For the most part, Messenia used locally made pottery, grew its own foodstuffs, had land for livestock, and had easy access to marine resources. The only foodstuff it was not able to produce in
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640 IG V.1, 1433; IG V.1, 1434; Themelis 2010, p. 95.
641 Themelis 2010, p. 96.
642 McDonald and Rapp 1972, p. 96.
643 Themelis 2010, p. 94.
644 Themelis 2010, p. 98.
enough quantity for the region was grains, which occasionally needed to be imported during famine.\textsuperscript{646} In addition, metals needed to be imported to the region, although there was a manganese mine within Messenia.\textsuperscript{647} Furthermore, lying on the west coast of the Peloponnese, Messene had several good harbors, which were important for trade in the Adriatic. However, these harbors did not achieve the status of Patras or Corinth.\textsuperscript{648} Few imports have been found in Messenia, such as Knidian and Koan wine amphorae and terra sigillata.\textsuperscript{649} This ability to exist independent of other regions may also be a key element in their strong sense of Messenian identity.

Although a Greek city left relatively autonomous by the Romans, there were clearly Romans living in Messenia, as is visible in the \textit{villae rusticae} and the names from the ephebic lists. However, the Romans who may have come to Messenia seem to have respected and maintained local practices, such as the institution of the ephebes. This notion is further supported by the larger number of Greek inscriptions not only for official use but also dedicatory and honorary. It seems that by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, Messene arrived at a similar situation to Patras, in which the inhabitants were able to balance both the Roman and Greek world throughout their lives, whether of Messenian or Roman descent. This is surprising considering how fiercely they determined to stay Messenian throughout the Hellenistic period and how they continued to identify themselves as Messenian in their inscriptions and monuments into the Roman period. Thus, this free city, as an important regional center with a strong Roman presence, makes a good comparison to the two Roman colonies.

\textsuperscript{646} Themelis 2010, p. 91.
\textsuperscript{647} Themelis 2010, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{648} Messene had trade connections with Rhegium, Messana, Kephallenia, Naupaktos where the Messenians had settled during the diaspora (Themelis 2010, p. 95).
\textsuperscript{649} Themelis 2010, p. 94 and p. 95.
V.C.1: The Houses

From the city of Messene three houses have been excavated by the Messenian Archaeological Society, MESSE001 through MESSE003 (Figure 300). A fourth structure, south of the Asklepion, was identified as a priests house, MESSE004, but dated to late antiquity, as was a farmstead found on the slopes of Mount Ithome, MESSE005. 650 These two structures were included in the database because they are mentioned in other studies on Messene, but given their dating, have not been used in this study. The other three structures date from the 2nd to 4th centuries CE and were constructed over previous buildings, including houses and a shrine to Cybele. 651 A further nine possible domestic structures (AITHA001, DESYL001, DHROS001, GRIZI001, KARDH001, KORON001, LONGA001, PETAL001, and POTAM001), dated to the 1st to 4th centuries CE, have been found in the region of Messenia. 652 These were identified through survey and Greek Archaeological Service excavations, and they are for the most part villae rusticae and farmsteads. Therefore, a total of twelve houses compose this sample within the chronology of the study.

Layout, Access and Visibility Analysis

Detailed plans have been drawn for two of these twelve houses, MESSE001 and MESSE002. These two villae urbane occupy an entire insula each and are composed of rooms which appear haphazardly arranged, lacking symmetry or axiality in the overall plan. In both there is included an atrium space, but it is not a central circulation space for

652 McDonald and Rapp 1972, p. 96; Grandjean 2003, p. 257; Vikatou 2004a; Vikatou 2004b; Chatzi-Spiliopoulou 2005; Themelis 2010, p. 102.
the house (Figures 301 and 307). In MESSE001, the atrium, Room 12, appears at the
center of the house, but is not visually accessible from the front door (Figure 305) and
through spatial analysis is shown to not be a control space (Figure 303). Instead,
Corridor 11 and Rooms 18 and 20 are the most accessible, most symmetrical, and have
the highest control values of the house (Figure 304). This corridor connects three of the
four distinct areas of the house (Figure 303). Among these three areas, two are shallowly
arranged and are similar to the patterns observed in earlier Greek housing. These areas
are the rooms around Room 9 and those around Room 20. Room 9 is a storeroom and
Room 20 may have been a secondary courtyard. The two rooms off of Room 20 may
have been dining or reception spaces based on the decoration; this is where a mosaic of
Dionysos and Ariadne was found. The third area, to the west of the atrium and centered
around Room 18, has a deep, asymmetrical arrangement, but the location of the doorways
lacks any direct visual access which was key in Roman plans. This area as well had
utilitarian functions since there was a well found in Room 21 and a wine press or grain
mill in Room 19. The fourth area, along the south part of the house, is independently
accessible from outside the house and it is uncertain how it connects with the rest of the
house. This additional exterior access is also similar to Roman housing; however, one of
the rooms involved is Room 4, a mausoleum. This feature is unique to Messenia and will
be discussed below.

Overall, this structure was asymmetrical and nondistributive, and its RRA was the
highest of all the houses in this study (Figure 310). This indicates that it was the least
accessible and is comparable with the Maison des sceaux and CORIN007 which had
completely independent sections of the house. Such division would make separation of
inhabitants and visitors possible, such as in the Greek tradition. However, there is no evidence to suggest who among the inhabitants were segregated from the reception spaces, such as slaves or female members of the household.

The resemblance to earlier Greek housing is also notable in the visibility from the two potential reception spaces, Rooms 24α and 24β. Neither of these two rooms allowed for visual access into the rest of the house (Figure 306). Moreover, they were positioned near the entrance of the house and Room 20 was immediately accessible from Corridor 11. Visitors allowed into these spaces would not have been able to pass through or see into any of the other areas of the house as they were led to these rooms.

As for MESSE002, a justified access map cannot be drawn for this structure as most of the interior doorways have not been preserved (Figure 307). However, the house was clearly arranged around an open courtyard space labeled Areas 3, 5 and 6. This courtyard gave access to all five distinct parts of the house. To the south flanking the main entrance of the house, there were two of these areas, and to the west and north was a set of rooms which included the atrium, Room 33. These sets of rooms were not arranged with typical Roman symmetry or visual accessibility, either within each set or between them (Figure 308).

In the center of the north side of the house is a large decorated hall and its antechamber. This space was decorated with marble revetments and an *opus sectile* floor, with a polychrome geometric mosaic floor in its antechamber. This is also where the full-size statues of Artemis Laphria, Hermes, and an emperor were discovered, likely decoration from the niches in the north wall of the room.653 The excavators have

---

suggested this space was a library. From this space which may have been used for reception, the other areas of the house were not visible, except for the courtyard area (Figure 308). To the east of this ornate space is the fifth set of rooms, also of unknown function. Behind these rooms is a second entrance from the east side of the house which passes behind the possible library and accesses the set of rooms with the atrium space. Although this structure contains Roman decorative elements, multiple entrances, and an atrium, it too does not reflect Roman household arrangements and usage patterns.

This small sample reflects the urban elite housing, which is comparable with the housing discussed in the other cities of this study. However, it must be noted that these do not reflect the housing of the lower classes nor of the countryside. The other houses from the area reveal elite villas that dotted the countryside. These are identified primarily from mosaic floors, marble elements like columns and statues, and baths. None has been completely uncovered, but they do demonstrate that the countryside was still in use, likely divided up into large agricultural estates and owned by elites.

**Construction Materials and Features**

All of the houses in this sample were built using local stone, tile, mud brick, rubble, and mortar (Appendix D). There is no evidence of Roman brickwork for domestic structures in the region. As for wall decorations, there are the marble revetments from Room 1 of MESSE002, but no painted wall plaster has been preserved

---

654 Themelis 1993, p. 103.
655 A caveat to the identification of these structures as villae is discussed in Alcock 1993, p. 64 and Grandjean 2003, p. 258. Both state that these villae are named based mostly on decorative elements and baths and do not account for other possible monumental structures which might have used these features such as sanctuaries.
in either of the houses. However, *opus sectile* floors have been found in both Rooms 10 and 12 of MESSE001 and in Room 1 of MESSE002. Most of the houses contained polychrome mosaics, usually figural with geometric borders, such as the mosaic of Dionysos and Ariadne from MESSE001 and the Dionysiac mosaic from KORON001 (Appendix C). None of the mosaics resembled the black, white, and red geometric mosaics popular in Patras and Italy; instead, they were part of the continuing eastern Mediterranean tradition seen at Corinth. Marble-lined tanks for collecting rain water were found in MESSE001 and MESSE002. Unlike Patras, however, these were not connected with a citywide water supply system, but collected the water for the household use.

Although they contained features similar to those of Roman houses, the accessibility and visibility in the available structures more closely resembled that of Greek housing. Nino Luraghi has suggested based on epigraphic evidence that some of these families, such as the Saethidae, may have had property in Italy as well as Messenia.657 It may be that they kept more Roman-style accommodations there, and more Messenian ones in their homeland. If this is the case, it would suggest the continuation of local traditions and customs in housing in Messenia over empire-wide trends seen in Patras and Corinth.

### V.C.2: Evidence of Household Cult

Despite the Roman citizens attested at Messene, there is no evidence for Roman-style household shrines and cults in this small sample. In fact, no evidence of household
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657 Luraghi 2008, p. 306 n. 53. The sons of Tiberius Claudius Frontinus Macer Campanus of the Saethidae family were *patroni* of Abellinum.
cults in general has been identified at Messene so far. It is possible that the over-life size statues from Room 1 or MESSE002 could have been used in cult rituals for the household, but there is no evidence to support this and using statues alone as evidence is problematic. Instead, in one structure, MESSE001, there is a distinctly Messenian feature of an intramural mausoleum in Room 4 of the house. The room was paved with a tile floor and contained two sarcophagi built of mud brick and tiles located along the south and west walls. The room was built before the Hellenistic period funerary monuments to its south, which would make it older than the house itself. It may have been contemporary with the Hellenistic Cybele shrine over which the Roman house was built. Looking at the plan of the structure, the walls are double the thickness of the rest of the house and may have been two sets of walls placed against each other (Figure 301). This would indicate further that the monument was an independent structure before the house was built. Therefore, when the Roman period house was constructed, it incorporated this important monument.

Hero cult for deceased members of the elite and important civic benefactors was a tradition unique to Messene, Sparta, and Megara. At Messene, the historic hero Aristomenes was honored at his intramural tomb with a hero cult for his victory over Sparta during his lifetime and for appearing at the Battle of Leuktra centuries later. This tomb was located within the gymnasium of Messene, as were several other tombs.
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660 Pausanias 4.16.6–7, 4.24.3, 4.32.4.
which honored important Messenian families and benefactors as heroes from the Hellenistic period through the Roman period.\textsuperscript{661}

According to Themelis, Messene had the largest number of intramural burials in all of mainland Greece.\textsuperscript{662} For the most part these were independent structures and were located not only around the gymnasium but also the Asklepieion, two important centers of cultural institutions for the city.\textsuperscript{663} These are monumental dedications to local benefactors similar to the smaller inscriptions and statues from the agora to the city’s benefactors, both local and imperial.

Thus far, the funerary monument found in MESSE001 is the only one known within a domestic structure. Its location next to the gymnasium and the fact that it was previously an independent structure are both in keeping with the traditions of these funerary monuments. The owner of the house was clearly important enough to be allowed not only to build over a shrine to Cybele but also to incorporate such a culturally important monument within the house. It is also possible, given the small number of houses found within the city walls, that a tradition of burying the dead within houses is not well preserved. This hero cult is not necessarily meant for the protection of the house and household, but it is a unique feature to this house which clearly reveals that the inhabitants still identified themselves as Messenian.

Turning to the other cults attested in general at Messene, they were ones reflecting the Hellenistic origins of the polity and the traditional gods of the peoples who called

\textsuperscript{662} Themelis 2003a, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{663} Themelis 2003a, pp. 40–72; the gymnasium was the location for the continued ephebic traditions and the Asklepieion was not only a healing sanctuary, but the center for the political cults of the city and region.
themselves Messenians. These included Messene, the first queen of Messenia, Asklepios, who had Messenian origins, Artemis Limnatis, from a part of the region constantly contested between Messenia and Laconia, and Zeus Ithome, the titulary deity of the capital of the region. The imperial cult is attested at this site through inscriptions and statues, but there was no evidence of Roman names for Greek deities. Therefore, it may be assumed that in Messenian households, similar deities were worshipped. There are no catalogs or reports which describe objects representing or depicting deities found in these houses or in secondary contexts; therefore, a more quantitative study of deities cannot be conducted at this time.

V.C.3: Cult in Context

Since there is no evidence surviving, no context can be provided. The spatial analysis of the houses in general did not reflect Roman patterns of circulation or of emphasis on axiality and visibility. It can be assumed that the location of household cult within the structure would also reflect this non-Roman accessibility, visibility, and intended participants.

V.C.4: Observations

In the free city of Messene, there was a continual effort to define themselves as Messenian even into the Roman period. Although they embraced Roman names, political roles, and even some household decorations, the Messenians in Messene still bury the elite dead within city, honored their traditional cults, and maintained customs like the ephebes. In order to rise in the Roman political system, the elite Messenians would have

664 E.g., IG V.1, 1455.
had to participate in Roman traditions as well, taking on Roman names and customs, and participating in the imperial cult. It is possible that they expressed their Romanness more outside of Messenia, may be through their activities in Southern Italy. Maintaining a Messenian identity in Messene would have allowed them to relate better with the Messenian communities making them more effective local leaders.

In Messene it seems that association with Roman culture on a household level was demonstrated through decoration of one’s house but not necessarily in the activities of the household. From this perspective in Messene to be Roman appears to have been a way to demonstrate social status within Messene rather than in a change in cultural identity, unlike in Patras and Corinth. However, the elite Messenians were similar to those of Patras and Corinth in that by keeping up Greek and local practices in their home lives, they acted as a bridge between those who identified themselves as Romans and those who did not. Is this also true in other free cities of Achaia, such as Athens and its port Piraeus?

V.D: Athens

Athens, unlike Corinth and Patras, was revered as a center of Greek culture under the Roman Empire. For this reason Athens also received imperial favor and was maintained as a free city within the province of Achaia. Like Patras and Messene, there was no break in the occupation of Athens with the arrival of the Romans in Greece,
in spite of Sulla’s devastation of the city. The Romans had for a long time favored Athens. During the conflicts of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, Athens was a center for diplomacy where Roman ambassadors met with Greek officials and Roman officials heading to the East stopped along their way. At the same time, many Romans went to Athens to study philosophy and oratory or to visit on tours of Greece. However, for this time period there is very little evidence for many Romans taking up permanent residence in Athens; most appeared to have been passing through or residing for only a few years.

They would, therefore, have very little noticeable effect on housing in Athens, but their esteem for Athens prevented its total destruction in the 1st century BCE, like that which befell Corinth in the previous century. Athens sided with Mithridates in 89 BCE and was consequently besieged and sacked in 87/86 BCE by Sulla. Excavations in the Agora area have shown that the sacking of Athens was not a total destruction, but still very severe, targeting key public structures like the arsenal, the state prison and political monuments, as well as wealthy residential areas for plunder. Excavations outside this area have also revealed many further domestic structures with severe damage or

---

669 Polybius 2.12; Polybius 38.13; Plutarch, Marcus Cato 12; Livy 35.31; Plutarch, Pompeius 27.3 and 42.5–6; Cicero, de Oratore 1.18.82; Cicero, ad Familiares 12.16 and 13.1; Livy 45.27.10–11; Habicht 1997, pp. 9–10.

670 Cicero ad Atticum 3.8; Plutarch Pompey 27.

671 Horace, Epistles 2.2.43–45, 80–85; Livy 45.27.11–28.1; Cicero, de Oratore 1.11.45, 1.18.82, 3.9.43, 3.18.68; Cicero, ad Atticum 5; Cicero, ad Familiares 4.12; Cicero, de Natura Deorum 1.21.59; Cicero, in Q. Caecilius 12.39; Dio Cassius 45.15.4; Ovid, Tristia 1.2.77–78; Plutarch Brutus 24; Plutarch Cicero 4; Habicht 1997, pp. 10–11 and 12–13; Papaioannou 2002, p. 18; Habicht 1997, pp. 12–14. While these primary sources were written after 86 BCE, they reflect a tradition which dated back at least as far as Aemilius Paullus in 168 BCE (Livy 45.27.11–28.1).

672 Horace Epistles 2.2.80–85; Cicero pro Balbo 12.30; Habicht 1997, pp. 12–14.

673 Plutarch Sulla 14; Appian, Mithridateios 4.38; Strabo 9.1.20; Livy 55.78, 55.81

674 Hoff 1997, pp. 38–43.
destruction related to the sack. Therefore, those who remained in Athens would have needed to renovate or rebuilt to live in these structures.

Following this destruction, Athens experienced continued hardship and lacked sufficient means to rebuild, especially during the Roman civil wars. However, with the creation of the province of Achaia in 27 BCE and the establishment of the Pax Romana, wealthy benefactors began to finance the rebuilding and renovation of the public areas of Athens. This would have led to more people returning to Athens and building new residences or renovating less damaged or neglected ones. Therefore, the sacking of Athens in 86 BCE will mark the beginning of the chronology for Roman Athens, as the point at which there was a distinct change in habitation across the site. An excellent example of this can be seen in the excavations of the Makriyianni plot, where the structures built in the 5th century BCE show damage, abandonment, and reuse around the 1st century BCE followed by extensive restructuring and renovation of the site in the late 1st century BCE.

During the imperial period the population of Athens was composed of Athenian citizens, foreigners including Romans, and travelers, as it was before Sulla. Based on the epigraphic, literary, and archaeological evidence, the composition of the population of Roman Athens appears similar to that of Patras. Although Athens did not have a
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675 Hoff 1997, p. 41.
676 ATHEN008 has a courtyard with a floor dated to between 86 and 27 BCE. The rest of the house may have been renovated in the 1st century CE.
677 Hoff 1997, p. 44; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 14–17. Geagan argues that Athens actually prospered between the time of Sulla and Augustus due to Roman interest in the Eleusinian Mysteries and the philosophical schools (Geagan 1979, p. 375). However, as will be seen, the remains of domestic buildings reflect economic hardship.
678 E.g., IG II.2, 3426 and 4122; Suetonius Augustus 60; Thakur 2007, pp. 108–109.
679 Eleutheratou 2008, pp. 185–188.
680 E.g., Geagan 1979, pp. 371–437; Baslez 1989, pp. 17–36; Habicht 1997, 9–18. It should be kept in mind, however, that aside from inscriptions, which also carry their own biases and agendas towards the
veterans’ colony, the popularity of its philosophical schools and its historical prestige were enough to draw Romans to the city.\textsuperscript{681} It would seem from this description that these Romans were less likely to be permanent inhabitants in comparison with the Romans at Patras; however, some epigraphic and literary evidence suggests that Romans sought Athenian citizenship and offices.\textsuperscript{682} Furthermore, as Marie-Françoise Baslez’s study indicates, foreigners, including Romans, actually outnumbered Athenian citizens on the ephebic lists of the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries CE.\textsuperscript{683} Baslez concluded from this study that the increase in foreigners participating in Athenian traditions, however, was proportional to Athenian economic hardship and not related to any love of foreigners.\textsuperscript{684} Nonetheless, clearly there were Romans in Athens who were active members of the Athenian community and likely more permanently established in the city.

As for the Athenians themselves, scholars such as Daniel Geagan and Michael Hoff have highlighted how the Athenians resisted Roman rule in the early imperial period.\textsuperscript{685} And, Sanjaya Thakur has discussed the conflicting evidence for acceptance and opposition to Roman rule in reference to the Temple of Roma and Augustus.\textsuperscript{686} Such

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{681} Thakur 2007, p. 106.
\item \textsuperscript{682} Cicero \textit{pro Balbo} 12.30; Oliver 1983, pp. 56–61; Habicht 1997, 12–14. According to Habicht there is only one piece of epigraphic evidence for a Roman holding an Athenian office, \textit{IG II}\textsuperscript{2}, 1938, line 40, and he conjectures that no Roman was made a full Athenian citizen until 125 BCE when foreigners were admitted to the ephebate; and then only four of the foreign youths were labeled “Roman” (Habicht 1997, p. 13). It is not until 60 BCE, in Cicero’s \textit{pro Balbo}, that there is evidence of Romans becoming naturalized Athenian citizens (Habicht 1997, p. 14).
\item \textsuperscript{683} Baslez 1989, p. 19 and pp. 35–36 (table).
\item \textsuperscript{684} Baslez 1989, pp. 34–35.
\item \textsuperscript{685} Cassius Dio 54.7.2–3; Hoff interprets the incident with the statue of Athena as an act of defiance towards Rome (Hoff 1989, 269); Cassius Dio 47.20.4; Orosius 6.22.2; \textit{IG} 2.2, 323: a rebellion in 13-14 CE (also see Geagan 1979, p. 379 and Hoff 1989, p. 275); Athenian rebellious spirit: Tacitus \textit{Annales}, 2.55; Hoff 1989, 267–276 describes Athenian resistance in general; Geagan 1997, pp. 19–21.
\item \textsuperscript{686} Thakur 2007, pp. 119–122.
\end{itemize}
resistance could lead one to the conclusion that Roman citizenship was not as desirable as it was for Patreans and Messenians. However, this Athenian resistance is only mentioned at the beginning of Roman dominion and disappears from the sources after 18 CE. Furthermore, among the elite, there were those from the Augustan period onward who paid for the Temple of Roma and Augustus to be built, who gained Roman citizenship, and who adopted Roman names and the Roman *tria nomina* system.\(^{687}\) Still, according to the epigraphic record, which was in Greek, Athenian citizenship remained a requirement for office and political advancement within Athens.\(^{688}\) This is in opposition to Patras and Corinth where Roman citizenship was needed for political advancement. Thus, there would have been less need to be Roman in Athens than there was in the colonies. This is also one explanation for why Roman citizens sought Athenian citizenship instead of the reverse.

In addition, there was a strong desire on the part of the Romans to preserve the Athenian culture, whether out of admiration or for political control.\(^{689}\) To this end emperors and Roman citizens alike donated money to preserve historic monuments throughout the city, such as the Panathenaic Way, the Propylaea, the sanctuaries of the city, and the Theater of Dionysos.\(^{690}\) Festivals such as the Eleusinian Mysteries were continued, with many Romans, including emperors, as initiates. The major cults of Athens, such as Athena Polias, Demeter and Kore, Dionysos, and Asklepios were thus

\(^{687}\) Woloch 1973; Geagan 1979, pp. 388–389; Geagan 1997, pp. 21–28. Woloch in 1973 calculated 716 mentions of Athenians with Roman citizenship and 429 of those were elites. This seems high in comparison to the evidence from Patras and Corinth, however, this may be the result of preservation and the redundancy of the same individual in multiple inscriptions. Furthermore, Woloch’s study focuses on 96-161 CE and therefore does not reflect trends throughout the Roman period.

\(^{688}\) Geagan 1979, p. 389.

\(^{689}\) Shear (Shear 1981, pp. 356–377) hints at antiquarian interests in preserving Athens, while Geagan (Geagan 1979, pp. 371–437) and Hoff (Hoff 1989, pp. 267–276) see these acts as a form of political control.

\(^{690}\) *IG* 2.2, 1035; Geagan 1979, pp. 279–382, pp. 382–385.
preserved. In addition, the imperial cult was added to the Acropolis and to the Agora.\textsuperscript{691} Other sanctuaries, such as to Ares, were brought into Athens from Attica by the Romans.\textsuperscript{692} While Ares could have also been called Mars in his new location, it seems that none of the deities introduced or promoted by the Romans were distinctly Roman or Italic. All of the deities, with the exception of the imperial cult, were Hellenic in origin, although often with a Roman counterpart.

As at Corinth and Patras, there was a surge of construction and urban development under the emperor Hadrian, who invested in major building projects throughout the city,\textsuperscript{693} such as in the Ilissos area, as well as an expansion of the city itself into the area east of the Acropolis, called Hadrianopolis or Novae Athenae.\textsuperscript{694} A few of the houses in this study were found in this new part of the city and can be compared with those dated from the pre-Hadrianic period. Furthermore, older sections of the city also have signs of reorganization in this period, such as the Makriyianni plot where a new street plan was imposed and new buildings were constructed accordingly,\textsuperscript{695} the second period of renovation of this area. Papaioannou states that many of the houses destroyed in 86 BCE were not rebuilt, or their plots not reoccupied, until this period.\textsuperscript{696} Thus, much of the evidence analyzed in this study is dated to this second Roman phase, from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE. The populations in these new residential areas do not appear to be distinctly Roman, or foreign in general, or Greek.

\textsuperscript{691} On the Temple of Roma and Augustus, see Thakur 2007; Shear mentions 13 altars to Augustus found in the Agora area and also discusses the connection between the Temple of Ares and the imperial family (Shear 1981, pp. 362–363).
\textsuperscript{692} Spetsieri-Choremi 2003, pp. 176–178.
\textsuperscript{693} Spetsieri-Choremi 2003, pp. 181–190.
\textsuperscript{695} Eleutheratou 2008, pp. 188–189.
\textsuperscript{696} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 16–17. E.g., ATHEN045.
However, especially during the 2nd century CE, it would have been difficult for the residents of Athens to escape Roman architectural influence given the large number of public Roman type buildings constructed across the city, such as the Roman Agora, the Odeion of Agrippa, and the Library of Hadrian. Furthermore, under Hadrian a large aqueduct was constructed providing running water for Roman-style bath complexes, both public and private, and gardens and fountains in private homes. Therefore, although there may not have been a significant community of Romans living in Athens imposing their domestic ideals, Roman architectural types and decorative elements, as will be discussed below, found their way into private Athenian architecture. Furthermore, Flämig’s study also points out that Athenians adopted the tradition of lining roadways outside the city with funerary monuments, although it was thought this was a practice related to Roman colonies.

The end date for the study in Athens will be distinguished by the invasion of the Herulians in 267 CE, which resulted in a contraction of the city walls to the area to the immediate north of the Acropolis up to the Library of Hadrian. The remainder of the old city was still inhabited, but this is a clear shift in the settlement pattern and new domestic construction.

V.D.1: The Houses

Dating from 86 BCE to the late 3rd century CE, 63 houses have been uncovered in Athens through the excavations of the American School of Classical Studies and the Greek Archaeological Service, listed in Appendix A as ATHEN001 through ATHEN063.

---

697 Flämig 2007, pp. 98-112.
In general, the houses of Roman Athens have been found throughout the city; from the Makriyanni area south of the Acropolis,\textsuperscript{699} to the neighborhoods surrounding the Agora\textsuperscript{700} and in Hadrian’s extension of the city to the east,\textsuperscript{701} as well as many scattered locations in all directions across the modern city (Figure 311). However, as with Patras, the archaeological evidence for neighborhoods is dictated by where in the modern city excavations could be conducted; it does not reflect the total residential area of the city.

**Layout**

Most of the known houses of Roman Athens, in general, appear to be large middle class or upper class housing, making them comparable with those of the previously discussed cities. They were planned around a courtyard with a water supply, usually a well. In comparison with houses of Classical Athens, Stamtia Eleutheratou and Papaioannou have observed several distinct differences with the houses of Roman Athens: the predominance of a peristyle in the courtyard when possible, the increase in size of the rooms, and the installation of sanitation facilities like latrines with drains connected with a main citywide sewer system.\textsuperscript{702} Furthermore, with two exceptions (ATHEN006, ATHEN043), andrones are no longer found in houses of this period. Instead more spacious rooms, such as a triclinium or oecus, took their place for dining rooms. These rooms are usually located off of the courtyard either directly or through an antechamber, similar to the Classical andrones discussed in Chapter III. However, unlike in Classical houses, these reception spaces were placed at the back of the houses, similar

\textsuperscript{699} Eleutheratou 2008, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{700} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 24–25.
\textsuperscript{701} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 26–28.
\textsuperscript{702} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 28–32; Eleutheratou 2008, p. 188.
to Delos. Thus, in general, the houses seem to reflect a continuation of local traditions in layout with a few developments which would affect the plan and available spaces, but not the function of the rooms.

Access and Visibility Analysis

For this part of the study, Athens has more complete houses than any of the other sites in this study. A total of thirteen houses have been completely uncovered and preserved well enough for detailed plans to analyze. These are ATHEN002, ATHEN004, ATHEN007, ATHEN014, ATHEN026, ATHEN027, ATHEN029, ATHEN030, ATHEN031, ATHEN032, ATHEN053, ATHEN054, and ATHEN055. Ten of these houses were uncovered in the work of the American School of Classical Studies Athenian Agora Excavations and three were found in the excavations of the Makriyianni plot by the Greek Archaeological Service. From this sample it is clear that there was much variation in the accessibility of these houses.

Five houses can be described as symmetrical in their overall plans. ATHEN002, also called House N, was symmetrically arranged around a central, open courtyard (Figure 314). In the Roman period, this house remained without a peristyle or impluvium tank, and most of the rooms were arranged one space removed from this courtyard. These rooms were non-distributive, accessing only the courtyard. The courtyard thus was the controlling space of the house (Figure 315). The house was accessed through a corridor along its south side. There was no visual access at all into this house from the alley that led to its entrance, and there was no visibility from the possible reception spaces (Figures 316 and 317). These, however, were placed at the opposite side of the
house from the entrance indicating that visitors would have to traverse the whole courtyard and pass by all the other rooms of the house, like the houses of Roman Italy. The inhabitants of this house did not appear to deviate much from the permeability and visibility of Classical Athenian houses, but the location of the potential reception spaces is more like those of Italy. Furthermore, its average RRA is comparable with those of the Roman houses in this study, as well as Maison du Dionysos, Maison de Q. Tullius, and the Classical Athenian house (Figure 374).

ATHEN014, or the House of Aristodemos, similarly was symmetrical (Figure 374), although its rooms were more distributive on the justified access map (Figure 330). This is partially due to the balustrade or parapet wall which ran between the columns of the peristyle in the courtyard. As a result, the courtyard was divided into five separate spaces in access analysis instead of one space. But, there were also three suites of interconnected rooms around the courtyard, so that even without the intercolumniations in the peristyle, there would have been a distributive mobility in the house.

Visually from the entrance, one could have seen along the east side of the courtyard but not into any of the spaces along it (Figure 332). Reception space has not been identified in this house, but visibility from two of the larger rooms around the courtyard indicates that this too was limited (Figure 333). Thus, while this house looks more like those of Hellenistic Delos, it still maintained the visual access of Classical Athenian houses. Without knowing where the reception spaces were, I cannot state confidently what visitors might have been able to see as they travelled to these spaces.

ATHEN031 and ATHEN032 were part of an insula of six houses uncovered to the south of the South Stoa. These houses were constructed in the Classical period, but
have evidence of occupation into the Roman period. Even in this phase, these two houses continued to have symmetrical arrangements (Figure 340). The walls of ATHEN031 experienced several renovations and it is possible that the rooms were distributive in nature, depending on where the entrances to Rooms d and b were located. ATHEN032 is a little easier to understand; its rooms were arranged around the courtyard in a nondistributive manner. The courtyard of this house, like ATHEN002, was the single controlling space of the house (Figure 342). Visibility from outside the entrance to the house is restricted to the vestibule of ATHEN032 and the courtyard of ATHEN031 (Figure 343). These houses were smaller and lacked evidence of decoration. Therefore, no space in these houses has been identified as a reception space. Even without this feature, it is clear from the access and visual analysis done here that these two structures appear to maintain their original Classical Athenian household plans and accessibility into the Roman period (Figure 374).

ATHEN054 is less well preserved than these four examples. It was a narrow building placed between two larger houses in the Makriyianni plot (Figure 348). It consists of a long, narrow courtyard running from the entrance to the back of the house with rooms arranged to the west (Figure 356). Most of these rooms were directly accessible from this courtyard but possibly not with one another, making them nondistributive in accessibility (Figure 357). Visually, one could see “through” the house as represented by the courtyards, but not into any of the other rooms (Figure 358). And, from these rooms the others were not visible. This too is similar to the Classical Athenian house, although the depth of the courtyard and the visibility along it resembles Roman Italian housing a little.
The remaining eight houses can be described as more asymmetrical, but these also vary with regards to distributiveness. ATHEN007 was also arranged around a peristyle courtyard with intercolumniations (Figure 324); therefore, this courtyard was divided into five spaces as well giving it a more distributive characteristic (Figure 325). There were also three rooms which were interconnected without the division of the courtyard.

Although the permeability of this house is comparable with Roman housing (Figure 374), there were also some aspects which resembled Greek housing. The actual entrance into this house is unknown\textsuperscript{703}, but based on the details of the courtyard it was likely along the south wall. In this location, access into and out of the house could be monitored from the courtyard. Additionally, the position of the reception space, Room 8, near the entrance, would have limited visitors’ interaction with the rest of the house, similar to earlier Greek housing.

Within the columned area of the courtyard there was planted a garden which, along with the columns and a staircase along the west wall of the courtyard, may have prevented visual access into most of the rooms of the house from the possible entrance (Figure 327). Furthermore, from the large Room 8, which was likely a reception space, the only clearly visible part of the house was the garden of the courtyard (Figure 328). Therefore, although there was more distributive movement within the house like in Roman housing, there was not visual access.

Also distributive in nature were the rooms of ATHEN053, or House ΣΤ’ (Figure 354). This eight room structure had a large reception room at the north end of the house, opposite the entrance (Figure 353). Between the two was a long narrow corridor which

\textsuperscript{703} The walls of the rest of the rooms are either well preserved enough or are cut into the bedrock. The southwest and northwest walls of the courtyard were not so well preserved.
connected the entrance with the courtyard, around which the rest of the rooms were arranged. This corridor meant that visual access from the entrance of the house was limited to this corridor (Figure 355). There was also a vestibule between the courtyard and the reception space, which further limited visibility from this visitor space; however, visitors would have had to walk the length of the house to reach this space, much like in Delian or Roman houses. However, they may not have had visual access into the service spaces as these were on the opposite side of the courtyard from the corridor.

The other four houses from the *insula* south of the South Stoa, ATHEN026, ATHEN027, ATHEN029, and ATHEN030, were also asymmetrical, but nondistributive in character (Figure 340). This is due to the narrow nature of the *insula* into which these were placed. ATHEN026 consists of only three spaces arranged in a row (Figure 339); access analysis beyond the access map is not necessary to understand movement through the house. There was no single space from which to monitor activities within the house, but there was only one path to follow through it. Visually, the entire house was almost completely accessible from the outside (Figure 343). ATHEN029 and ATHEN030 were similarly arranged, but with two and three additional rooms to the north. How these rooms were accessed is unclear, but if all possibilities are added into the access maps the arrangements of these houses were still rather asymmetrical and more nondistributive (Figure 340). As with ATHEN026, there was also visual access through the house from the entrance (Figure 343).

ATHEN027 was better preserved. This structure, likewise, was asymmetrical and nondistributive (Figure 340). Room a, which was the first space from the carrier point, was the control space of the house (Figure 341). This space was visible from the outside
as well as Room b giving the impression of visibility through the house, but the rest of the house was not (Figure 343). While all four of these residences have traits similar to Roman housing, only ATHEN027 is complete enough to be compared. The separation of the house into two visual parts resembles the houses of Delos, where the reception spaces were visible from the entrance and the utilitarian areas were not. Furthermore, the average RRA of this house is similar to that of Maison des sceaux. The nature of the rooms of this house is not understood, except that Room b had storage jars. It may be that Rooms a and b were commercial in nature while the living areas of the house were separate and invisible.

The last example from the Makriyianni area is ATHEN055, or House O’. This house is less well preserved than the others since much of its south side is missing, including its entrance (Figure 361). By comparing it with the others from the same neighborhood, it is possible to suggest that the corridor Room 1 was the entrance corridor for the house which led to two separate wings of the house. That to the northeast contained a vestibule from which one entered either the courtyard or the reception room. The other wing had its own smaller courtyard around which were rooms of a utilitarian nature. Both of these wings were asymmetrically arranged and nondistributive, as far as can be determined (Figure 362). Visibility from outside, like the other Athenian houses, was along the corridor and nowhere else (Figure 363). From the reception space, one could see the vestibule and courtyard, and possible whatever rooms were to the south of the courtyard. Like ATHEN027, this house calls to mind those of Delos with the reception space at the opposite end of the house and the separation of utilitarian and reception spaces.
The last house which can be analyzed, ATHEN004 or the South House, is a little more complicated in plan and in preservation (Figure 318). This house overall is asymmetrical; however, looking at the justified access map it is clear that this house, in fact, is divided into three separate sections, each of which is symmetrically arranged around a central space, and all three are accessible from the main peristyle courtyard of the house, Room 28 (Figure 319). This arrangement has led some scholars to interpret this structure as two to three separate houses. Visually, only the main courtyard, accessed from a corridor, was seen from the entrance (Figure 320). Interior visibility was limited to each unit and Room 28 (Figure 321).

With regards to accessibility, in general, the houses of Roman Athens have a single entrance, usually via a corridor, into the courtyard. As Papaioannou has observed, the courtyard was now more centrally placed within the house704 although the availability of space seems to have still been an important factor in the placement of rooms. Reception spaces were positioned at the back of the house, like in Delian and Roman houses. Papaioannou has observed that the houses were more symmetrically arranged than in earlier periods705; however, through this access analysis, it is clear that there was much variation in symmetry and in mobility within these spaces. Some maintained arrangements like those of Classical Athens while others looked more like those of Hellenistic Delos or Roman Italy.

For the most part, visual access into these houses was restrictive. The few exceptions from the insula south of the South Stoa do not contain evidence for reception spaces and may have been housing of lower classes; therefore, there may not have been

---

the expectation of visitors and the visibility may be because of the limited space available within the *insula*. The long narrow entrance corridor appears to have been typical for upper class housing and the lack of visibility in most of these examples indicates that the typical Roman house plan may not have been integrated at Athens.

**Construction Materials, Decorations and Other features**

Athenian houses of this period appear to have been typically constructed of a stone socle, incorporating rubble and large blocks often of reused materials, to carry a mud brick superstructure (Appendix D). This is the same technique observed in earlier Athenian houses. Occasionally they reused wall foundations, whole walls, or rooms from earlier buildings as well. For example, ATHEN010 and ATHEN056 reused walls from pre-Sullan structures when they were constructed in the 2nd – 3rd centuries CE, while ATHEN006 and ATHEN014 continued to use the same structure from the Hellenistic through the Roman period, modifying its plan very little. In addition, those of the Areopagus area were often carved into the hillside, using the natural rock as walls and floors; and, at least in the case of ATHEN007, the carving was originally done for a Hellenistic period structure and was later modified for this Roman period house.

The floors found in these houses did not differ much from those of pre-Sullan houses. When floors are preserved, they are made of clay, earth, bedrock, marble or tile chips in mortar, pebble mosaics, tessellated mosaics, and stone slabs (Appendix C).

Often the flooring in one house varied from room to room, with mosaics in one room and

---

706 From ATHEN016 and ATHEN040 baked bricks were found among the building materials in the destruction debris, as well as conglomerate and marble blocks and local stone. Thus, baked bricks were incorporated into the walls along with other reused building materials.

707 E.g., the houses of the Industrial Area along the Areopagus built in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE (Young 1951, pp. 187–252).
earth or clay floors in another. Seven of the known houses had marble or tile chip floors, often in the courtyard or in a large room just off the courtyard (Appendix C). Seventeen of these houses had at least one mosaic found among the remains in use during this period (Appendix C). The majority of these mosaics were from the Makriyianni area, but this is likely due to preservation, not regional preference. They date from the 2nd-3rd centuries CE phases of their buildings, but one, ATHEN041, has been identified as 1st century CE or earlier. These tended to be simple mosaics, such as the plain white tessellated mosaics from ATHEN036 and ATHEN037, or in white, black and red tesserae, a palette popular in Italy and Patras from the 1st century BCE onward. A few were more complex, such as a polychrome figural mosaic from ATHEN010 and a polychrome cubes in perspective mosaic from ATHEN041. These have comparanda in the Hellenistic period, especially from Delos.

When preserved, the wall decorations of many of these houses, like their contemporaries in Corinth and Patras, reflect general trends in wall painting from the Mediterranean. Fourteen of these houses had wall painting fragments which reflect the changes in styles from pre- and post-Hadrianic Athens. Those from under the Library of Hadrian offer earlier examples (ATHEN017, ATHEN018, and ATHEN019). The paintings found were either marbleized, have a floral pattern, or are paneled decoration with figures. One of the rooms from these houses depicted a New Comedy scene with a caption. Papaioannou has categorized them as Pompeian Fourth Style paintings.
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709 For cubes in perspective see Ling 1998, p. 33 and there are several examples from Hellenistic Delos as well. For the rosette, amphora, and doves the Maison du Masques on Delos has a similar collection of subject matter in one mosaic; all are common subject matter from Delos as well.
711 Papaioannou 2002, p. 70.
There are more examples of wall decorations from the 2nd – 3rd centuries CE, the last occupation phases of most of the houses (Appendix D). These wall paintings combine all the elements which were painted separately in the previous phase into panels with figural, floral or geometric patterns placed above a marbleized or solid dado.\textsuperscript{712} According to Papaioannou, this wall decoration reflected popular trends in wall painting of this period across Greece and the eastern Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{713} In addition, in both ATHEN017 and ATHEN053 was a room with plaster evidence of marble wall revetment. The inhabitants of these houses possessed enough wealth to have the means to decorate their walls as well as their floors. Therefore, these are not the dwellings of the lower class.

In addition to these standard decorations, some of the houses had further embellishments. As mentioned above, peristyle courtyards became popular in Roman Athens (Appendix E), although this is not a foreign element to Athenian housing.\textsuperscript{714} Private baths and water features were elements of elite domestic space which were more popular in the Roman period, especially after the construction of Hadrian’s aqueduct (Appendix E). Related to these features were also the private ornamental gardens. The introduction of fountains, gardens, and baths, all requiring continual access to large amounts of water, can be linked with the Hadrianic renovations of the city and the construction of the newer aqueduct. Therefore, it is in these water elements that Roman influence can be seen in the domestic spaces of Athens. However, the function of fountains and gardens was to embellish the courtyard, which was always a feature of Athenian houses and which always had some type of access to water in it.

\textsuperscript{712} For a detailed discussion, see Papaioannou 2002, pp. 71–75.
\textsuperscript{713} Papaioannou 2002, pp. 74–75.
\textsuperscript{714} Eleutheratou 2008, p. 188.
While most of the houses in this study appear to be wealthier homes, two houses from the Makriyianni area, ATHEN052 and ATHEN054, were rather small, cramped buildings. In fact, ATHEN054 was a narrow row of four rooms placed between the private bath of one house and the courtyard of another, but within this house was found a marble hekataia suggesting the inhabitants had some means. The Makriyianni area is one example of an area with mixed commercial and residential spaces from this period, placing humbler dwellings among larger, well-appointed ones, as well as workshops and shop fronts. Finds such as marble table legs and features like a marble well-head have led the excavators to suggest the inhabitants were from a middle class.\footnote{Eleutheratou 2008, p. 197. Table legs also described in Eleutheratou 2006, p. 26, nos. 19 and 20.}

Similarly, the insula to the south of the South Stoa contained houses of varying size. ATHEN026 was only three rooms arranged in a narrow row while ATHEN031 had eight rooms placed around a central courtyard space. Moreover, ATHEN027 may have contained a commercial space within this domestic unit. Its location behind the South Stoa indicates there may have been a mixed commercial and residential nature to this neighborhood. ATHEN029 may have contained a reception space, Room c,\footnote{Thompson 1959, p. 101.} and the finds from the area were of good quality\footnote{Thompson 1959, p. 103.}, suggesting that while these were not large houses, like those of the Makriyianni plot they may have been occupied by a prosperous middle class.

As observed in Corinth, Patras, and Messene, the houses of Roman Athens exhibit some elements identified with the decoration of Roman housing. At Athens these were mainly water features and black and white mosaics. However, the visibility as well as the materials and techniques used to build the houses remain the same as from previous
periods. There is a shift in the permeability of these houses which may have been a development from the Hellenistic period, based on comparison with the houses of Delos. The changes identified there have been attributed to cultural identity in a multicultural community and not necessarily the result of Roman influence. Furthermore, Delos was under the administration of Athens during the Hellenistic period; therefore, it is likely that developments in housing there may have influenced Athenian housing as well.

Athens was a free city without a Roman colony or pressure to appear Roman, yet, there was clearly an exchange of ideas between the Roman residents of Athens and the Athenians themselves regarding domestic space. It cannot be established whether any one house was built and inhabited by a Roman or a Greek specifically, but the trends across the site of Athens indicates that this does not matter; housing in general maintained a Classical or Hellenistic Greek permeability, visibility, and construction, while incorporating Roman decorative elements and amenities. In this respect, Athens is similar to the other three cities already discussed.

V.D.2: Evidence of Household Cult

From this sample of houses, seventeen have evidence which may relate to household religion. The majority of this evidence consisted of portable finds; however, nine houses also contained more permanent, architectural evidence, such as niches and altars. These are houses ATHEN047, ATHEN053, ATHEN055, ATHEN054, ATHEN059, ATHEN040, ATHEN025, ATHEN007, and ATHEN004. The evidence from the other eight structures will be mentioned when relevant, but with caution since the functional location of the evidence cannot be securely understood. This evidence is
still important for providing an overall understanding of household cult in Roman Athens. From all seventeen houses, the evidence in Athens for domestic cults consists of a possible cultic suite or *sacellum*, hearths, altars, niches, foundation deposits, and objects depicting or related to deities. There are no clear remains of *aediculae* or wall painted shrines so far at this site.

**Sacred Suite or Sacellum**

There is one example of a potential *sacellum* that has been identified in Athens. It was found in ATHEN059, a building identified as a villa, possibly a philosophical school, located just inside the Phaleron gate (Figure 366). The small suite of at least four rooms was attached to the building along the south side of its courtyard sometime around the late 2nd or early 3rd century CE as part of a renovation. The whole building, including this suite, was destroyed in the second half of the 3rd century CE. The entrance to this space is uncertain, but it may have been from the east end of the courtyard along its south side. The suite was entered from the east and the path from east to west is broken up by two partition walls creating the three rooms. The partition walls were arranged in an opposing manner so that one entered the first room from the north end of its east wall, the second room from the south end of its east wall, and the third room from the north again. The fourth room, the innermost of the suite, was constructed on a podium and approached by four broad steps of gray granite. To the north of this suite was a peristyle courtyard, around which were placed the other rooms of
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719 Bouyia 2008, pp. 207–208 and 229.
721 P. Bouyia (pers. comm.).
the building. Finds from the rest of the building indicate a domestic function which, along with the plan, led Polyxeni Bouyia to interpret the whole structure as a *villa urbana.*

The rooms of the suite were decorated with white, yellow and red painted plaster in panels with stylized lilies. In the innermost, elevated room were found sherds of amphorae, pot-bellied jugs, cooking pots, plates, lamps, fragments of figurines and of glass vessels, a bone pin, and a handle of a “frying pan” with a ram’s head at its termination. Three similar handles were found in the three rooms to the east. Bouyia has identified vessels of this type, along with the jugs, as related to the cult of Cybele. She identifies these through comparisons with reliefs from *taurobolium* altars associated with the Attic version of the cult. In the center of the room, to the east of the innermost room, before the steps of the podium, was uncovered a square built feature. Around it were found several male figurines either bare-headed or clad in soldier attire, as well as numerous bone pins identified as those used for hair-dressing. These finds as well as the location of the feature have led Bouyia to consider this feature to be an altar or an offering table.

In addition to this, to the north of this suite among the wall collapse of the reception rooms of the house were found two female figurines with different attributes of Cybele and a relief of a Cybele in a naiskos, which is a distinctly Attic depiction of the goddess (Figure 368). Additionally, there were found one, possibly two, masks of a
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723 Bouyia 2008, p. 211.  
726 Bouyia 2008, p. 213.  
youthful Pan, part of a miniature tragic mask, and two sherds of elaborate lamps with horse and vine decorations. Based on all of these finds from throughout the building, Bouyia has interpreted the four room suite as a shrine, possibly with some theatrical ritual conducted there.\textsuperscript{728} Due to the formal wall decoration, the podium, and the indirect path to the innermost room, as well as the offerings of hair pins and male Attis-like figures, Bouyia concluded that this was a shrine to Cybele.\textsuperscript{729}

From this evidence, this room was clearly used for special activities. The finds appear to indicate dining and rituals taking place, although whether the deity honored was Cybele or another deity such as Dionysos or Demeter cannot be securely determined from this evidence. While the evidence for the worship of Cybele in this building can be argued from the figures found elsewhere in the house, this does not mean that the shrine was exclusively to her; other evidence such as the masks may indicate other deities. Regardless, these rooms appear to have been a private shrine in a type of domestic space, and therefore, is an important example of a potential sacellum in Roman Athens. This is the earliest known sacellum in Athens, and the only one which falls within this study. As Bouyia suggests, it may be the precursor to the type of shrines popular in the late Roman period.\textsuperscript{730}

Bouyia considered the shrine suite a feature specifically of a philosophical school and draws comparisons between this 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE villa and the philosophical schools identified from the late 4\textsuperscript{th} or early 5\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE, namely the House of Proclus (Figures 369 and 370), as well as a more contemporary building, the villa in the northeast

\textsuperscript{728} Bouyia 2008, pp. 212–219.
\textsuperscript{729} Bouyia 2008, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{730} Bouyia provides two examples of such shrines in Late Roman Athens (Bouyia 2008, pp. 220–222).
corner of the National Gardens (Figure 371). I am not convinced that a sacellum necessarily indicates a philosophical school, as these have been identified in other domestic spaces not considered to have this function, such as the Panayia Domus at Corinth and the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Also, Bouyia has argued that the cult of the Mother of the Gods-Cybele specifically points to the building being a philosophical school like the later House of Proclus; however, she has been found in other houses which were not philosophical schools, such as ATHEN004 and PIRAE002 discussed below. For this study, it is important as a unique example of a household shrine and more elaborate than the sacella identified in Italy.

Hearths

Four hearths were found in three of the houses from Roman Athens: ATHEN053, ATHEN055, and ATHEN004. Two hearths were located in ATHEN053, House ΣΤ’ from the Makriyianni Plot (Figures 353 and 355). In Room 4 of this house was uncovered a small, egg-shaped hearth/stove lined with clay. Another hearth was found in Area 5 with broken pots and vessels next to it suggesting first that this was a kitchen, and second that the inhabitants abandoned the house unexpectedly. These two rooms were connected to one another through a door in Room 4’s south wall and an east-west corridor leading into Area 5. Area 5 was significantly smaller than Room 4, almost a corridor itself, and the proximity of the two hearths to one another is curious. Abandoned
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731 Bouyia 2008, pp. 220–222. They all seem to be related to Cybele, who Bouyia points out no longer had a public shrine in the center of the city (Bouyia 2008, pp. 221–222). She suggests that these private shrines emerge with the ruin of that temple.
cooking vessels were found around the hearth in Area 5, but are not mentioned around that of Room 4.

One possible explanation is that Area 5 was a storage room and either a seasonal or auxiliary hearth to the one in the larger Room 4, or Room 4 was auxiliary to Area 5. Another possibility, although comparanda are scarce, is that Room 4 was for the focus of domestic cult and Area 5 for domestic service. However, the purpose of the Hestia and Vesta cults was to protect and honor the hearths that kept the household safe and alive. An earlier instance of two fixed hearths in one domestic space has been found at Eretria. In House IB of the lower town, a second hearth was added to the industrial/agricultural area in the south part of the house, Room D, in the fourth phase of the building, roughly the early 1st century BCE.\(^7\) This room is also next to the kitchen space, Room u, also with a fixed hearth. The function of the hearth in Room D most likely related to the industrial/agricultural activities of the southern area of the house. It is also possible that the hearth in Room 4 of ATHEN053 was also for an industrial purpose, given that cooking wares were found around the hearth of Area 5. Regardless, at least one of these two hearths could have been regarded as a shrine to Hestia or Vesta and revered for its ability to sustain the household.

The third hearth was also found in the Makriyanni area, ATHEN055 or House O’ (Figures 361 and 363).\(^8\) Room 5 of this building was a kitchen with a small hearth and 3rd century CE cooking utensils broken and abandoned next to it, similar to Area 5 of ATHEN053. No description of the hearth itself has been published, but storage vessels

were found in a neighboring room which supports the function of Room 5 as a kitchen space.\textsuperscript{736}

The final hearth was found to the south of the Agora area near the industrial district along the northwest slope of the Areopagus, in ATHEN004 (Figures 318 and 320).\textsuperscript{737} This feature, found in Room 27, consisted of an area against the center of the east wall of the room demarcated by tiles standing on end along its north and west sides, with the south missing. Within the space marked by the tiles was found a concentration of ash and burnt material, while in Room 26 a large collection of cooking utensils and vessels was found in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE destruction debris. This room also had a bench along the south and east walls probably for storage.\textsuperscript{738} Therefore, there was a storage room for utensils and possibly food attached to the room with a hearth, indicating a food preparation function for Room 27. This would also be the area of the house where Vesta or Hestia would have been honored. Thus, the hearths of Roman Athens, like those of Patras, are not specific to a particular cultural identity, but are simply areas for containing fire or coals to prepare food and possibly to honor the divine protectors of the household, Vesta or Hestia.

\textsuperscript{736} Eleutheratou 2008, p. 193.

\textsuperscript{737} The building has had several names (House B, House or Building P, House K, House D, House L, Roman House B, and Building G), but is currently referred to as the South House. This large house was originally thought to be two houses (Athenian Agora Excavation Notebooks ΠΠ I-ΠΠ Χ), but it was later made clear that the house was originally constructed as one large building. After the Herulian invasion, the rooms to the west were filled in and abandoned and the central rooms were separated from those to the east, creating two buildings out of the one (Athenian Agora Excavation Notebook ΠΠ ΙΙΙ, pp. 1469–1480).

\textsuperscript{738} Skeletal remains of a donkey were also found in this room, but the animal was most likely seeking shelter and was trapped in the room when the house was destroyed in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE, rather than the victim of a large animal sacrifice.
A potential brazier or altar was also found in Room 27 of ATHEN004 (Figure 322). It was composed of a hollow cylindrical object found on a base under two stacked bronze bowls. In the excavation notebooks it is suggested that this was an altar or brazier. If an altar, this would support cultic activities in this room; if a brazier, it may relate to the need to heat and/or cook in different parts of this large house, possibly due to seasonal changes. Nevertheless, even as a brazier it could have been used like a hearth in household cult rituals. To me the object does resemble a brazier, which is why I have included this object in this section.

**Altars**

Three altars or potential altars have been uncovered in the houses of this study, ranging from portable altars to built structures. The first to consider is from ATHEN055. In the northeast corner of Room 7 of this dwelling was a built square structure (Figure 365). The room was an elongated space with a dirt floor and a cistern, and was possibly a second courtyard. The nearly square feature (1.4m x 1.5m x 0.5m high) was constructed out of tile and rubble and was decorated with fresco painting on its two free sides with vertical red lines. Eleutheratou suggests it may be an aedicular *lararium* like those in Pompeii, but the upper part of the structure is not preserved. It is also possible that this was a fixed altar like that seen in Olynthos, a work surface, or a secular base. However, in support of this structure as sacred, the upper torso of an Ephesian Artemis statuette was
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739 Initially excavators though the hearth was an altar as well (Athenian Agora Excavation Notebook ΠΠ VII, p. 1234).
740 Athenian Agora Excavation Notebook ΠΠ III, pp. 582–583.
found in a stratum associated with the structure and may have been located on or near it (Figure 364).\textsuperscript{743}

As for portable altars, one was found in Area 3 of ATHEN054. The marble altar was cylindrical with a boukrania and garlands decoration carved on its sides in high relief (Figure 359). Above each garland was also carved a gorgon head.\textsuperscript{744} The decoration on the altar was common iconography for altars and sacred objects in Greece and in Italy. Therefore, the identification of this as a portable altar is secure. Furthermore, the rushed nature of how the buildings of this area were abandoned prior to their destruction would indicate that is was most likely used in this house and possibly in this room.

The third feature which might have served as an altar or offering table is a rectangular built structure found against the north wall of Room 1 in ATHEN007, a house on the northwest slope of the Areopagus (Figure 324).\textsuperscript{745} Composed of small stones, it measured 0.99m long and 0.69m deep and was added to the room after the wall plaster was applied.\textsuperscript{746} Its height was not recorded, but it appears in the excavation notebook to have come up to the level of the niche. Although there is no corroborating evidence for its use as an altar or shrine, it was located beneath a niche in the wall is suggestive. It is also possible that this platform was constructed to extend the floor of the niche for whatever its purpose was.

In addition to these three possible altars from secure domestic contexts, five portable altars have also been found in secondary contexts. The first was uncovered in the Metro excavations in Makriyianni. This rectangular altar, dated to the late Hellenistic

\textsuperscript{744} Eleutheratou 2006, p. 67, no. 159.
\textsuperscript{745} Shear 1940, pp. 272–273; Thompson 1949, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{746} Athenian Agora Excavation Notebook ΠΓΓ 1, pp. 106.
to early Roman period, was carved from Pentelic marble with mouldings around the top and bottom. The other four altars, also rectangular with mouldings, were made from terracotta and were found in the Athenian Agora Excavations. These four also have traces of painting on them in red vertical lines, similar to the possible fixed altar in ATHEN055. One of these portable altars dates to the late 1st century BCE to the 1st century CE, one to the late 2nd century CE, and one to the 3rd century CE, while the other is simply identified as Roman period. Based on their form, the function of these objects was probably sacred; and it is also possible they were used in household shrines but this cannot be proven. The identification of the portable altar from ATHEN054 is more secure and supports the continued use of this form of household cult object into the Roman period.

Niches

Four niches have been identified in three separate houses which may have had a cultic function. The niche from ATHEN040 had additional evidence to support the identification of a shrine. This vaulted brick niche was found in the house located in Varvakeion Square. The niche was discovered toppled from the east wall of one of the rooms uncovered and lay over a statuette of Athena. The niche was found over a mosaic floor of the well-appointed room in which it stood. Although the rest of the house was heavily damaged by the construction of a later Byzantine building, it is clear that this
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748 A brief description of the house was published in Kourouniotes 1913, pp. 193–209 and Lange 1880, pp. 370–379 but most of the discussion focuses on the famous Athena Varvakeion statuette found in the niche and used to reconstruct the Athena Parthenos.
749 Also found in this structure, but not in the niche, were statuettes of Asklepios, and a female portrait.
niche contained a statuette of a deity and was located in a prominent room of the house.

This combination of evidence suggests a decorative or cultic function, or both.

The second niche was found in the courtyard of the house half way up the
northern slope of the Areopagus, ATHEN025.\textsuperscript{750} The house was constructed in the late
2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE and has finds indicating its use into the mid-4\textsuperscript{th} CE. The remains
of this house consist of the courtyard with a garden and three rooms arranged around it.
The garden was surrounded by a parapet wall with the entrance into the space in the north
corner of the northeast wall. Also in this corner, along the northwest wall, was found a
bench placed under a niche which faced into the garden space. A trough for watering the
flower beds at the center of the space runs from the south side of the bench, around the
four sides of the garden and stops at the east side of the entrance, creating a separate
space in this corner. There is no description of any decorations, divine images, or
implements to suggest a cultic function of the niche, but it is tempting to see it as a shrine
in a garden setting, like those of Casa degli Amorini Dorati. However, without further
evidence, this is only a hypothetical identification, especially since such a setting would
be equally appropriate for decorative sculpture.

Two more niches were both found in ATHEN007 (Figure 324). In the large
broad Room 8 was a one meter high niche cut into the natural rock opposite the entrance
to the room. The size of the niche was also rather large for cultic function and it may
have contained a full statue as decoration. It is possible a full size statue could have been
honored in household religion, but there is no secure evidence to support this
identification in this case.

\textsuperscript{750} Frantz Thompson, and Travlos 1988, p. 36.
The other niche was found in Room 1 placed over the platform feature constructed on the floor of the room. It too was cut into the natural rock. The niche was briefly mentioned in the excavation notebooks but no measurements were provided. There is no corroborating evidence that this was cultic, but its size, ascertained from the published plan, was more akin to cultic niches in both Greek and Roman traditions that the one in Room 8. In addition, the platform in front of it, as mentioned above, could have served as an altar or extension of the niche, but this cannot be proven.

Household cult is one possible function for these niches and suggests that this is one form which domestic cult in Athens could have taken. Support for this function comes from two later houses in Athens, namely the House of Proclus and the villa in the northeast corner of the National Gardens. These structures each contained niches with sufficient evidence for a cultic function and, therefore, demonstrate that household cults in Athens took this form in the Late Roman period. The niche of the House of Proclus was found in a potential cult room with associated reliefs of deities and an altar (Figure 370). The niches of the villa from the National Gardens were found in a possible cult room with statuettes fallen to the floor before them. With the corroborating evidence of the images of the deities, these niches become strong indications of household cult practices. Taking into consideration the literary evidence from Classical Athens for household shrines in niches, discussed in Chapter II, and this Late Roman use of niches for household cults, it is reasonable to suggest that some of the niches found in Roman Athenian houses may have contained household shrines.
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751 Athenian Agora Excavation Notebook ΓΓ II, 345–346.
752 Since these later houses are mentioned for comparison, they have been included in the database as ATHEN063 and ATHEN064 respectively.
Figurines, plaques, and lamps associated with deities

The largest group of evidence found within domestic spaces to consider is the representations of deities and objects associated with deities. Five of the nine houses with other evidence of household cult contained cult-related objects. From the Makriyianni plot, many such objects were found in these excavations, but only two were found in the context of houses, ATHEN054 and ATHEN055. From ATHEN054 came the small hekataion\textsuperscript{753} found next to the portable altar from this structure in Area 3 (Figure 360). The hekataion depicts the goddess Hekate on three sides, standing back to back on a cylindrical base with moulded edges top and bottom. Each depiction of the goddess holds something different in her hands: one has a phiale in her right and a torch in her left, the next holds a fruit and an oinchoe, and the third a fruit and the hem of her dress. She is dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st}-2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries CE. As mentioned in Chapter II, hekataia were a type of evidence of domestic cult traditional associated with a Greek household and would have been used to protect the entrances to the house. This one was not found near the entrance of the building, but in a room in the middle of it. It is possible that there was something in this room which needed specific protection such as foodstuffs, goods related to the inhabitants’ livelihood, or a sacred space. It is also possible that it was moved to this spot when the house was abandoned suddenly; may be to protect it until the owner could return.

In ATHEN055 was found a fragment of a marble figure of Artemis of Ephesos in Room 7 (Figure 364). The goddess’s attire is adorned with two identical Nikes above a garland about her shoulders and rows of breast or eggs around the rest of her torso. Her head, arms, and lower body are all missing. She was found in a disturbed layer which

\textsuperscript{753} Eleutheratou 2006, p. 70, no. 166; Eleutheratou 2008, p. 194.
Eleutheratou associates with the 2nd century CE house and the possible altar or lararium found in this room, although not immediately on the floor of the structure. This version of Artemis appears to have been unusual to Attica and may represent a foreigner living in this district or the home of someone who traveled often to the East.

The figurines and plaques found in ATHEN059 have been used to identify the possible shrine to Cybele. From around the rectangular base in the third room of the suite came a collection of male figurines either with armor or bare headed, thought to be Attis or korybantes, as well as a fragment of a female bust with a mural crown and a fragment of a gorgon medal like those found clasped on the outer garments of kourotrofos figurines, both associated with Cybele. Outside the shrine were also found, in the area of the corridor to the north, the upper torso of an Aphrodite of Knidian type, a mask of Pan, and a miniature mask of a tragic actor. In one of the rooms to the north of the shrine suite was found a marble naiskos with enthroned Cybele facing forward, holding a drum and phiale with a lion across her lap (Figure 368 middle).

This room was interpreted as a reception or banquet space. Bouyia has suggested that this figure fell from a niche in the wall of the room, which is no longer preserved, since the naiskos was found face down among destruction debris. In another of these rooms was found a clay figurine of two enthroned women of the Matrona type facing forward, thought to be associated with Cybele-Demeter-Rhea-Mother of the Gods (Figure 368 right). Bouyia proposes that these images were part of the expected domestic
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religion of the household, but it is also possible these representations were decorative, especially if the rooms they occupied were reception spaces.

Also mentioned above were the images found at ATHEN040 of Athena, Asklepios, and a female portrait. Both of these deities were important to Athens, Athena being the traditional protectress of the city and Asklepios having an important healing sanctuary along the south slopes of the Acropolis. Their selection for domestic shrines would be appropriate for an Athenian citizen, but also appropriate for decorative sculpture.

Several images of deities or related figures were found in ATHEN004. During the investigation of the rooms along the east side of the building, just east of Room 6, a seated marble female statuette was uncovered, probably of the Mother of the Gods (Figure 323). Also, several fragments of terracotta satyr figurines were found in the area, and fragments of terracotta figurines in general were found in several rooms of the house, but not many of them were preserved well enough to be identified. Furthermore, a bronze statuette of Eros was found on the floor of Room 27, in which were also found the possible brazier/altar and the hearth. The Eros statuette may have been a decorative element in the room; however, in combination with the potential brazier/altar and hearth in the room it is possible that it may have been from a shrine in the room.

In addition to these five houses, a house in the Ilissos area just north of the Olymppeion, ATHEN034, contained a cult related image, likely in its functioning location. The remains consist of three rooms located to the north of the northeast corner of a peristyle courtyard (Figure 347). The rooms were arranged as two small
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761 Travlos 1971, p. 290.
rooms accessed through a broad room, possibly an oecus, along the north side of the courtyard. The house was used from the 5th or 4th centuries BCE down to the 2nd CE and was probably destroyed in the completion of the temple.762 A votive relief of Demeter, Kore and the Hierophant Hagnousios was found in situ to the right of the entrance to the broad room from the courtyard. It seems to have been intended for the Eleusinian sanctuary but never made it. In fact, Papaioannou suggests that it acquired the new function of a shrine in the house.763 If so, it represents a traditional Athenian cult as well as a very popular cult in the Roman period.

This sample of cult-related objects from domestic structures suggests that Cybele could have been a prominent household deity in the Roman period in Athens. Also found were representations of Eros, Aphrodite, Athena, Demeter and Kore, Artemis, and Asklepios. All of these were deities known in pre-Sullan Athens. However, the Knidian Aphrodite and Ephesian Artemis represent imported versions of the Greek goddesses. Their discovery demonstrates that while most houses in Athens appeared to have honored traditional household deities, some, whether occupied by foreigner or Athenian, were introducing non-Attic cults as well.

In order to get a better overall sense of who may have been worshipped in the home, I also considered cult-related objects from secondary contexts in Athens. A study of all cult-related objects from secondary contexts in Athens is hindered by the massive size of the known sample. Therefore, I have only drawn a representative sample from the Makriyianni and Athenian Agora areas where residential neighborhoods have been
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762 Travlos 1971, p. 290.
Thus, it is probable that some of these objects found in wells, cisterns, and streets were once used in homes.

This sample consists of figurines, lamps, plaques, and masks of marble, bronze, and terracotta which date to between the late 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE and the early 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE. To this I also add those images found in eight other houses in Athens, but which lack find spot information. The total sample size, therefore, is 650 objects. Within this sample, 64 date from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE to mid 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries CE, 99 from the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} to mid 3\textsuperscript{rd} CE, 219 from the mid 3\textsuperscript{rd} to early 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE, and 269 not more specifically dated than the Roman period. While this study does span four centuries of material, the majority of it is dated to the mid to late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE, probably as a result of cleaning up debris following the sack of Athens in 267 CE. Because of the disparity in the samples sizes from each major time period and the fact that the majority of the finds are non-specifically dated “Roman”, statistical analysis of the types of images will not be fruitful. Instead, the continuity, appearance, or disappearance of certain types of images is more relevant and feasible.

From the total sample of objects, 214 depict specific gods, their associates,\textsuperscript{765} and heroes.\textsuperscript{766} Among these the most popular individual images are Eros (37, possibly 38), Telesphoros (27), and Aphrodite (23). However, after combining those associated with one another into groups, 60 of the images are related to Aphrodite and her son Eros, 44 to Dionysos and his followers, and 36 to Asklepios and his children.\textsuperscript{767} As Dionysos and

\textsuperscript{764} This information was gathered from the exhibition catalog Το Μουσείο και η Ανασκαφη for the Makriyianni plot and The Athenian Agora VI, The Athenian Agora VII, and the American School Digital Library for the Agora Excavations.
\textsuperscript{765} E.g., satyrs, fauns, matrona.
\textsuperscript{766} E.g., Herakles and Orpheus.
\textsuperscript{767} Telesphoros and Hygieia.
Asklepios had important sanctuaries in Athens, this high concentration of related objects is logical. For the same reason, the small number (10) of Athena-related objects is curious. However, this may be explained by the more individualized nature of the cults of Dionysos and Asklepios and the more political nature of Athena. In addition to these deities, there were ten hekataia and three herms, all found throughout the three chronological periods, indicating that this traditional form of protecting private spaces may have continued into the Roman period. It is also possible that these were decorative or provide evidence for collecting antiques.

The popularity of Aphrodite and Eros has already been observed in the houses of Corinth and Patras. Aphrodite was an important Greek deity for women in general, and was worshipped in relation to marriage, fertility, and child birth.\textsuperscript{768} Looking at the three time periods in this study, Aphrodite and Eros appear continually through all three periods, as did Dionysos and Silenos, while Pan, satyrs, and fauns occurred in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} through early 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries and one maenad in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century. The “appearance” of these attendants may also be a result of the lack of dating for the majority of these pieces. Most of the Asklepios-related images were of Telesphoros, an Anatolian deity with possible Gallic origins who does not become popular in mainland Greece until the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE when he is added to the deities honored at Epidauros.\textsuperscript{769} None of the images of Telesphoros appear in the sample until the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE. Therefore, while Asklepios is a traditional deity of Athens, these objects were specifically depicting a foreign deity brought in with the Romans.

\textsuperscript{768} For detailed discussions about the role of Aphrodite in Athens see Pirenne-Delforge 1994, pp. 15–82 and Rosenzweig 2004.
\textsuperscript{769} Robinson 1959, pp. 52–53, no. J14.
Telesphoros was not the only divinity to come to Athens with the Romans. A bronze figurine was found in the agora which was identified as a possible Genius from the Roman tradition. However, the description of the figure does not fit with the iconography of this divine being; the bronze is of a youth partly dressed in a mantel, possibly an animal skin, carrying a cornucopia (Figure 373). The cornucopia is appropriate for the Genius, however, such spirits are usually adult men, being the *paterfamilias*, wearing a toga. This figure may be more in keeping with depictions of Lares, although he does not have the appropriate hat or pants. A more typical depiction of the Lares was found on a lamp from a well in the agora. On the discus of the lamp, dated to the 1st to 2nd centuries CE, is a scene of two Lares on an altar (Figure 372). Following Stewart’s hypothesis of lamps as altars, this example may demonstrate that these Roman household gods were worshipped by some residents in Athens.

In addition to these 214, 121 images have been found of human figures associated with deities, such as priestess, maenads, and matronae. Of these figures 94 are identified as matronae, types of which have been connected with several different female deities all of whom are mother figures such as Demeter, Isis, Cybele, and Rhea. Of these matronae 31 are depicted with a child either on her lap or suckling; this type is often associated with Isis, Demeter or Rhea. Three of the matronae hold a kithara and may be muses. One holds a wreath, another a dog, and a third a tortoise. The remaining 56 figures are either not preserved well enough or lack attributes.
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770 Shear 1936, p. 18, fig. 16. Shear depicts the figure but does not discuss it. It was listed as a Genius in the ASCSA Digital Archives record for the object B 241.
772 Stewart 2003, pp. 184–222.
This particular group of figures, however, may explain why there were so few objects identified with Cybele; only seven related to Cybele were identified, three of Cybele and four of Attis, from all three periods. This seems to contrast with the importance she appears to have among the potential household cult evidence. Matrona figures have often been connected with Cybele, usually when they are seated and sometimes with an animal on their laps. Two of the matrona figurines from this sample fit this description, one with a dog and one with a tortoise on their laps. The tortoise, however, may indicate Aphrodite as discussed above. Bouyia also points out that these other mother goddesses were also often merged with one another;\textsuperscript{773} it is possible that we can identify some of these matronae with such syncretized deities. Furthermore, eighteen figurines of boys wearing Phrygian caps may also be associated with Cybele, since she is of Phrygian origin and her companion, Attis, is sometimes depicted as a youth or boy.\textsuperscript{774} It must be kept in mind, however, that the sanctuary for Cybele was located in the Agora, which also affects this sample. The rest of this collection of associated humans contains one maenad, six priestesses, and two fruit bearers.

Finally, 52 cult-related objects from this study were of animals and cult objects. From these were indentified two cornucopiae which were usually associated with deities such as Tyche, Demeter, and a Genius. One miniature terracotta thymiaterion was also found, which is associated with Dionysos. Among the objects there was also a pomegranate or quince, a pine cone, a palm frond, a tree stump, a couch, and a terracotta capital. The majority of this grouping, however, were terracotta figurines of dogs (21), especially Maltese (17). The remaining animals included five cocks, three crustaceans,

\textsuperscript{774} Bouyia 2008, p. 219.
three bears, two goats, two boar, a dolphin, a ram, a peacock, a horse, a hare, and a duck. All of these have the potential for association with several of the deities mentioned above, such as the dogs with Hekate and Artemis and the boars with Ares, or others not yet identified, such as Hera associated with the pomegranate and the peacock and Poseidon with the horse.

Considering all of these examples of objects associated with deities and household cult, there appears to be a propensity towards Aphrodite, Cybele, Asklepios, and Dionysos in the Roman period. Even though the majority of these images was found in secondary contexts, all of them have been identified among the finds from the houses of Makriyianni, if not in their original locations. This implies that they were all acceptable deities for the household either in worship or in decoration. The more secure cult evidence from households indicates that Cybele and apotropaic deities in the form of herms and hekataia were highly esteemed. While Aphrodite is not as securely placed within households in Athens, it is possible, given her importance for women in their private lives, that many of the images of her or her son might have been intended for the home; three were found in the housing blocks of Makryianni and one in ATHEN059.

Overall, the majority of these images are traditional deities of Athens, including Athena, Ares, Cybele, Aphrodite, Artemis, Dionysos, Apollo, and Asklepios. However, there was also a strong presence, 44 in all, of foreign and non-traditional deities found as well, namely Mên, Telesphoros, Isis, Harpokrates, Serapis, Jupiter Dolichenus, Zeus Heliopolis, Ephesian Artemis, Knidian Aphrodite, the Lares, and the possible Genius. Therefore, Athens may not have been as conservative in its religious choices as it was assumed, certainly less so than Corinth, Patras, and Messene. Corinth did have one
example of a Lar and a Roma, but the rest of the deities were more traditionally Corinthian. Patras and Messene had no Roman deities at all. This may be a result of the proportionally larger amount of available material, but it may also reflect Athens’ status as a free city.

Athenians were under no pressure to participate in Roman politics to advance themselves, while those in Patras and Corinth were. As a result, in their private lives, the Patreans and Corinthians may have tried to keep their traditional household cults, while expressing their association with Rome in the form of shrines. In Athens, however, without the need to appear Roman to those outside the home, it is possible they were more willing to introduce new deities. It also suggests that foreigners in Athens and Roman citizens may have been able to bring their practices with them, while in Patras and Corinth they worshipped the deities of their new city. In this case, to be “Roman” in Athens may have been to be part of the foreign community.

**Votive or foundation deposits**

While the Athenians seemed open to new deities in their houses, they also appeared to have maintained traditional forms of household religious practices. Such preference can also be seen in the continuation of the tradition of foundation or votive deposits within houses. In two of the houses dated to the Roman period deposits have been found of burnt animal bones and lamps, ATHEN047 and ATHEN059. Deposits like these were often found in Classical and Hellenistic Athenian houses and identified as votive foundation deposits.\(^{775}\) The phenomenon of foundation deposits has already been observed at Corinth, but it is more closely associated with Classical and early Hellenistic

Athens. According to Weikart, Athenian foundation deposits are pits with ash, bones of small animals or poultry, and pottery found together within a building and related to the construction of the building or its renovation.\textsuperscript{776} This pottery includes drinking and eating vessels, cooking vessels and lamps.\textsuperscript{777} While not a shrine itself, these votive foundation deposits were likely intended to protect the structure of the house, and, therefore, by extension, those dwelling within it. These two deposits indicate the continuation of this ritual, if only on a limited scale.\textsuperscript{778} The first of these was identified as a foundation deposit by the excavators in ATHEN047, House Θ' in the Makriyianni plot.\textsuperscript{779} The foundation deposit was placed under the mosaic floor in Room 6 and included burnt animal bones and a single 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE lamp, which helps to date the re-foundation of the house.

The second came from ATHEN059 near the Phaleron Gate. North of the colonnade of the courtyard in the corridor in front of the northern rooms was uncovered a rectangular pit with brick lined walls and a marble cover measuring 0.42 x 0.34m and 0.21m deep (Figure 366).\textsuperscript{780} It held two complete, unused lamps dated to the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} to early 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE and two burnt animal bones (Figure 367). Bouyia suggests they were associated with the renovations of the building in its last phase and specifically connects this pit with Cybele worship through parallels with mother-goddess worship in France.\textsuperscript{781} However, the offerings in the pit are consistent with offerings found in typical Athenian foundation deposits, including that from ATHEN047. Therefore, I suggest that

\textsuperscript{776} Weikart 2002, p. 99; for his catalog of evidence from Athens see pp. 171–177.
\textsuperscript{778} Weikart states that the ritual did not seem to continue into the Roman period (Weikart 2002, p. 101), but since this study was published, these two pits were found within Roman period houses containing animal bones, lamps, and ash.
\textsuperscript{779} Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189.
\textsuperscript{780} Bouyia 2008, p. 214.
\textsuperscript{781} Bouyia 2008, p. 214.
this pit may be in keeping with the Athenian tradition to whichever deities were honored with this sacrifice.782

V.D.3: Cult in Context

From the overall sample of Roman Athenian houses with evidence of household cults, eight also have sufficient evidence to analyze the accessibility, visibility, and intended participants. Although several of these do not have sufficient plans for formal spatial analysis, there is enough information about the rooms in which the household rituals may have been practiced to make some meaningful observations.

To begin with, ATHEN055, as mentioned above, was not preserved to its south and it is thus uncertain how it was accessed from the street; however, it is likely that the house was entered through Corridor 1 (Figure 361). The possible altar and its statuette of Ephesian Artemis were located in the northeast corner of Room 7 in the west wing of the house. Room 7, possibly a second courtyard, was an elongated room with a dirt floor and a cistern. At its west end was Room 6 which connected with Room 5, a kitchen with the small hearth and cooking equipment. This kitchen space with its hearth, therefore, was remote and would have required knowledge of its location to gain access to it. Thus, its hearth, with both utilitarian and cultic functions, was intended primarily for the inhabitants. In the south wall of Room 7 was another doorway with the only access to Room 8. No evidence has been published on the nature of Room 8, but its location suggests service, storage, or more personal quarters for the household.

The asymmetrical, non-distributive layout of the structure means that access to this service area was controlled through two spaces. The first is Corridor 1 which allowed visitors entering the house to be directed to Room 3 without entering Room 7. Visually, one passing into Room 3 would only see the north wall of Room 7 (Figure 363); the possible shrine and the other rooms would have been hidden to a passerby. Furthermore, the long corridor might have also prevented those outside the household from seeing even the north wall of Room 7. Given the service nature of the area and the difficulty of access, this potential cultic area was clearly not intended to be seen or used by visitors to the household, but only for inhabitants and possibly those visitors who were intimately acquainted with them.

The second control point was Room 7, through which those in the service area of the house had to pass in order to leave the building or interact with visitors in the reception spaces. Therefore, the inhabitants of the house could not avoid at least seeing the possible shrine in Room 7; it stood next to the door to Room 8 and at the opposite end of the room from Room 6. This internal accessibility further supports the idea that the potential shrine was intended solely for those living in the house and not meant for visitors. If a shrine, the service nature of these rooms, and the liminal status of Room 7 as a control point, placed it within the traditions of Greek household cults rather than Roman in spite of its potential resemblance to a *lararium*.

Unlike ATHEN055, the identifiable service area of ATHEN053 was connected with the reception area through the courtyard. At the north end of the courtyard was Room 13, which is considered to be a triclinium because it was the largest room and
centrally located (Figure 353). The north stoa of the peristyle, therefore, was the vestibule to Room 13. The north and south walls of vestibule had wall fresco of imitation marble revetments and the floor was a colored floor indicating that this was part of a reception area of the house. Room 4 was directly accessible from the east stoa of the peristyle. The hearth in this room is indicated on the plan in the northern part of the room, which was also the part of the room where the doorway to the peristyle of the courtyard was located. Therefore, there was direct access from the courtyard to this hearth and its activities. It is also noteworthy that the well of the courtyard was located near this doorway, which supports the use of this room as a food preparation and cooking area. Such a location would make it easy to bring food to the possible triclinium to the north, but it also shows that the service areas were not fully hidden from the reception areas of this house; any visitor who lingered in the courtyard could see what was going on.

Area 5 was more secluded. The hearth in this space was located to the north in the space next to the entrance to Area 5 from Room 6, but set away from the entrance from Room 4. Room 6 might have been accessible from Corridor 1, the courtyard, or both. The nature of Room 6 is unknown, but it is a large room and might have been a reception space as well. This would place this hearth near to the spaces visitors might occupy. However, its position in Area 5 would make it unobservable to those in Room 6. Therefore, in this house, the potential cultic spaces were located in important spaces for protecting for the inhabitants of the household, and obscured from visitors as much as the plan of the house allowed. Visitors may not have passed along the east stoa to go to the
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785 Eleutheratou 2008, p. 192; Eleutheratou does not say what the floor was made of.
triclinium, since the west side of the courtyard led directly from the street to the dining area. Whether Room 6 was reception space or not, the hearth in Area 5 was hidden from its view as well. Thus, like ATHEN055, the potential household shrines were in a service area and clearly not intended to be seen by visitors, and lead to the conclusion they were only for the inhabitants.

As for ATHEN059, although incomplete, a few observations can be made about accessibility of the suite and the two images found in the rooms to the north. It is not understood yet how the building and the shrine suite were entered. The building entrance may have been from the south.\textsuperscript{786} What did remain was the courtyard, or one of the courtyards,\textsuperscript{787} of the building along the north side of the shrine suite (Figure 366). The east end of both the courtyard and the shrine suite are missing, but the suite’s length appears to correspond with that of the courtyard. If this is the case, the entrance to the suite was either through the south wall of the courtyard at its east end or through a room in the southeast corner of the courtyard. Regardless of whether access was directly from the courtyard or through another room, the approach into the sacred space was arranged in such a way as to isolate the focal point of the shrine, the westernmost room of the suite, from the entrance into the suite. Therefore, in order to access the shrine proper, one needed to know its location. Furthermore, a visitor to the house would not have visual access to the suite either because of its separation from the rest of the rooms and because the arrangement of the suite’s rooms prevented visual access from the entrance into the suite. Therefore, this appears to have been one of the most remote spaces within the house.

\textsuperscript{786} Bouyia 2008, p. 209.
\textsuperscript{787} Based on the published plan, there might have been a courtyard to the west of the one under discussion.
The other two possible household objects were found in the rooms to the north of the suite. The double enthroned terracotta figurines were found in the destruction layer of the courtyard, but it is possible they came from one of the rooms to the north of the courtyard, which have been interpreted as reception spaces.\(^ {788}\) The marble naïskos of Cybele, however, was found face down on the floor of the room, probably having fallen from the wall or a furnishing where it was kept. Bouyia has reconstructed the original position of the relief on the east wall of the room, opposite its find spot along the west wall.\(^ {789}\) In this location in the southeast corner of the room, it would have been only slightly visible through the doorway and fully visible when one entered the room and moved westward. This room was accessible from the courtyard through another, larger room to its south. Therefore, it appears to have been a remote space from the courtyard. However, the walls of these two rooms were decorated with elaborate wall painting three layers deep applied over the course of roughly a century. This suggests that these rooms maintained a display aspect, such as a reception space. Therefore, this room may have been more accessible than its position suggests, although the outsider would still need to be made aware of the room and the possible shrine in order to access it, as it was not visible outside of its space.

Sacella are a feature found most often in villas of Roman Italy, although usually located in a garden or other more accessible space. Having shrines in multiple locations within a house is in keeping with the traditions found in literature of the Classical Greek period, but, as Bouyia discusses, in this particular case they appear more Roman. To support her argument she cites an example from Pompeii, the Casa degli Amorini Dorati,

with a *sacellum* dedicated solely to the Egyptian gods separate from the *lararium* of the household.\(^{790}\) Except for Casa degli Amorini Dorati, in the majority of other instances of multiple shrines in Roman houses, one was in a public reception area and the other or others were found in the kitchen areas, at a distance from the more public shrine.

However, these two figures found outside the *sacellum* were uncovered in rooms interpreted as reception spaces which were located not far from the *sacellum*. If this is the case, than they were not placed in rooms where their protection was to guard the food and well-being of the inhabitants in the Greek tradition, but the ostentation of the Roman tradition. Unlike in the previously discussed Athenian houses, the naiskos appears to have been intended to be seen by those visiting the house, and the elaborate form of the four-room suite suggests that participants from beyond the household might have been expected to be in those spaces. While the multiplicity of shrines has been linked with Greek practices in this study, in this case the evidence appears more noticeably Roman in function and intended audience.

In ATHEN007, the entrance to Room 8 was located just opposite the entrance to the garden allowing visual access from the room into the garden (Figure 328). And, on the wall opposite that with the door in Room 8 was the large stuccoed niche. If it was used for a shrine, it was equally as visible from the garden, but would have been obstructed from the rest of the courtyard by the garden and columns of the peristyle, depending on the height of the plants and where one stood in relation to the columns. The niche and the room would have been accessible from the courtyard and the decoration of the room, with a marble chipped floor and stuccoed walls, suggests it was a reception type space. Therefore, if this niche was for a shrine, it was meant to be seen,

\(^{790}\) Bouyia 2008, p. 216.
and possibly used, not only by those living in the house but visitors as well. However, as mentioned above, this niche was rather large for a household shrine; it may be better to interpret its function as decorative.

The other possible domestic shrine in this house was the niche located in Room 1. Room 1 was also directly accessible from the courtyard, but to the north (Figure 324). Again, the niche was placed in the back wall of the room opposite the doorway from the courtyard. This was possibly a shrine because of the rectangular platform built below it, but this is not a strong interpretation. In this location, it would have been visually accessible from the courtyard, probably more so than the niche of Room 8 since the area in front of the door to Room 1 is wider than that before Room 8. Unfortunately, the floor of Room 1 is not well preserved, but may have been a mosaic, and the walls were stuccoed. This suggests that this room, also, was meant to be seen by those visiting, and, by extension, so was the niche and platform. Directly off Room 1 was Room 2, which had a long bench built against its east wall and might have been used for storage or food preparation, likely in service to Room 1 as a reception space.

This house, unlike ATHEN055, was arranged in a distributive pattern with three interconnected spaces and the divided courtyard (Figure 325). Therefore, the inhabitants of the house may have been able to move about less restricted since the courtyard was not a single controlling space. Those using the service area Room 2 could have used the potential shrine in Room 1 easily. However, this house is also asymmetrical with access to and from the outside of the house controlled by the four porticos of the courtyard. Therefore, visitors to the house were restricted in their movement, unless they were permitted past the courtyard. The visibility diagram from the entrance of this house
suggests that even with the columns and the staircase, those at the entrance may have been able to see the niche in Room 1 (Figure 327). However, this is assuming that the hypothetical placement of the entrance is correct. Furthermore, with the colonnaded garden at the center of the courtyard, visually, visitors could not access the rooms of the house either. The niches were conspicuously located within the household, but also appear obscured from outside the house. It was only after having been led around the garden that visitors may have been able to observe them.

Immediately accessible from the main courtyard, Room 28, of ATHEN004, to the south was Room 27 which contained the possible hearth, brazier/altar, and image of Eros. Room 27 was one of the control points in the nondistributive arrangement of this house (Figure 319). The location of the hearth at the center of the east wall would have placed its activities out of direct sight from the central courtyard since the door from there into Room 27 was found at the northwest corner of this room. However, it would be visible and accessible to all who were in the surrounding rooms; they had to pass by it to access Room 28 and the rest of the house to the north. Also, the finds from Room 26, cooking and storage vessels and benches for working or storage, suggest that this part of the house was a service area. Therefore, this hearth was intended for the inhabitants; as were the Eros statuette and the altar/brazier, if they indeed represent other cultic evidence in this space.\textsuperscript{791}

However, in contrast to the finds from Room 26, there were two Roman portrait busts found in Room 27, one of an older man and one of a younger man, which led the

\textsuperscript{791} As mentioned above, the house was destroyed in a fire and the finds appear to have been found where they were left, presumably where they were last used. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Eros and altar/brazier, although portable objects, belong in this room.
excavator to suggest ancestor cult worship in this room. Whether indicative of ancestor cult or not, the two portrait busts suggest a display function for the room, as did its location just off the main peristyle courtyard of the structure, possibly for dining. However, there were four doorways into this room, making it a less than ideal room for dining couches to be arranged. Instead, I interpret Room 27 as a food preparation space. The portraits, the Eros, and possibly the altar/brazier may indicate a household shrine located in this space as well. However, as a food preparation space and a central hub in this part of the house, it is difficult to say whether the function of the potential shrine in this room was in keeping with Greek or Roman traditions. This example reflects some of the ambiguities apparent in studying household cults in Roman Achaia.

The remaining three houses were not preserved well enough to understand their layouts; however, the relationship of the evidence to each structure can still be ascertained. In ATHEN025 the niche was located within the central courtyard of the structure. Placed next to the entrance into the garden space at the center of the courtyard, the niche would have been accessible to anyone in the courtyard. The courtyard itself was paved in marble slabs with this garden and fountain at the center, suggesting this was more than a utilitarian space, that it was intended to be seen by those outside the household unit. Therefore, in this location, the niche and probably the activities involving it would have been accessible to both visitors as well as inhabitants, at least visually. This would give it an additional element of displaying the household’s piety and possibly wealth. But, it is also because of this location that it is possible this niche was for decorative statuary and not a shrine. As for the stele of ATHEN034, it was

792 Excavation Notebook ΠΠ VII, p. 1234.
793 More suitable would be the other rooms arranged around Room 27, although there is no evidence to support this identification.
prominently placed at the entrance to a reception room suggesting an emphasis on display. And, the niche of ATHEN040 was located in a well-appointed room, with mosaic floors. It is unknown what the function of the room was, but by its decoration it was most likely not a secluded service area.

Of these examples, the possible evidence of household religion from ATHEN055, ATHEN053, and ATHEN004 was located in service-related parts of the houses and hidden from the gaze of visitors. Those in ATHEN059 were also relatively isolated from the courtyard of that structure; however, based on the appointments of the room with the naiskos and the complexity of the shrine suite, these were possibly intended to be viewed by more than the household. In the remaining four houses, the potential shrines were placed in reception space. If any of this evidence was cult related, it does suggest that there was variation in the practices of household religion in Athenian houses of the Roman period. In some houses, these possible shrines appear as though they were only meant for the household to use, as in earlier periods in Athens. In others, it seems to have been important to display these features to visitors, as in Roman Italy. However, the forms do not coincide with the location. Those made more visible were not necessarily specifically Roman in form, while two, possibly three, of the more hidden shrines resemble Roman types or had elements seen in Roman lararia.

In Roman Athens then there appears to have been a continuation of traditional household cults, forms of shrines, and intended audiences, but with a more pronounced foreign presence than was observed at Corinth. This may be a result of the level of preservation of houses found at Athens. But, it may also be that the stronger foreign presence resulted in the abundance of evidence in Athens; or, it is also possible that
Athens was a less conservative and traditional city than literary evidence and the domestic architecture suggest. As observed above, with regards to the deities in household shrines, this may be linked to the status of Athens and its citizens within the imperial system.

V.D.4: Observations

The potential evidence of household cult found in Athens appears more diverse than that of Corinth, Patras, or Messene. This may be because of the larger body of preserved evidence available, but it may also reflect a more multicultural population. With Classical Athens’ rich cultured past, for this city more than the others in this study, a continuation of local household cult traditions can be seen into the Roman period. Foundation deposits, hearths, niches, altars, figurines, hekataia, and herms have all been found in houses as late as the 3rd century CE. With the exception of foundation deposits, however, these forms are more ambiguously Greco-Roman since they could also be found in Roman tradition as well. While none of this evidence has been securely linked with household religion, the location of these pieces of evidence suggest that household shrines may have continued to be placed in areas where food was prepared or stored, and in liminal areas. Furthermore, the majority of the deities honored were also traditional for the city, namely Aphrodite, Cybele, Dionysos, and Asklepios.

Along with this continuity of form, accessibility, function, and divinity, there was also apparent an incorporation of new, foreign practices. Two potential shrines look physically similar to those of Pompeii and Ostia. Shrines in some other houses were conspicuously located and visually, if not physically, accessible to visitors, as in Roman
traditions. In addition, there were also several foreign deities honored in households such as Telesphoros and possibly the Lares. Athens and Corinth are the only two cities in this study with evidence of traditional Roman household deities. Not even in Patras with its veterans’ colony or Messene with its strong ties to southern Italy, was evidence of these deities found.

This difference between Athens and the other cities of this study may be related to Athens’ status as a free city as well as the attitude of the Romans and Athenians towards one another. In the colonial cities, there seems to have been pressure, both internal and external, to be Roman and Greek at the same time. The elite of these cities needed to bridge both cultures in order to have social and civil status, and, as a result, household shrines may have been one means of staying connected with their Greek heritage. Placing their shrines in more conspicuous locations allowed them to participate in Roman cultural identity, but also to keep their customary deities and forms of shrines.

Athens was viewed by the Romans as the epitome of Greek culture and religion; and the literary sources and public benefactions suggest the Romans wanted to preserve Classical Athens. From the Athenian perspective, as it has been ascertained by modern scholars, Rome was another tyrant. Some within the city sought Roman citizenship and favor with the emperors, but others fomented rebellion, at least in the early imperial period. Furthermore, within Athens, advancement was based on Athenian citizenship, not Roman. Thus, there was less social pressure in general to participate in socio-political customs and to be able to bridge Roman and Greek culture.

Therefore, there was no need to use household cult practices to maintain a Roman identity or to stay connected with one’s heritage. Although many did maintain traditional
household religious practices, some residents of Athens may have felt freer to worship as they wanted within the home. We cannot ascertain the ethnic background of the inhabitants of these houses, but the majority did seem to culturally identify with Greek. It may even be possible that since publically their city had to preserve the traditions of the past, they desired something new in their domestic lives.

Furthermore, it is also possible that Romans in Athens wanted to be Athenian-like, as many came to Athens to experience the heritage and the culture. In addition, for those who came to Athens for a short period of time, it is likely they rented houses from Athenians and would not have needed, or been able, to make significant, permanent changes to these structures. Therefore, Roman household cult practices and features were not usually introduced into these houses.

Therefore, the diversity of evidence likely represents the diversity of the population. The maintenance of Greek traditions in household religion may be because the household were culturally Greek, were philhellenic Romans, or were temporary residents of the city. The introduction of new cults, forms of shrines, and locations for cult activities may reflect the presence of Romans or other foreigners, or may be Athenians incorporating new features into their household religion, either for social/civil advancement within the imperial system or for personal interest possibly related to the pressure to maintain Classical Athens.

This study will now turn to the Piraeus, which will provide regional comparanda for Athens, as well as a comparable port city for Patras. And, in contrast to the four other cities of this study, the Piraeus was never an independent political player. Its importance
to the Roman Empire was as a port with its markets, not in its ability to control a region; therefore, signs of Roman influence in housing and household religion are less likely to be connected with the political aspirations of the inhabitants.

**V.E: The Piraeus**

As at Athens, the siege and sack by Sulla was a critical turning point for urban planning and construction in the Piraeus; therefore, it is the beginning date for the chronology of this study. The Piraeus was the main port for Athens from the Classical period onward and its history was very much linked with that of Athens. It was not an independent city-state like the others in this study, but it was one of the largest urban demes of Athens. It was famous for its Emporion, an important commercial center for the Eastern Mediterranean, and as the harbor for the Athenian navy. However, by the Hellenistic period, its popularity was waning in preference for Delos, where an emporion was established as a free-trade zone in 166 BCE. As a result, the settlement began to be restructured, centering it on the isthmus between its two main harbors rather than spread out within the walls of the Classical city.

In 86 BCE the Macedonian general Archelaos fled Sulla’s siege of Athens, but tried to hold onto the Piraeus and its access to the sea. Appian provides a detailed description of Sulla and Archelaos’s actions during the siege of the Piraeus in 86 BCE.
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794 This section owes much to Dr. Dimitri Grigoropoulos’s help and guidance on the Roman Piraeus.
796 Isokrates Panegyikos 42; Thucydides 2.38; Garland 1987, pp. 83–95.
797 Demosthenes Cherronesoi 74–75; Thucydides 2.13.7–8; Garland 1987, pp. 95–100.
798 Strabo 10.5.4; Garland 1987, p. 95; Rauh 1993, pp. 1–5.
800 Appian, Mithridateios 30–41.
and Appian, Plutarch, and Strabo all record that Sulla thoroughly burned the port city.\footnote{Appian, \textit{Mithridateios} 41; Plutarch, \textit{Sulla} 14.6–7; Strabo, \textit{Geography} 9.1.15.} A recent study by Dimitris Grigoropoulos of the post-Sullan Piraeus has shown that the most extensive damage targeted key civic buildings, commercial areas, and wealthy neighborhoods lying between the walls of the city and Mounichia hill, Archelaos’s stronghold.\footnote{Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 27–30.} However, the damage also spread to surrounding areas and buildings. As indicated by archaeological evidence, the destruction was not total and the Piraeus continued to be inhabited within the area of the Hellenistic settlement.\footnote{Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 43–44.}

Following Sulla’s sack of the city, the Piraeus, like Athens, experienced a period of instability during the 1st century BCE as it recovered from the devastation.\footnote{Grigoropoulos 2005, p. 44.} The literary sources suggest that this was the beginning of the decline of the Piraeus into a small backwater community.\footnote{E.g., Cicero, \textit{ad Atticum} 7.3.10; \textit{ad Familiares} 4.5.4 and 4.12.2–3; Strabo, \textit{Geography} 9.1.15 and 14.2.9; Lucian, \textit{The Ship}.} And, until recently, many scholars have treated the Roman Piraeus as such using 86 BCE as the last chapter in studies of the Piraeus. But, Grigoropoulos has shown that the Piraeus was, in fact, an important harbor and trade center in the province of Roman Achaia.\footnote{Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 52–58.} Even before the imperial period trade may have returned to the Piraeus following Mithradates’s attack on Delos in 87 BCE.\footnote{Rauh 1993, pp. 68–74.} As a result of the decline of Delos, commerce in the eastern Mediterranean needed new hubs, such as the Piraeus. Furthermore, the Romans considered the Piraeus to be a militarily strategic port and several military campaigns in the eastern Mediterranean were launched.
from there.\textsuperscript{808} Epigraphic evidence, specifically \textit{IG} II.2, 1035 regarding Augustan building projects in Athens, demonstrates imperial interest in the harbor as well.\textsuperscript{809}

Rescue excavations have revealed evidence for the Piraeus also receiving attention from Hadrian, especially with regard to its commercial areas.\textsuperscript{810} In addition, in the Roman period the Piraeus was also one of the points of interest for travelers to Greece and Athens.\textsuperscript{811} Furthermore, Garland has pointed out that the Neo-Attic sculpture industry of the Roman period likely had a positive economic impact on the port as well.\textsuperscript{812} Therefore, the Roman Piraeus was not the economically depressed and depopulated community it has been portrayed.

The population of the Roman Piraeus, as understood through bouleutic, funerary and ephebic inscriptions, was composed of Athenians from various demes and foreigners.\textsuperscript{813} The commercial importance of the Piraeus is likely the reason for this migration from around Attica and the Mediterranean. From the funerary inscriptions alone, foreigners outnumber Athenians,\textsuperscript{814} however, it must be kept in mind that some of these were not residents, but visitors who died while in port.\textsuperscript{815} It is probable that much of the population during sailing season was transitory. Those who resided in the Piraeus permanently supported themselves not only through trade but also through the development of a service industry, catering to the needs of their diverse visiting

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{808} Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 60–62.
\textsuperscript{809} Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 63–65.
\textsuperscript{810} Steinhauer 1989c, pp. 44–45.
\textsuperscript{811} Pausanias begins his tour of Attica with the Piraeus: 1.1.2–1.2.2. Also see Cicero \textit{ad Atticum} 5.12.1; \textit{ad Familiares} 4.5.4.
\textsuperscript{812} Garland 1987, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{813} Grigoropoulos 2009, pp. 164–182.
\textsuperscript{814} Grigoropoulos 2009, fig. 1.
\end{footnotes}
population. These included Roman bathing facilities, hotels or short-term rented quarters, and food preparation.

The population, both visiting and permanent, seems to have continued to worship at several shrines from previous periods. These cults included Asklepios, Athena and Zeus Soter, Artemis Mounichia, Dionysos, and Cybele. Looking at the epigraphic evidence, Grigoropoulous observed that there appear fewer non-Attic cults functioning in the Roman period than prior. However, some new cults were identified such as Thea Belella from Syria, the Mounichos hero, and Mithras/Helios. While there are statues of the emperors found in the commercial areas of the city, there is no evidence for a shrine of the imperial cult in the Piraeus, which was only found in civic centers; for the Piraeus this was Athens.

Unlike Athens, the Piraeus does not seem to have been affected by the Herulians; there is no evidence across the site of destruction in the 3rd century CE. There is, however, evidence of major changes to the plans and arrangements of domestic structures in the city dated to around the late 3rd to early 4th centuries CE, which will therefore be the end date for this study of the Piraeus.

V.E.1: The Houses

Few domestic structures have been uncovered at this site from the Roman period mainly because of the continued occupation of the city. A total of twelve domestic or possibly domestic sites has been excavated primarily in rescue excavations carried out by

---

818 Grigoropoulous 2005, pp. 74–76.
the Greek Archaeological Service and in 19th century excavations. These are PIRAE001 through PIRAE012 in Appendix A. The houses are located on the isthmus between the Kantharos Harbor and the Zea Harbor, a key location near the commercial center of the Piraeus \[^{820}\] (Figure 375).

**Layout**

The houses of the Roman Pireaus in general consisted of rooms arranged around a courtyard, often with a peristyle. The dry environment and seaside location of the Piraeus made fresh water a precious commodity, even with the aqueduct of the Roman period; \[^{821}\] therefore, cisterns and wells were the main source of water for houses, making a courtyard with an open roof a vital feature in them. \[^{822}\] Thus, the courtyard house plan is likely to have been the dominant house plan in the Piraeus, as it appears to have been in other sites of Roman Achaia. This also means that embellishments, like fountains and gardens, were probably not common in the houses of the Piraeus.

**Access and Visibility Analysis**

Two houses, PIRAE002 and PIRAE003, have been revealed with near complete plans including doorways, both within the same *insula*. \[^{823}\] These structures were occupied from the 1st century BCE through the 6th century CE, but it is the 2nd/3rd century phase which is most complete and relevant for this study (Figures 376 and 381). The
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821 Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 99–105. The aqueduct was not connected with private houses as it was in Athens.
822 Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 91–92.
823 PIRAE005 has a near complete plan published, but many of the interior doorways are not marked; therefore, the relationships between the rooms cannot be fully understood. PIRAE001 was completely uncovered but a plan of the structure was never published. It may be that the remains were too fragmentary.
justified access maps of these two structures reveals two different arrangements of rooms and mobility through the houses. PIRAE002 was asymmetrical in plan and possibly distributive, if the hypothetical connections are correct (Figure 377). There appear to be four levels of depth to this house, each level with four to six rooms symmetrically arranged. However, there does not appear to be one room which controlled mobility through the house, not even the courtyard, Room 31. One of the reasons for this is the multiple entrances into the residence from the possible shops along the southeast side. This side was also where occupation continued into the 6th century CE when the rest of the house to the west was abandoned. Thus, it is difficult to say for certain whether these possible exterior entrances were all part of the 2nd century CE plan and if any of these possible shops connected with the house.

Access into PIRAE002 from one of these possible entrances would have been indirect, since one first had to pass through at least three spaces before reaching the main rooms of the house. If there was an entrance to the southwest, it was not a primary one used for visitors; more likely it was for the household, through a shop operated by the inhabitants. In this case, the courtyard, Room 31, may have been the control point for the main part of the house, between rooms and between the entrance and the rest of the house. The only certain entrance into PIRAE002 was via Corridor 46a and 46b, which was placed to one side of the courtyard (Figure 376). It was arranged in such a way that there was not direct visual access from the main entrances into any of the rooms from the courtyard (Figure 378). Furthermore, PIRAE002 had evidence of a door dividing the entrance corridor into Rooms 46a and 46b; obviously, passers by were not allowed any visual access into this structure.
PIRAE003, on the other hand, was also distributive in character but appears more symmetrical in the restored arrangement (Figure 382). If conjectured correctly, there were multiple access points into PIRAE003, as there were for PIRAE002, a feature uncommon to earlier Greek housing. This likewise may be the result of shop fronts along three sides of the structure. In the justified access map, all possible connection have been drawn, but not all of these may have actually existed. For the main part of the house, where the connections are more certain, the arrangement of the residence is asymmetrical and distributive. The courtyard, Room 15, was the control point of the house both among the rooms and between the house and the outside. This courtyard was accessed by two corridors arranged parallel to each other from the same street and separated by one room. This arrangement obscured the activities in the courtyard from view, which is highly dissimilar to Roman house plans (Figure 383). Furthermore, these two corridors are not aligned with any doorways to the rooms surrounding the courtyard, as observed in earlier Greek housing and in the other cities of this study.

In addition, at the center of the courtyards in both houses, was placed a colonnaded cistern for collecting water. Such features added further difficulty to visual and physical accessibility within the structure. The visual inaccessibility from the outside seen in both these examples is similar to arrangements observed in both Classical and Roman Athens, as well as in Roman Corinth and Messene. While a sample of two houses makes observing general trends difficult, the similarities between Athenian and Peiraeis houses in the arrangement of spaces suggests that these two examples are typical of middle to upper class housing in the Roman period.
Construction Materials, Decorations, and Other Features

In general, the houses of the Roman Piraeus are built of local materials, mainly limestone blocks, small rough stones, reused materials from previous buildings, mud bricks, tiles, and mortar. A few were built using the cuttings from limestone quarries or the walls from buildings of previous periods (PIRAE002, PIRAE003, PIRAE004, and PIRAE009). Also, in the preliminary report for PIRAE008 bricks are mentioned among the construction materials for that building, but these may be reused materials.824

The floors of post-Sullan houses were composed of beaten earth, tiles, mosaics, and pebbles in mortar, as was found in contemporary and earlier houses in Athens (Appendix D). In the Piraeus there has yet to be found the marble chip floors and the stone slab floors also popular at this time in Athens. However, the lack of marble chip or stone slab floors may be due to the availability of materials. Pebbles from the coastline would have been more available in the Piraeus area than in Athens, while marble chips from stone workshops might have been more available in Athens. Wall plaster has been recorded for PIRAE002 and PIRAE004, but only PIRAE002 has been described in detail. In the rooms of this house were found fragments of red stripes, marbleized dados, and elongated lozenges in green, yellow, and blue dated to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} to 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE phase of the building. The marbleized dado is a feature also observed in contemporary buildings in Athens.

Other embellishments have also been found in a few of these houses to indicate that they belonged to individuals of the upper or prosperous middle class. In the earlier excavations of PIRAE001, composite column capitals and fragments of columns were found as well as stone thresholds. As mentioned above, PIRAE002 added a tetrastyle

---

824 Steinhauer 1983b, p. 35.
treatment to its courtyard in the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} or early 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE along with a marble paved collection pool, and marble thresholds. PIRAE003 also had a tetrastyle courtyard in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries CE. And, PIRAE012 contained an earlier peristyle courtyard also with a collection pool identified as an impluvium.\textsuperscript{825} In addition, it is important to mention the remains of marble statues found in a few of these houses, namely PIRAE002, PIRAE004, and PIRAE008.

All of these adornments along with the mosaic floors and wall painting suggest that at least nine of these twelve houses were owned by individuals with some wealth and a need or desire to display it; therefore, this study does not include housing for the lower classes since this has not yet been uncovered or identified for this period. Furthermore, the presence of peristyles in three of these houses suggests a similar trend in domestic adornment as was observed in Athens. The addition of impluvia may also indicate western influence, although, as the feature in PIRAE012 suggests, this may have been an adornment in use prior to the designated Roman period.

\textbf{Attica}

The sample size for the Piraeus is significantly smaller than that of Athens, which probably has affected this general analysis of the houses. It is possible that there were some elements unique to the Piraeus, like the popularity of pebble floors noted above, which have not been uncovered yet in Athens. Further excavations and publication of materials from the Piraeus are needed. However, even without these details, the houses of the Piraeus do reflect the same continuity of household construction, arrangement, and function from before Sulla as was observed at Athens. Decorative elements as well

\textsuperscript{825} Steinhauer dates this to the Hellenistic period (Steinhauer 1995, pp. 50–52).
reflect a similar mixture of traditional forms with new motifs as was found at Athens. This is not to say that Athens and the Piraeus are the same entity, however, their close political, social, and economic connections indicate that the personal tastes and social habits of their inhabitants would likely follow similar trends.

Hans Lohmann’s survey of the houses from region around Athens did not uncover any Roman period houses from the countryside. However, similar construction and decorative elements were uncovered at urban sites like Eleusis. All of the eight known houses from Roman Eleusis were constructed of local stone, pebbles, tile, and mortar. One of these houses, ELEUS003, contained mosaic floors, wall paintings in several rooms, marble wall revetments in another room, an impluvium, and a garden.826 And, like the houses of Athens and the Piraeus, it also was arranged around a central courtyard through which one had to pass in order to access the suites of rooms to the north and south (Figure 387); unfortunately, the location of the entrance is unknown. Another house from Eleusis, ELEUS001, also contained panel wall paintings, including one depicting Zeus holding a victory in his right hand; however, only the three rooms of its south terrace are preserved (Figure 384, L1).827 A third structure, ELEUS004, was found along the road from Eleusis to Thebes contained the remains of several mosaic floors and has been identified as a domestic structure (Figure 388).828 In one of its central rooms was found a large cistern which would suggest a courtyard space around which the rest of the building was organized. Thus, the trends in form, decoration, and construction of houses observed in Athens may be seen within Attica as well.
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V.E.2: Evidence of Household Cult

From the twelve houses of the Roman Piraeus, I have identified four with remains of domestic religion. These houses are PIRAE001, PIRAE002, PIRAE003, and PIRAE004. In this sample the evidence for domestic religion takes the form of a possible cult room, a possible altar, and several depictions of deities. Both the altar and the deities are from secondary deposits, but are important to understand the forms of household cult found in the Piraeus.

Cult Room or Sacellum

A possible example of a cult room was found in PIRAE002, also called House 1 of the Dikastiko Megaro plot. An enthroned Cybele statuette along with a terracotta eagle, which is thought to have originally been an antefix from a roof, was found in an exedra, Room 32, on the west side of the courtyard from the late 2nd/early 3rd centuries CE phase of the building (Figures 376 and 380). This Cybele statuette was found in a layer much disturbed in the Late Roman period, but, given its size, it had probably not been moved far from its original position; it may have been originally from this room. Additionally, this exedra was decorated with wall fresco in red bands. The combination of the red banded decoration and the Cybele statuette suggest that the exedra might have served as a sacred space, but it may also have been a decorated space. In Roman

829 D. Grigoropoulos (pers. comm.).
831 The association of red painted bands with household cult has been discussed above in reference to the similar bands painted on the feature from ATHEN055.
houses of an earlier period, specifically from Pompeii, exedrae sometimes served as *sacella* for the household cults.\(^\text{832}\)

The statuette was also found in the corner opposite the entrance from the courtyard. If this spot was either the original location or near the original location, it indicates that it was meant to be seen from the main circulation space of the house (Figure 379). It is also possible it would have come from further inside the room or from a completely other space. The former possibility would mean the statuette would not have been visible from the courtyard but the room would have been. The latter possibility means that this identification is wrong. If the statuette was a cult object and did originally come from this space it would suggest that the main function of the room was a shrine. Also, the fact that the room was highly decorated would indicate a special function, such as a reception space, a sacred space, or both, regardless of the location of the statuette within the room.

**Altar**

One structure which might have been an altar from a domestic context found in the Piraeus comes from PIRAE003. It was found in the south corner of Room 55 having been reused as a bench or work table in the Late Roman period. This room was one of the commercial spaces which lined the south side of the *insula*. The object, carved of marble, is rectangular in shape with a flaring moulding at one end (Figure 384). Its shape and size, roughly 0.50m high and 0.35m wide, are in keeping with domestic cult altars found in Corinth and Athens. However, it is also possible it was moved to this commercial/domestic building from somewhere else. The top surface of this end is worn,
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\(^{832}\) E.g., Pompeii I, x, 7.
but may have a shallow depression cut in it. The other end of it is now chipped away, but it was probably moulded as well and its top surface seems to have been slightly concave. Where it is preserved, the top surface on this end is much smoother than that of the opposite end and is more likely the original surface than the rougher surface of the other end. It is also possible that it was a statue base as both a statue base and an altar could have needed such a depression cut into it.

The depression is notable because one important function of an altar was to contain the offering, whether this involved fire or not. There is a second, deeper cut on this surface to one side of it, but it is unclear whether this was made for the initial function of the object or is a result of later use. Additionally, one of the vertical faces of the rectangular object has a narrow, horizontal cutting; it is as if something were attached to it, such as an inscription or votive. It is also possible that this cut was made for its secondary use.

**Figurines, plaques, and lamps associated with deities**

Objects related to, or representing, deities were uncovered in three of the houses in the Piraeus: PIRAE001, PIRAE002, and PIRAE004. From PIRAE001 came eight naiskoi of Cybele, five marble statuettes of Aphrodite, terracotta figurines of Eros, and a votive inscription of a priestess of Aphrodite.\(^{833}\) This would seem to have been a shrine to either of these goddesses, however, the area in which they were found was a continuously occupied domestic and commercial space;\(^{834}\) Axioti has identified four
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\(^{833}\) Axioti 2009, p. 494.
\(^{834}\) Axioti 2009, pp. 493–494.
Classical period houses under the Roman period villa here.\footnote{Axioti 2009, p. 493.} It is possible that this collection of images may have come from any or all of those houses since neither the find spots were recorded for them nor the specific buildings with which they were associated. But their discovery in the area of domestic spaces would suggest they were used either within the houses or within a shrine in the \textit{insula} for those living in the vicinity,\footnote{Milchhöfer thought they indicated a sanctuary in the area and a neighborhood of foreigners (1881, pp. 43–44).} similar to CORIN015.

As already mentioned, another enthroned Cybele was uncovered in PIRAE002 in Room 32. In addition, in Room 48, which is located next to the entrance to the house, was found a hekataion and a statuette of Knidian Aphrodite. These were found on the floor of the Late Roman phase of the room and may have been part of a cache of marbles destined either for reuse as building material or as a collection of sculpture.\footnote{Grigoropoulos 2005, p. 183, fig. 133, nos. 5 and 6.} These images, which could have come from anywhere and are dated to the Roman period, demonstrate two deities which might have been involved in personal worship such as that found within the household. Furthermore, the find spot of the hekataion near the doorway of the house hints at the original function of the image to protect liminal spaces.

Finally, found among the reused stones lining the mouth of a cistern in PIRAE004 came a headless statuette of enthroned Cybele. She was carved of Pentelic marble, roughly 0.365m high and 0.22m wide, in a classicizing style which could be Hellenistic or Roman.\footnote{Petritaki 2002c, p. 74.} Clearly, in this location, the statuette was no longer an object of veneration, but it is possible that she was originally intended for a domestic setting.
Thus, ten representations of Cybele have been uncovered in association with houses of the Roman Piraeus. Looking at the representations of deities from the Piraeus Museum, Cybele had been very popular among votive figure since the 5th century BCE. However, from these domestic contexts, Aphrodite and Eros appear to be equally important. This resembles the trends observed from contemporary Athens, Corinth, and Patras, where Cybele and Aphrodite seem to have maintained an important status in households and across the Roman period sites. And, hekataia were still present in the Roman Piraeus as they were in Athens and Corinth. However, unlike Athens, the Piraeus currently is lacking in evidence of foreign deities honored in homes, but this is likely because of the small size of the sample. The statuette of Knidian Aphrodite is currently the only example. Epigraphic evidence suggests that foreign cults could still be found in the Roman Piraeus, as they had been in earlier periods as well.\textsuperscript{839} Therefore, they might also have been present in households as well.

\textbf{V.E.3: Cult in Context}

From these four structures, analysis can be conducted for PIRAE002 which has not only evidence of possible domestic cult located in or near its intended location but also a well preserved plan. The room in which the Cybele statue was found was part of a late 2nd/early 3rd century CE renovation. As discussed above, in this phase of the house, along the southwest side was a row of shops opening on a main street, but the house proper was primarily entered from a side street to the north along a long corridor. The corridor enters the courtyard along its east side, so that anyone who wished to access the majority of the rooms (ten of the fifteen) would have had to turn to the left. The marble

\textsuperscript{839} E.g., SEG XXIX 197 (Helios/Mithras); Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 71–76.
impluvium and its tetrastyle colonnade would probably have drawn a visitor’s attention and brought him into this part of the house. However, the view of the rooms to the south and southwest would have been obscured by the columns, and the rooms to the north would not have been visible since their entrance was further down the same wall as the entrance from the corridor.

Room 32 with the statuette, however, would have been clearly visible from this point (Figure 379). If the statuette was placed in line with the entrance to the room, it would have been easily seen by visitors to the house. In this arrangement, the potential cult room was also physically accessible to visitors once they were in the courtyard, since the statuette was only one room removed from this space. Furthermore, considering that the walls were well-appointed with wall painting, this suggests that the room was intended to be seen by outsiders. With regard to the inhabitants of the household, the room was immediately off the courtyard, the central circulation space, and positioned at the northwest corner; anyone passing to or from the southern and northern rooms had to pass by this space and those leaving the eastern part of the house would see it as well. They would, therefore, not only have access to the space but be constantly visually aware of its presence in the house.

Grigoropoulos has suggested that the impluvium would not only make it easier to collect rain water in the cistern below but also possibly allowed the inhabitants to display something Roman in their house, not necessarily to identify themselves with being Roman but to call to mind an association with the past, like displaying antiquities or “retro” furnishings in modern day houses. It is possible that this potential shrine room, which was introduced to the house with the impluvium, was also added for this same
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840 Grigoropoulos 2005, p. 116–119. Atria at this time were passé in Roman Italy.
reason. The off-axis entrance corridor, the double external doors, and the control of movement within the house via the courtyard are indicative of traditional elements of Greek housing; in fact, in that sense these elements are also “retro”. However, as discussed for Athens, this is likely because of a continuity of function and use, and not nostalgia.

V.E.4: Observations

In the Piraeus, as in Athens and Corinth, local traditions of construction, accessibility, and visibility in houses appear to continue in the Roman period. The addition of impluvia may suggest Roman influence, but may also have been a status symbol not specifically attached to Roman.

The evidence for household religion is highly speculative. The deities worshipped seem traditional for Attica, namely Cybele and Aphrodite, but could also be Roman. The forms of cult evidence which are preserved are ambiguously Greco-Roman as well, statuettes and altars. However, the depiction of Cybele in a naiskos is a form associated with Attica, as mentioned above; this suggests a continuation of Greek practices. The possible cult room of PIRAE002 seems to be the exception as the form and location of the shrine appear Roman, but the deity is in keeping with local customs. This is similar to the colonial cities of Patras and Corinth where traditional deities were found in foreign forms and locations. I suspect, given the other similarities between the Piraeus and Athens, that some examples of Roman-like shrines or shrines with other foreign associations were used in the Piraeus as they were in Athens, but they have not
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841 It is possible that this may be the case for other household cult features discussed in the other cities as well.
yet been found. In general, however, Greek traditional household religion likely dominated as it did in Athens.

V.F: Observations for Roman Achaia

As Bonini and Papaioannou have demonstrated in their studies, the houses of Roman Achaia clearly display Roman influence in their decoration and architectural features, the degree to which these aspects are incorporated into the houses varying from site to site. What I have been able to observe in addition is that patterns of accessibility and visibility generally appear to follow pre-Roman Greek patterns across the province, even where the Roman-looking features are found. This suggests that, on the whole, patterns of activities within the houses may also have remained the same. This observation would seem to confirm the opinion that Roman Greece was “un-Romanized.” However, there were some exceptions to this, such as PATRA038 and ATHEN002. These exceptions thus demonstrate that Roman influence could be identified in the use patterns of houses as well.

Similarly, the evidence for household religion in general seems to resemble that of the pre-Roman culture, but there are also some examples of Roman influence from four of the five cities. At Corinth two possible shrines looked Roman in form but Greek in function and a mixture as to the deities honored. From Patras, two potential shrines were Roman in form and function, but Greek in the deities represented. Athens also had two examples of possible Roman household shrines, but the location of these seems to have been in keeping with Greek practices. Messene, on the other hand, maintains its unique religious traditions, and while evidence of household cult has yet to be identified,
it may be hypothesized that Messenian household religion perhaps continued unaffected as well. The Piraeus only had one example possibly in a primary context which is difficult to interpret.

Likewise, there are only a few examples of distinctly Greek household cult evidence, mainly the votive foundation deposits from Athens and Corinth. Such a tradition has been identified in houses from the Classical period through the Roman period and does not appear to have any parallels in Romano-Italian household religion.

The majority of the evidence was more ambiguously Greco-Roman. This material includes altars, hearth, braziers, niches, representations of deities, and cult objects. Images and objects associated with deities for the most part relate to deities already known in Greece before the Roman period, but which were also common in Italy. Herms and hekataia were considered objects of household cult in the Greek tradition, but I have found no evidence in the Roman tradition of such objects being honored with offerings. Herms are known from houses in Roman Italy, but are usually considered to be decorative in those contexts. Still, in this study of Roman Greece, such objects have been regarded as a continuation of Greek traditions although it is also possible that they were only decorative. Overall the evidence for household religion in Roman Achaia is sparse and at times difficult to read.

What can be read, however, is how Roman elements were incorporated into these examples, the variations of this incorporation throughout a single province, and whether household cult was used a means of displaying Roman cultural identity. In Corinth, the evidence of household religion included three deities associated with Roman political and social institutions, namely the Lar, Roma and the Europa/Sosandra/Aphrodite/Venus.
However, their potential shrines appear to have been located following Greek customs. This suggests an association with Roman culture through household religion, but not one necessarily for display to the community. Looking at the houses themselves, one’s Roman association was more likely demonstrated to visitors through the decoration and architectural features. It may be the personal choice of the inhabitants to worship these deities in this way rather than a desire to appear Roman through household religion.

As for Patras, there were no deities specifically associated with Roman culture, but the two potential shrines were located adjacent to reception spaces which suggest Roman practices. However, these reception spaces were also a liminal space appropriate for Greek practices. The houses were also more Roman looking in decoration, construction, and accessibility than any of the other houses in this study. Based on this, it may have been that household religion could have played a role, in addition to the house itself, for displaying Roman cultural identity, but it did not matter by the 2nd century CE if the Lares and the Genius were included.

In Athens, the contextualized evidence which resembles Roman forms of shrines is associated with deities not specifically Roman in origin and both were placed out of view from the reception parts of the house, possibly following Greek practices. The houses themselves resembled those of Hellenistic Delos with a few decorative elements which may reflect Roman influence. There was also from this site evidence from secondary context for Roman deities. Therefore, it seems in Athens that the incorporation of Roman elements, as at Corinth, was a personal choice and not one to demonstrate openly a Roman identity. Nor does the display of Roman cultural associations seem to have been as important as in the houses from Corinth and Patras,
either in the appointments of the house or household religion. The Piraeus has only one location preserved with insecure evidence, while Messene has no evidence for household religion.

Both the colony of Corinth and the free city of Athens did not appear, based on this evidence, to have participated in the practice of displaying household religion. Even those features which may demonstrate Roman influence were not placed where they could be viewed by visitors. While the colony of Patras does seem to have put its household religion on display, including those features which resemble Roman ones. Furthermore, the free city of Messene demonstrates no Roman influence whatsoever.

The pattern which emerges across the province appears to be related to the discrepant experiences of these cities. In the colonial cities the upper classes, and possibly ambitious members of the middle classes, formed the ruling class on whom the Roman administration weighed. In order to participate and to gain status in the empire-wide system, and possibly Roman citizenship, these individuals needed to bridge customs and cultures to demonstrate to the Roman elites that they were their peers, but also to maintain their Greek traditions as members of their own communities. As mentioned in Chapter III, the Roman political system placed a value on one’s Romanitas which was typically displayed through one’s home. Therefore, these leaders may have needed to appear to live following Roman mores.

However, whether from a need to stay connected with their past or with the Greek communities or from a form of rebellion, they chose to keep their traditional deities. This is assuming that they understood these deities in their Greek personas and not as their Roman equivalents. At Corinth, the provincial capital, they also appear to have
maintained their Greek functionality; that is, the two Roman-looking possible shrines were located where they could be accessible to the inhabitants, but not necessarily to visitors. This is odd if they wished to appear Roman, but may still be a local interpretation of Roman household cult practices.

As for the free cities, there may not have been as much pressure upon the elite to participate in the Roman political system, although many did. In Messene where there is much evidence of Romans and Messenians with Roman citizenship, there is no evidence of Roman household cult elements or practices. At Athens, however, without the need to be Roman in one’s home, there was more freedom of choice. It is likely that expressions of Romanness were conducted in public places since the majority of houses and evidence for household religion suggests Greek traditions prevailed. Those Roman looking shrines and Roman household deities which were identified may represent any number of situations from Roman citizens permanently residing in Athens, to Athenians who wanted to be Roman, to a freedom of personal choice. It is not possible to tell which from the evidence available.

To be Roman in Rome was based on birth, social status, and familial connections. For those from the provinces, at least until 212 CE, one needed to prove one’s loyalty to Rome through the public enactment of rituals and oaths, and through demonstrating behaviors and customs valued by Romans. \(^{842}\) Even so, most did not achieve the civic status, but they did make Roman a part of their cultural identities. \(^{843}\) From this point of view, Roman cultural identity is public and seems almost superficial, which leads to the question of how much of this Romanness was carried over into their personal lives.

\(^{842}\) Ando 2000, pp. 12–15.
\(^{843}\) Ando 2000.
Based on the evidence presented here, I would say that Roman elements were
incorporated into the visible spaces of the house, and sometimes into the activities of the
household, at least those which relate to household religion.
Chapter VI: Conclusions

At the beginning of this thesis I had three goals. The first goal was to identify the evidence for household religion in Roman Achaia using a three step approach. The second was to test the effectiveness of the approach itself for establishing a physical context for objects and architectural features on the basis of their accessibility, visibility and find-spots. The final goal was to determine what the results of this study could reveal about the nature and extent of cultural interactions in Roman Achaia in comparison with previous interpretations.

In terms of the first goal, I have examined the evidence of Greek and Roman household religion from various perspectives. I followed both more traditional avenues by exploring literature and inscribed evidence and more innovative ways by placing more importance on spatial aspects, such as the location of the sacred feature and the find-spots of cult-related objects within the house. The location of the sacred finds and architectural elements, furthermore, is important for understanding how it was viewed and used, and by whom. It was more challenging to identify objects and features related to household religion in pre-Roman houses in Greece, at least partly because activities, as we understand them, were less structured in form and location than in Roman houses. Still, some features or objects, such as altars, are indicative of cultic activities, and when such materials are found within a domestic context it is logical to suggest they were related to cultic activities in the household. Furthermore, based on literary sources, objects or features which could possibly be association with cultic activities, such as statuettes or niches, their location and visibility within the house can help identify them as cultic in
nature. Therefore, it is reasonable to posit that a niche next to a front entrance or a votive plaque found *in situ* in a storage area may have had a cultic use.

Roman traditions of household religion are more easily recognized in the archaeological remains, mainly because of the use of the *lararium* form and the location of lararia in the atrium or peristyle of the house. In the province of Achaia, there were two caches of statuettes which resemble a collection of Penates and both of these were found in small rooms located near *atria* or courtyards (Corinth and Patras). There was a third, similar small room with one statuette of Cybele (the Piraeus). Fragments of wall painting depicting a Lar (Corinth), a painted niche suggestive of a *lararium* (Patras), and a possible *aedicula* feature (Athens) were also identified. There was in addition a four-room suite with cultic objects possibly related to the cult room/sacellum tradition in Italy (Athens) as well as a lamp and figurine from secondary deposits depicting the Lares and possibly a Genius (Athens). None of these features or objects can be definitely identified as items of household religion because they do not resemble a standard Roman household cult unit as understood from Pompeii and Ostia. Thus, this study questions how much of this tradition, particularly the *lararium* with its specific deities and the prominent location of the shrines, was exported to the provinces.

Nine different features from across Achaia is a small sample, but the small amount of evidence is likely related to the poor preservation of many of these houses. Even still, this sample can, at least in part, suggest that the concepts from Roman household religion were brought to Achaia, although it is uncertain if they held the same significance or functions. Except for votive foundation deposits, the rest of the securely identified materials from the houses of these five sites are more ambiguous in their
cultural associations. In relation to this ambiguous Greco-Roman looking evidence, it appears that these elements of Roman household religion were not the typical choice of the inhabitants of these sites. It is, therefore, also conceivable that the sample is small because in antiquity such forms of household religion may have varied throughout the Empire and are, thus, harder for us to identify as Roman through comparisons with evidence from Italy.

Related to this last issue is that of general change to what has been defined as Roman household religious practices. Even limiting the focus of the study to the 2nd to 4th centuries CE presented a large period of time in which much change could have happened to household religious practices, such as those observed from comparing shrines in 1st century CE Pompeii with those of 4th century CE Ostia. Although comparing these two sites has helped to observe that change did occur within Roman household religious practices, taking into account the nature of Ostia’s abandonment, the different locations and political positions of these two cities, and the different population compositions, specific information regarding what these changes were cannot be identified. Nevertheless, because I have attempted to identify general changes in the household religions of Roman Achaia, the specifics of Roman household religious practices in Italy do not need to be well-defined at this time. Based on the available evidence from Roman Achaia, it is not possible to distinguish between the changes which were a result of interactions with Roman culture and those which were general religious developments over time; only changes in comparison with pre-Roman Greece can be observed.
One further issue also related to the long chronological span of this study is anachronism. This may be found in the possibility that older sculpture and out-dated features like *atria* were used in houses to recall the past, either from some sense of nostalgia or from a level of prestige associated with owning antiquities. Therefore, collections of sculpture which contained older pieces could either represent a *lararium* group or some ancient antiquities collector. The presence of herms andhekataia in a house could have been an allusion to the ‘glory days’ of Greece rather than apotropaia to protect the entrance of the house. In addition, there is also the greater issue of whether or not these objects did indeed hold cultic significance to the inhabitants of the house, or if they were perceived in some other way; something which cannot be proven one way or the other. In spite of these issues, however, I was able to identify a small sample of secure evidence and a larger sample of less secure evidence for household religion in Roman Achaia. The conclusions which can be drawn from this evidence are preliminary until more is brought to light to confirm them.

In addition, the issues of identifying evidence of household religion are also made more difficult by the definition of household religion and our interpretation of how it was perceived by its participants. Household religion is on some level a personal concept and activity and, therefore, susceptible to variation not only in its initial function but also in our modern interpretation and understanding of it. Noting the similarities between polis cults and household cults as described in literature, several scholars have argued over whether “Greek domestic religion” was indeed perceived as a separate concept from Greek polis religion. Scholars such as Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood have argued that all forms of religion in ancient Greece were extensions of the polis religion with the most
basic cult unit being the individual.\footnote{Sourvinou-Inwood 2000, p. 53.} This is an appealing perspective on domestic religion, especially with regards to the formal cults of Zeus Herkeios, Zeus Ktesios, Apollo Patroos, and even the hearth. The descriptions of the rituals of these cults found in ancient literature and epigraphy resemble those of polis cults, and for each of these cults there is evidence for a polis or deme cult site as well. However, this point of view does not explain the other, less formal aspects of domestic religion that have been included in this study such as the use of apotropaia to protect the individual and the houses, the variety of forms, deities, and practices from house to house within the same polis, and the leading role of women in domestic cult rituals especially those surrounding transitions to different life stages.

On the other side of the debate are those like Christopher Faraone\footnote{Faraone 2008, p. 211.} who perceive those aspects of domestic religion which resemble polis cult as miniature and/or simplified versions of the latter,\footnote{Faraone 2008, p. 222; Boedeker 2008, p. 243.} and in those rituals find some distinct differences such as the use of cakes instead of blood sacrifice and who could participate.\footnote{Faraone 2008, p. 222; Boedeker 2008, p. 231.} To these arguments I would add that within those practices which resembled polis cult, as well as those of a less formal nature, one of the main intentions was to protect the city from the pollution, or miasma, which was produced in the home through rites of passage.\footnote{Stower 2008, pp. 11–12 and pp. 13–16.} Miasma was a threat from anyone in a liminal state, and in performing the rituals surrounding birth, death, marriage and sickness the family protected the community from this pollution as well as the vulnerable individual experiencing the transition. Stanley Stower describes the role of domestic religion in ancient Greece as controlling the

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnotemark[44] Sourvinou-Inwood 2000, p. 53.
  \item Faraone 2008, p. 211.
  \item Faraone 2008, p. 222; Boedeker 2008, p. 231.
  \item Stower 2008, pp. 11–12 and pp. 13–16.
\end{itemize}}
pollution which came with the rites of passage to protect the temples and sacred spaces of the polis. This view, additionally, suggests that the polis and the domestic cults, while dependent on one another, may have been perceived as distinct entities.

The distinction between household and public shrines in Roman religion has been much debated, too. However, such dialogues tend to discuss individual cults associated with household shrines and not the general understanding of the concept of household religion; their specific arguments have been discussed in Chapter II in the descriptions of these cults. There were civic versions of the Lares as well as the cult of Vesta and the state hearth at the center of the Forum Romanum. Many of the deities honored as domestic Penates had civic cults, especially the Capitoline Triad, and there was a state version of the Penates located near the Temple of Vesta. Still, as mentioned in Chapter III, there is also evidence for legal distinctions made between public shrines as loca sacra and personal shrines as loca profana. If we are correct in interpreting personal shrines as meaning those of the individual or of a small group, such as a household, and public shrines as meaning those of the wider community and the state, then there was a recognizable division between the two forms of worship. But, legal documents do not necessarily represent the beliefs of all those identifying themselves as Roman and it is not possible to know if the laws and legal precedents mentioned were implemented or enforced as we assume they were.

In both cultural groups, it cannot be understood for certain, based on the available evidence, whether or not the cultic rituals of the household were perceived of by its members as an extension of the civic religion. Therefore, the definition used for household religion in this study is one connected specifically to place. To reiterate this

definition of household religion, the term refers to the cultic rituals and practices carried out within the domestic space by those residing within it which were concerned with their health, safety and fecundity. Where the cults were derived from and how they were perceived, while discussed, has not played a significant role in the study as they are nearly impossible concepts to prove.

The evidence of household cult was not identified entirely based on its appearance and form. In terms of the second goal, the location of the feature and its visibility were considered to determine how the feature was viewed and used and by whom. What set apart cultic objects and features from secular ones was the type of activities in which they were used, even though these too are difficult to read in the archaeological record. What can be more easily seen in the archaeological record is who may have seen or used the feature. This aspect is important for connecting household religion with cultural identity; built spaces and the features added to them form and are formed by the activities which take place within them. To understand this, I have employed a three-step analysis of access, visibility, and the contextualization of the potential evidence for household religion and the spaces which contain it within the houses.

By testing this method with houses of pre-Roman Greece and Roman Italy, not only was I able to establish criteria against which to compare the analysis from Roman Achaia but also to demonstrate the effectiveness of this method. One important observation from this testing was that the accessibility within both Greek and Roman houses was very similar. There were differences in the calculated RRAs and in the justified access plans, but they were small and, in fact, at least one example from each sample group resembled the houses of the other group. There was, however, a difference
in the location of reception spaces. The position of these types of rooms reflected another key observation from analyzing pre-Roman Greek and Roman Italian houses; that these generalized house-forms were distinct in terms of visibility from both outside the houses and within reception spaces.

Focusing on the use and visibility of the space containing cultic evidence also revealed that the role of the visitor within the house was the key difference between houses and household religion of pre-Roman Greek cultures and those of Roman Italy. In Greek houses, the visitor was restricted in movement and visual access within the house, and was not relevant to the decisions made regarding where household cult activities took place and what form they may have taken. In Roman Italy, however, the ability of the visitor to visually access the house was an important element in the arrangement of the houses of the upper classes. The Roman household shrine, furthermore, needed to be visible to those of the community in a recognizable form, mainly the *lararium*. Thus, while access analysis was important for identifying the function of a space, in order to differentiate the two traditions in the houses of Roman Achaia, visibility was truly the distinguishing element. These interpretations agree with the literary evidence about household religion in both cultural groups.

The importance of visibility can be understood more clearly in the analysis of Hellenistic Delos, the first site in the Greek world with a large community of Romans and Italians. By applying this approach to the well-preserved houses and identifiable evidence for household religion, I demonstrated that in this multicultural community Greek or Greco-Roman customs appear to have been the most popular. Shrines that were
specifically Roman in nature were located in neighborhoods, but, with a single exception, not in houses.

More informative was the observation that these houses were no longer as visually restrictive towards visitors; reception spaces were moved towards the back of houses with visual access into them from the entrance of the house, although service spaces were made almost invisible. This observation agrees with the recent work of Monika Trümper on the domestic spaces of Delos and the emphasis on display in the architecture and plan of the houses. While increased visibility may be the result of Roman influence, I believe that its popularity in fact was the result of the multicultural nature of the Delian community. Through the evidence of the religious associations found in Delos, it is clear that affiliation with a specific cultural group was important to those living in Delos. It may also have been important for them to demonstrate their cultural identity in their homes, whether it was Roman, Greek, or something else. One way to achieve this was through visual access into key areas of the house, such as reception spaces, which could display one’s cultural associations.

In Roman Achaia, the remains of the houses and the evidence of household cult were not as well preserved as those of Hellenistic Delos. This resulted in my inability to conduct spatial analysis on every house under consideration. However, the visual analysis was significantly more useful as it did not require the entire plan of the house to be preserved. Therefore, the versatility of having three steps in my approach did allow some analysis to be carried out and proved that the method, especially visual analysis, was effective in identifying the changes in patterns of household activities in Roman Achaia, including those related to household religion. As expected, there were not
significant differences between pre-Roman Greek and Roman Greek housing with respect to accessibility, but there were notable changes in visibility. These changes reveal a shift in the patterns of activities in some of the houses.

Furthermore, not every house exhibited such changes; there was variability among the five sites chosen as case-studies. At the colonial cities, visibility into the houses resembled that of Delos, with some visibility into a couple rooms of the house from the entrance and reception spaces, but not a complete visual axis through the entire house. In the free cities, on the other hand, visibility from outside the house was restricted to the entrance space (vestibule, courtyard, corridor), and that of the reception space to its anti-chamber. This was even the case in Athens where there was the largest sample of complete or near complete houses to consider and, therefore, has the potential for the most variety. Thus, there were significant changes in domestic activities within the houses of the colonies which were not found or were not common in the houses of the free cities.

The third goal of this project was to explore, through this element of culture, the nature of cultural interactions in Roman Achaia at the level of the household, the most personal level available in archaeological remains, and how this interpretation compares with previous scholars’ work on cultural identity in the province. I have argued that there were a few households within four of these five communities which incorporated Roman cultural identity into their ‘personal,’ domestic lives. Because of the poor state of preservation of the majority of domestic remains from all five of these sites I cannot state what proportion of the residents of these sites incorporated Roman household religion elements and which did not.
I was, however, able to demonstrate that the pattern of this incorporation of Roman elements varied from city to city with respect to which elements were chosen and how they were used in household cult. This variation reflected the discrepant experiences of each community, as discussed at the end of Chapter V. Thus, this study has demonstrated the significance of the discrepant experience model as well as the significance of Roman Achaia in discussions of cultural identity in the Roman Empire. However, it has also highlighted the problems of applying this model to the study of ancient cultures. Using the discrepant experiences model for ancient cultures is valid in that it is flexible and allows innumerable perspectives to be recognized on many levels, from province to city to individual. At the same time, however, this model emphasizes the fact that so much information has been lost to time, destruction, and deterioration, especially with regards to the individual.

The obvious relationship between these two cultures has been thoroughly discussed by scholars who have identified Greek culture within Roman culture in Italy in terms of statues, education, monumental architecture, and cults. As discussed in Chapter I, it has been argued that Greek culture was indifferent or opposed to Roman culture. I have demonstrated here that in fact elements of Roman culture, specifically within the household cults and the houses, were occasionally incorporated into communities in Greece. These findings of Roman cultural influence on Greek culture as well as the effects of discrepant experiences on this influence agree with the findings of recent scholarship regarding houses in Roman Greece.850 They also concur with recent studies of other forms of large scale material culture, such as public sanctuaries and funerary

850 Papaioannou 2002; Papaioannou 2007; Bonini 2006.
monuments.\textsuperscript{851} But who do these examples of Roman influence in household religion represent? Are they Roman immigrants, Greeks hoping for Roman citizenship, someone else? These questions cannot be answered, but can stimulate discussion and further research.

Additionally, my results challenge whether or not a study of ancient identity and in particular Romanization, even as cultural exchange, are valid concepts for examination. Can we truly understand how, in a specific time and place in the distant past an individual understood himself and his actions within the context of his life? And, how do we fully recreate that context given the distance of time and deterioration of evidence? Can we fully remove our own cultural formation from our interpretations of the evidence? Nevertheless, through testing new investigative methods, such as those presented here, as well as by recognizing the flaws that lurk in our analyses, we can still strive to achieve a better understanding of the past.

\textsuperscript{851} E.g., Lagogianni-Georgakarakos 2002; Spetsieri-Choremi 2003; Bookidis 2005; Fläming 2007; Longfellow 2011.
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Guidelines for the Use of the Appendices A to E

The following appendices are supporting material for Chapter V. These are intended to supplement the more general descriptions of the houses referred to in Chapter V. Appendix A provides a list of Roman houses in Achaia with their most basic information (name, location, date) and a short bibliography. This list is arranged in alphabetical order of the site in which a house was found. Each identification number is composed of the first five letters of the name of the site followed by a three digit number. When specific dates are known, they will be provided. When they are less certain they are recorded as follows:

A: Archaic, c. 8th – early 5th centuries BCE
C: Classical, c. 5th – 4th centuries BCE
H: Hellenistic, c. late 4th – early 1st centuries BCE
LH: Late Hellenistic, c. 2nd – early 1st centuries BCE
R: Roman, c. 1st century CE – 4th century CE
ER: Early Roman, c. mid 1st century BCE – 1st century CE
LR: Late Roman, c. 4th – 6th centuries CE
EByzantine: Early Byzantine, post-Roman
EChristian: Early Christian, post-Roman

The references to Early Byzantine and Early Christian are taken from the publications when specific dates, including what they define as Early Byzantine and Early Christian, are not given. For the purposes of this study they refer to the post-Roman period and have been noted in the database to demonstrate the longevity of the
house’s use or that there were later constructions which effected the preservation of the house. A date of “H and R” means that the house was built in the Hellenistic period, then abandoned, and was subsequently reoccupied in the Roman period. A date of “H – R”, on the other hand, indicates that the house was continuously in use from the Hellenistic period through the Roman period. Furthermore, the phrase “Terminus Post Quem” has been abbreviated as “TPQ” when used. The reader should consult the appendix when he/she would like to obtain more information on an entry mentioned in the main text. At the end of each entry, it is indicated whether this house also appears in Appendices B to E.

Appendices B to E list only a selection of the houses of Appendix A. Each appendix focuses on a specific topic that is relevant for the analysis of houses in Roman Achaia in Chapter V. Appendix B is, in essence, a list of all the houses with potential shrines or possible household cult evidence; it also provides information on their location in the house, if known. Appendices C, D, and E present detailed information about the floors, walls, and other key decorative features such as tanks, baths, and colonnades. None of these appendices provide information on dates and select readings. The reader is supposed to consult Appendix A to obtain this kind of information.
## Appendix A: Roman Period Houses of Achaia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>ID Number:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Appendices References:</th>
<th>Figure Number(s):</th>
<th>Bibliography:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moutsatsou plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigio</td>
<td>AIGI0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Dodekanisou,</td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 38; Whitley et al. 2007, pp. 274-278.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diamantopoulou plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oikonomou, Koulouri plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theocharopoulou plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigio</td>
<td>AIGI0004</td>
<td></td>
<td>H and R</td>
<td>Odos Elikis, Razi plot</td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 38; Whitley et al. 2007, pp. 274-278.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 38; Whitley et al. 2007, pp. 274-278.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhaia (Ellinika</td>
<td>AITHA001</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Site of Grava on the N side of national road from Athens</td>
<td>Valmin 1930, p. 58 and pp. 62-63; McDonald and Rapp 1972,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Thouria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to Lamia</td>
<td>p. 96 and pp. 288-289, no. 137.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akraiphnion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th CE</td>
<td>to Lamia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyra</td>
<td>ANTIK001</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd - 4th CE</td>
<td>D. Kontogiannnis plot</td>
<td>Kourenta Raptaki 1999, pp. 112-113; Blackman 2000, p. 56;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>ARGOS006</td>
<td>H - LR</td>
<td>Odos Asklepiou and Odos Gounari 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protonotario and Laki 1967, p. 158, pl. 140b-d; Spathari 1996a, pp. 89-90, pl. 52a-b; Spathari 1996b, p. 92; Sarri 2000, pp. 92-94, fig. 1, pl. 43b; Papaioannou 2002, App. 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN005</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Along W slope of Kolonos</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson 1948, pp. 169-170, pl. 47.2; Papaioannou 2002, p. 68, p. 72, p. 80, p. 83, App. 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN008</td>
<td>House Q</td>
<td>End of 1st BCE and 1st CE</td>
<td>NW of ATHEN001 and ATHEN002, W of ATHEN003</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Thompson 1948, pp. 168-169; Young 1951, p. 183 and p. 277, fig. 1; Papaioannou 2002, p. 34 n. 84, pp. 34-35, p. 77, pl. 13, App. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN010</td>
<td>Name: House S</td>
<td>Date: 3rd CE before Herulian sack</td>
<td>Location: E of ATHEN011</td>
<td>Appendices References: C</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 310</td>
<td>Bibliography: Thompson 1948, pp. 168-169; Young 1951, p. 278; Frantz, Thompson, and Travlos 1988, p. 36; Waywell 1979, p. 296; Papaioannou 2002, p. 35, p. 64, p. 77, p. 79, App. 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN011</td>
<td>Name: House T</td>
<td>Date: Early 3rd CE</td>
<td>Location: SE of ATHEN001 and ATHEN002</td>
<td>Appendices References: C</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 310</td>
<td>Bibliography: Thompson 1948, pp. 168-169; Young 1951, pp. 278-279; Waywell 1979, p. 296; Papaioannou 2002, p. 35, p. 64, p. 77, p. 79, App. 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN012</td>
<td>Name: House U</td>
<td>Date: 1st and 2nd CE</td>
<td>Location: S of ATHEN001 and ATHEN002, over A cemetery</td>
<td>Appendix References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography: Young 1951, p. 279, fig. 1; Papaioannou 2002, p. 44, pl. 3, App. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN013</td>
<td>Name: House of the Parrots Mosaic</td>
<td>Date: 4th/3rd BCE - c. 2nd CE</td>
<td>Location: S of Areopagus near Pynx</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography: Daux 1965, p. 684; Daux 1966, p. 734, fig. 4; Thompson 1966, p. 53, pl. 18a-b; Thompson 1968b, pp. 49-50, pl. 72b; Travlos 1971, p. 399, fig. 515; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, p. 185; Waywell 1979, p. 295; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 63-64, p. 73, pp. 79-80, App. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN014</td>
<td>Name: House of Aristodemos</td>
<td>Date: 4th BCE - LR</td>
<td>Location: Between Pynx and Areopagus</td>
<td>Appendices References: E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 327 - 331, 372</td>
<td>Bibliography: Dörpfeld 1892a, p. 443; Dörpfeld 1894, pp. 503-504; Dörpfeld 1901, pp. 1-2, pl. 37-38; Jundeich 1931, pp. 196-201, p. 299, pl. 18, 36; Graham 1966, p. 12, fig. 27; Thompson 1966, pp. 51-52; Travlos 1971, p. 392, p. 401, fig. 520; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 37-38, p. 50, p. 61, p. 73, pl. 4b, 11b, App. 11; Bonini 2006, pp. 254-255, Atene 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN015</td>
<td>Name: 6th - 3rd BCE and third quarter 2nd BCE - 86 BCE and end of 1st BCE - early 2nd CE</td>
<td>Location: Eastern house found under NE basilica in Agora</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography: Shear 1973a, pp. 138-142; Baldini-Lippolis 2001, p. 157; Papaioannou 2002, p. 44, pl. 16a, App. 28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN016</td>
<td>Name: H and first half of 2nd CE - 267 CE</td>
<td>Location: Western house found under NE corner of Agora; along E side of the NE basilica in Agora</td>
<td>Appendices References: D, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 332 - 333</td>
<td>Bibliography: Shear 1973a, p. 135, p. 138, pp. 142-146, fig. 2; Papaioannou 2002, p. 44, p. 45, p. 50, p. 71, p. 77, pl. 16a, App. 15 and 28; Bonini 2006, p. 233, Atene 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN020</td>
<td>Name: 3rd - 4th CE</td>
<td>Location: Syntagma</td>
<td>Appendices References: B, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 335</td>
<td>Bibliography: Whitkey 2005, p. 6; Zachariadou 2004, pp. 53-60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN021</td>
<td>Name: 3rd - 5th CE</td>
<td>Location: Syntagma</td>
<td>Appendices References: B</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 335</td>
<td>Bibliography: Whitkey 2005, p. 6; Zachariadou 2004, pp. 53-60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Athens</td>
<td>ID Number: ATHEN022</td>
<td>Name: ER</td>
<td>Location: NE end of Areopagus</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography: Shear 1940, pp. 272-273; Frantz, Thompson, and Travlos 1988, p. 34; Papaioannou 2002, App. 29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
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<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN033</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Along road leading to the Academy, next to the Demosion Sema</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>Kourmanoudes 1871-1872, p. 7 and a plan; Dontas 1973, pp. 21-25; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 48-49, pp. 81-82, pl. 17a, App. 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN037</td>
<td>House B ER and LR</td>
<td>Junction of Odoi Dionysiou Areopagitou 35 and Kallispere 16, just W of Makriyianni Plot</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orphanou 1998, pp. 35-37, fig. 1, pl. 20a-b; Blackman 1999, p. 7, figs. 8-9; Papaioannou 2002, p. 70, App. 23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN039</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>N of Leophorou Olga's in the area of Hadrianopolis/Novae Athenæ</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kourmanoudes 1889, p. 199; Kourmanoudes 1890, p. 59; Papaioannou 2002, App. 34.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN041</td>
<td>LH or 1st CE</td>
<td>Odos Sarre 9, just off of Odos Menandrou in Monastiraki/Psyri area</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandri 1970k, pp. 72-73, fig. 1, pl. 60b; Papaioannou 2002, p. 66, App. 35.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN043</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Menander 9, half way between Omonia and Thesio metro stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papaioannou 2002, p. 66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN044</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd CE, renovations 4th CE</td>
<td>Odos Amphiktyones</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandri 1968b, pp. 49-51, fig. 10, pl. 70d; Andreiomenou 1968, pp. 72-73, pl. 80a; Waywell 1979, p. 296; Bonini 2006, p. 232, Atene 1.</td>
</tr>
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<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN058</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaka on Odos Adrianou 52</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackman 1999, p. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN060</td>
<td>C - R</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Meliti district on Hill of Nymphs 100 m SE of Pnyx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pologiori 2002, pp. 33-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN061</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Odoi Erechtheiou and Dionysioi Areopagirou, S slope of the Acropolis, W of Makriyianni Plot</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meliades 1960, pp. 50-52, pl. 9a; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 75-76, App. 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ATHEN063</td>
<td>R - LR</td>
<td>Plateia Tsokri and Odos Chatzichristou 29</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karayiorya-Stathakopoulou 1985a, p. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens,</td>
<td>ATHEN064</td>
<td>Villa of</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>Kephissia, near the Pyrna Stream and Plateia tou Platanou</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philostratus Vitae Sophistanum, 2,562; Aulus Gellius Noctes Atticae, 1,2, 1-2; Dragoumes 1895, p. 185-186; Petrakos 1963, pp. 29-30; Tobin 1997, pp. 211-239, fig. 42; Papaioannou 2002, p. 54, p. 82, App. 38.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>CHALK002</td>
<td>LH - ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agias Paraskenitis and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Messapion, Alexiou plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Desylla</td>
<td>DESYL001</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valmin 1930, pp. 90-91; Roebuck 1941, pp. 8-9; Gialouris 1968a, p. 206, pl. 145b; Papathanasopoulos 1969, p. 156; McDonald and Rapp 1972, p. 96 and pp. 318-319, no. 609; Papaioannou 2002, App. 60.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desylla</td>
<td>DESYL001</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaimogli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>ELEUS001</td>
<td>House of the Kerykes</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>House of the Kerykes from the Sanctuary of Eleusis</td>
<td>Philos 1889, pp. 77-82, pls. 4-6; Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 4-14; Mylonas 1961, pp. 172-173, fig. 4, L1; Papaioannou 2002, p. 73 n. 224, pl. 23a, App. 37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>ELEUS002</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area B below the House of the Kerykes and up to the N peribolos wall</td>
<td>Mylonas 1961, p. 173, fig. 4; Papaioannou 2002, App. 37b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>ELEUS003</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside Peisistratean peribolos on the S slope of hill</td>
<td>Kourouniotes 1937, pp. 34-40, figs. 1-9, plan 1; Mylonas 1961, pp. 182-183, fig. 4, L30; Papaioannou 2002, p. 31, pl. 7, 8, App. 37c; Bonini 2006, pp. 357-358, Eleusis 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>ELEUS005</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Peisistratou and Karoule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandri, 1984d, p. 29; Papaioannou 2000, App. 37c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyphtika</td>
<td>GYPHT001</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andreimomenou 1961, p. 303, pp. 307-311, p. 313, pl. 1, figs. 5-6, pl. A; Andreimomenou 1962, pp. 150-151, pl. 131; Asemakpoulou-Atzaka 1973, p. 251, no. 67, pl. 30 a and b; Waywell 1979, p. 296.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Hérae</td>
<td>HERAE001</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phialdelphus 1931-1932, pp. 58-68, figs. 2-9, pl. 1; Papaioannou 2002, App. 64; Ecole Française d'Athènes 1954, p. 130; Asemakpoulou-Atzaka 1973, p. 219, no. 2; Waywell 1979, p. 299.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalisteri Phylis, Spilies</td>
<td>KALIS001</td>
<td>1st - 5th CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitkey 2003, p. 12; Platonos 2002, pp. 94-96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalydon</td>
<td>KALYD001</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Uppermost terrace of the acropolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitkey 2003, p. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kardhamili</td>
<td>KARDH001</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valmin 1930, p. 198; Gialouris 1968b, p. 206; McDonalnd and Rapp 1972, p. 96 and pp. 290-291, no. 147.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenchrei</td>
<td>KENCH002</td>
<td>R Koutsongila ridge</td>
<td>Early 2nd - mid 3rd CE</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitely 2005, p. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenchrei</td>
<td>KENCH004</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>c. 36m S of KENCH003, along the cliff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan 2008, p. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
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<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousoi</td>
<td>LOUSO002</td>
<td>LH - 2nd CE</td>
<td>Phournoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catling 1985, p. 23, fig. 27; Papaioannou 2002, App. 66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalopolis</td>
<td>MEGAL002</td>
<td>ER - LR</td>
<td>Found in survey at Megalopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcock 1993, p. 68, Table 6; Papaioannou 2002, App. 69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara</td>
<td>MEGAR002</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Achilleos 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 9; Zoridis 2004, p. 82.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td>MESSE006</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Found in survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcock 1993, p. 68, Table 6; Papaioannou 2002, App. 68.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>OLYMP001</td>
<td>Palace of Nero</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>SE corner of sanctuary, in front of Zeus temple</td>
<td>Dörpfeld 1892b, pp. 73-76; Malwitz 1972, pp. 206-208; Sinn 1993, pp. 139-147; Malwitz 1999, pp. 274-276; Bonini 2006, pp. 433-435, Olimpia 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropia</td>
<td>OROP004</td>
<td>93/4</td>
<td>3rd CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmopoulos et al. 2001, p. 113.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropia</td>
<td>OROP005</td>
<td>94/1</td>
<td>3rd - 7th CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmopoulos et al. 2001, pp. 116-117.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropia</td>
<td>OROP006</td>
<td>94/2</td>
<td>2nd - 1st BCE and 3rd-7th CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmopoulos et al. 2001, pp. 118-121.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropia</td>
<td>OROP007</td>
<td>95/1</td>
<td>3rd - 7th CE</td>
<td>Odos Fafouti, 900m W of Skala Oropou</td>
<td>Cosmopoulos et al. 2001, pp. 121-122.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropia</td>
<td>OROP009</td>
<td>95/2</td>
<td>1st BCE - 7th CE</td>
<td>Lagovouni</td>
<td>Cosmopoulos et al. 2001, p. 122.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropia</td>
<td>OROP014</td>
<td>91/4</td>
<td>1st BCE and 3rd - 4th CE</td>
<td>Hill O</td>
<td>Cosmopoulos et al. 2001, p. 103.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nea Politeia to W of Odos Pelion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleochori</td>
<td>PALE0001</td>
<td>C - R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley 2003, p. 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA002</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Kyprou 14, plot Ai.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petropoulou 2009a, pp. 298-299, figs. 1.11, 8, and 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA005</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Odoi Pneiou 14 and Kladeou, plot K. Tsoulo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Petropoulou 2009b, pp. 299-300, figs. 1.12, 10, and 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA006</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Zarouchleika</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basilogambrou 2009, p. 300, figs. 1.13 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA009</td>
<td>Name: ER and LR Odoi Charalambii 10 and Georgios Rouphos</td>
<td>Location: C, D</td>
<td>Bibliography: Georgopoulou 2001, p. 218-219, fig. 17, pl. 67b-g; Blackman 2002, p. 41.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA014</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Georgios Rouphos 75</td>
<td>Location: D</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papakosta 2004b, p. 258; Whitley 2005, p. 36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA016</td>
<td>Name: R Odoi Elia Miniati 18 and Agiou Georgiou</td>
<td>Location: D</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papakosta 2005b, pp. 252-253, fig. 1.8; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA017</td>
<td>Name: R - LR Odos Charalambii 16</td>
<td>Location: C</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papakosta 2005a, p. 252, fig. 1.6; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA018</td>
<td>Name: R Odoi Evnardos 10 and Germanou 137</td>
<td>Location: D</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papakosta 2005c, p. 253, fig. 1.11; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA019</td>
<td>Name: R Odai Lontos and Erenstrole</td>
<td>Location: D</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papakosta 2005e, pp. 253-254, fig. 1.13; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA021</td>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Agios Dimitrios 38, Vamvaka plot</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Papakosta 2005f, p. 254, figs. 1.14 and 2; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA022</td>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Charalambi 19</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papakosta 2005g, p. 254, fig. 1.16; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA023</td>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Gounari 141</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papakosta 2005h, pp. 254-256, fig. 1.19; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA024</td>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Evnardos 40</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kolia 2005, p. 256, fig. 1.20; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA029</td>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>North House</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Kanari 54 and Korinthos, Lower City</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1979a, p. 351, fig. 5; Papapostolou 1984, pp. 86-87; p. 89; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 191-192, pl. 169c, App. 73.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA033</td>
<td>ER - 2nd CE</td>
<td>Odos Erenstrole 31-35, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papapostokou 1985f, pp. 82-84, fig. 1, pls. 26 and 27a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, p. 194, pl. 72a, App. 77; Bonini 2006, pp. 472-473, Patrasso 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA036</td>
<td>ER - 4th CE</td>
<td>Odoi Ioannos Blachos 36 and Sachtouri, Lower City</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexopoulou 1999a, p. 210, fig. 4, pls. 70a, b; Blackman 2000, p. 45 and fig. 64; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, App. 81; Bonini 2006, p. 439, Patrasso 1.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA044</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Section D, Psyla Alonia Square, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Patras 1984k, pp. 86-89, fig. 14, pl. 62d and 63a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, p. 214, pl. 69b-c, App. 70.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA049</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Karatza and Lontos, Upper City</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAPA 1999, p. 96, fig. 1; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, App. 94.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA050</td>
<td>R, with 4th CE mosaic</td>
<td>Odos B. Rouphos 91-93, Upper City</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papapostolou 1987a, p. 130, pl. 33b; Catling 1988, p. 29, fig. 30; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, App. 95b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA051</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Nikita 69, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papapostolou 1987b, p. 130, pl. 34a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, App. 95c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA052</td>
<td>1st - 7th CE</td>
<td>Odos Erenstrole 36-40, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panagiotopoulou, Platonos, and Matsas 1987a, pp. 142-144, pl. 41d; Papaioannou 2002, p. 176, App. 95d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA053</td>
<td>1st - 3rd CE</td>
<td>Odos Germanos 80-82, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984b, p. 71, fig. 3; Catling 1986, p. 33, fig. 42; Papaioannou 2002, p. 179, pl. 64a-b, App. 96; Bonini 2006, pp. 475-476, Patrasso 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA054</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Odos Sissini 28 and Psylalonia, Upper City</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984, p. 80, fig. 9-10, pl. 61a-g; Papaioannou 2002, p. 180, pl. 46c, App. 97; Bonini 2006, p. 480, Patrasso 34.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA067</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Nikita 60-66, Lower City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1985g, pp. 84-86, fig. 2, pl. 27g-d; Papapostolou 1988g, p. 157 (Cheiron Patreos 8); Papaioannou 2002, p. 183, App. 109; Bonini 2006, p. 463, Patrasso 21A and 21B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA068</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Lontos 42, Upper City, W side</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Papakosta 1993, pp. 150-151, p. 152, fig. 3.4, pl. 87a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 184, App. 110.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA071</td>
<td>Odoi Lontos 42, Upper City, E side</td>
<td>R (?)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Papakosta 1993a, pp. 150-151, figs. 3-4, pl. 87a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 184, App. 113.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA076</td>
<td>Odos Germanou 134, Upper City</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1985c, pp. 79-80; Papaioannou 2002, App. 119.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA077</td>
<td>Odos Agios Dimitrios 42, Upper City</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1985d, p. 80, pl. 24b; Papaioannou 2002, App. 120.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA079</td>
<td>R, TPQ early 2nd CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Karaiskaki 213 and, Lower City</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984j, pp. 82-86, fig. 13, pl. 62g; Papapostolou 1985j, pp. 87-89; Papai..., App. 123; Bonini 2006, p. 483, Patrasso 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA081</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Gounari 69, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1984d, pp. 112-114, fig. 8 and 9, pl. 84a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 197, p. 209, p. 214, pl. 71d and 74a, App. 126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA082</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Sissini 17-19, Upper City</td>
<td>B, C, D, E</td>
<td>267-270</td>
<td>Papaioannou 1984f, pp. 77-80, fig. 8; Papapostolou 1985h, p. 86; Kotsaki 1995, p. 127, pl. 82b; Papaioannou 2002, p. 197, p. 209l, pl. 73a and c, App. 127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA083</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Asemaki Photela 97, Upper City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Papaioannou 1988b, p. 174, figs. 2-3, pl. 77a-b; Papaioannou 2002, p. 197, App. 128.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA085</td>
<td>1st - 3rd/4th CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Kanari and I. Blachos 10-12, Lower City</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Papaioannou 1988k, p. 162, fig. 7; Petritaki 1990d, pp. 111-114, fig. 4, pl. 40a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 198, App. 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA086</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Agios Dimitrios 90, Upper City</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Agallopoulou 1979f, p. 370, fig. 4, pl. 237a-b; Papaioannou 2002, p. 198, App. 131.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA095</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Nikita, Upper City</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastrokostas 1963, p. 126, fig. 1, pl. 149a-b; Papaioannou 2002, App. 139.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA102</td>
<td>R Odos Thermopylon between Odoi Amerikis and Episkopos Makarios</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Kotsaki 1989d, p. 84; Gkadolou 2000d, p. 199.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA103</td>
<td>R Odoi Tsamados and Korinthos, Lower City</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td>Sotiriou 1995, p. 130; Papaioannou 2002, App. 147.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA105</td>
<td>R Odos Eleias 55-57, Upper City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gkadolou 2000a, p. 198; Papaioannou 2002, App. 149.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA107</td>
<td>R Odos Erenstrole 43</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Gkadolou 2000f, p. 200, fig. 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA110</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Asemaki Photela 15 and Mesologgiou, Upper City</td>
<td>B, E</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Panagiotopoulou, Platonos, and Matsas 1987c, pp. 144-147, fig. 11, pl. 43a; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 180, n. 94, p. 197 n. 176, App. 154c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA113</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Lontos and Papadiamantopoulou</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1979b, pp. 394-395.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA116</td>
<td>South House</td>
<td>Odoi Kanari 54 and Korinthos, Lower City</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1979a, p. 351, fig. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA117</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Kanari 62 and Kanakari</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1979b, pp. 351-354, fig. 6, pp. 370-371, fig. 6, pl. 238a-στ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA118</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Asimaki Fotila 24 and Panachaikos</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papapostolou 1979c, p. 355.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA120</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Gounari 66-72</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agallopoulou 1979a, pp. 363-364, pl. 224a-γ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA121</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Korinthos and Miaouli 52-54</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agallopoulou 1979c, p. 366.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA123</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odoi Philopoimenos 55</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agallopoulou 1979e, p. 367.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA124</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Kanari 60 and Kanakari</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>Agallopoulou 1979g, pp. 370-371, fig. 6, pl. 238.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA125</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Kanakari 217, E side</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1984a, pp. 105-107, fig. 5, pl. 83a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA126</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Kanakari 217, W side</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1984a, pp. 105-107, fig. 5, pl. 83b-e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA128</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Lontos 100-102, W side</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1984c, pp. 109-111, fig. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA129</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Katazta 12, Lower City, N side</td>
<td>B, C, D, E</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984e, p. 76, fig. 6, pl. 57d and 58a; Bonini 2006, p. 478, Patrasso 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA131</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Maizonos 225 and Gennadiou</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Papapostolou 19851, p. 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA132</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odoi Trion Navarchon and Maizonos 209-211</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>287 - 289</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1985m, pp. 89-91, fig. 4, pl. 29a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA137</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Gournari - Odos Kanakari - Odos Kanari</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 291</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papapostolou 1988j, p. 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA138</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Pantanasssis 30</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 291</td>
<td>Bibliography: Papapostolou 1988j, p. 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA139</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Buronos 2 - Ypsilon Alonia 19 (plot Zeri)</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 291</td>
<td>Bibliography: Kotsaki 1989a, pp. 142-144, fig. 3, pl. 88-89; Bonini 2006, pp. 457-458, Patrasso 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA140</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Buronos 2 - Ypsilon Alonia 19 (plot Zeri)</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 291</td>
<td>Bibliography: Kotsaki 1989a, pp. 142-144, fig. 3, pl. 88-89; Bonini 2006, pp. 458-459, Patrasso 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA141</td>
<td>Name: 2nd CE Odos Gounari 61</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 291</td>
<td>Bibliography: Mennenga 1989, p. 144.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA142</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Australias 103 (plot Papadimitropoulou)</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 292 - 293</td>
<td>Bibliography: Petropolou 1989, pp. 144-146, fig. 4, pl. 91a-b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA143</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Malakasi 1, Proasteio of Patras</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, D</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 294</td>
<td>Bibliography: Gatsi 1989, p. 146, fig. 5; Bonini 2006, p. 460, Patrasso 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA144</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Agios Dimitrios 91</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 295</td>
<td>Bibliography: ΣΤ' Ephoreia 1989b, p. 1117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA145</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Gournari 159</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 296</td>
<td>Bibliography: ΣΤ' Ephoreia 1989c, p. 119, pl. 661a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA146</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Erenstrole 28-32</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 297</td>
<td>Bibliography: ΣΤ' Ephoreia 1989d, p. 119, fig. 3, pl. 61b-g; Bonini 2006, p. 456, Patrasso 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA147</td>
<td>Name: R Agyia, Ladonos 40</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 298</td>
<td>Bibliography: ΣΤ' Ephoreia 1989e, p. 125; Gkadolou 2000g, p. 211, fig. 12; Blackman 2001, p. 41 and fig. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA148</td>
<td>Name: R Odoi Germanos 176 and K. Palaiogos</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 299</td>
<td>Bibliography: Kotsaki 1989b, p. 84, fig. 2, pl. 29b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA149</td>
<td>Name: R Odoi Germanos 176 and K. Palaiogos</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 299</td>
<td>Bibliography: Kotsaki 1989b, p. 84, fig. 2, pl. 29b; Bonini 2006, pp. 454-455, Patrasso 14 and 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA150</td>
<td>Name: R Odos Karatza 16 (Plateia Omonoias)</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 299</td>
<td>Bibliography: Kotsaki 1989c, p. 84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Patras</td>
<td>ID Number: PATRA151</td>
<td>Name: ER - 3rd CE Odos Gounari 20 and Maizonos</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References: C, E</td>
<td>Figure Number(s): 299</td>
<td>Bibliography: Petriaki 1989, pp. 87-88, fig. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
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<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
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<td>-------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras</td>
<td>PATRA155</td>
<td>R Odoi K. Palaiologou and Germanou 172</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Kotsaki 1993a, p. 149.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE001</td>
<td>R Plateia Terpsitheas</td>
<td>B, C, E</td>
<td>Whitkey 2004, p. 7; Grigoropoulos 2005, p. 96, Table 1, no. 10; Axioti 2009, pp. 489-495.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE002</td>
<td>Dikastiko Megaro, House 1</td>
<td>B, C, D, E</td>
<td>Steinhauer 1988a, pp. 41-44; Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 107-120, Table 1, no. 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE003</td>
<td>Dikastiko Megaro, House 2</td>
<td>B, C, D, E</td>
<td>Steinhauer 1988a, pp. 41-44; Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 107-120, Table 1, no. 9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE004</td>
<td>R Odos Kountouri 212</td>
<td>B, D, E</td>
<td>Petritaki 2002c, p. 74; Grigoropoulos 2005, Table 1, no. 26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE005</td>
<td>House of the Dionysiasts</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>Dörpfeld 1884, pp. 279-287; Hoefnfer and Schwandner 1994, p. 24, fig. 16; Grigoropoulos 2005, p. 21, p. 76, Table 1, no. 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE008</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Philonos 131</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steinhauer 1983b, p. 35; Grigorooulos 2005 Table 1, no. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE009</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Charilaou Trikoupi/Odos Notara</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandri 1984c, pp. 48-49; Grigorooulos 2005, Table 1, no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE010</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Hypsilantou 174-176</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandri 1984b, pp. 49-50; Grigorooulos 2005, Table 1, no. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE011</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Philellionon/ Akte Moutsopoulos</td>
<td>C, D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dragatsis 1892, pp. 17-29; Grigorooulos 2005, Table 1, no. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>PIRAE012</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Praxitelogos 168</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steinhauer 1995, pp. 50-52; Grigorooulos 2005, Table 1, no. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potamia/Koule</td>
<td>POTAM001</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valmin 1930, pp. 169-170, fig. 32; Hood 1961, p. 11; McDonald and Rapp 1972, p. 96, pp. 312-313, no. 508.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnous</td>
<td>RHAMN002</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petrakos 2002a, pp. 13-17; Whitley 2003, p. 12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnous</td>
<td>RHAMN003</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petrakos 2002a, pp. 13-17; Whitley 2003, p. 12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhamnous</td>
<td>RHAMN004</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackman 1999, p. 17; Petrakos 1999b, pp. 11-17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART001</td>
<td>1st BCE</td>
<td>Odos Thermopylon, ancient Limnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zabbou 1999a, pp. 171-172; Blackman 2000, p. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART002</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Chamairetos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1999a, pp. 176-177; Blackman 2000, p. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART003</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Lykourgos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1999b, p. 177; Blackman 2000, p. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART005</td>
<td>3rd - 4th CE</td>
<td>Found during modern drainage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1999e, pp. 183-184; Blackman 2000, p. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART006</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Found during modern drainage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1999e, pp. 183-184; Blackman 2000, p. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART007</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos A. Kapetanea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1999c, p. 182; Blackman 2000, p. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART008</td>
<td>Late 1st BCE/early 1st CE to 2nd CE</td>
<td>Odos Kallikratide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackman 2001, p. 36.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART015</td>
<td>LH - EByzantine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Alkmanos, Kanellopoulou plot</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Themos 2004a, pp. 159-161; Whitley 2005, p. 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART017</td>
<td>H - LR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Triakosion 83, Souchleri plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Themos 2004c, pp. 163-165; Whitley 2005, p. 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART026</td>
<td>R Stratakou plot (O.T. 128), Mesoa district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spyropoulos 1988c, p. 139, pl. 49; Catling 1989, p. 35; Papaioannou 2002, p. 240, pl. 84a, App. 158.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART027</td>
<td>R Theodorakopoulou-Liokautou plot (O.T. 120A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1997a, pp. 103-104; Blackman 1998, p. 36; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 240-241, pl. 84b, App. 159.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART031</td>
<td>R Odos Dorieon between plots (bb 118 and 120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raftopoulou 1997i, pp. 107-110, fig. 7; Raftopoulou 1998, p. 131, fig. 12.11; Papaioannou 2002, p. 242, pl. 86b, App. 163.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART034</td>
<td>R 118 Odos (O.T. 117), Sot. and Demos. Malabazou plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zabbou 2000a pp. 120-121, fig. 1; Papaioannou 2002, App. 166.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART036</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st BCE - 1st CE</td>
<td>Sparta-Tripoli Road, SW of the modern bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steinhauer 1976, pp. 242-246; Papaioannou 2002, App. 168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART037</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH or ER</td>
<td>Loumou plot (O.T. 117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steinhauer 1977a, p. 168, pl. 147a; Papaioannou 2002, App. 169.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART038</td>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Odos Kallikratide, Liakakou plot (O.T. 131) in ancient Pitane district</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Themos 1999, pp. 177-178, fig. 5, pl. 60 a-b; Themos 2000b, pp. 130-133, fig. 7; Papaioannou 2002, p. 269, App. 170.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART040</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O.T. 136 (works by DEYE) and may be related to bath complex at Eleni Dipla plot (126)</td>
<td>Dimakopoulou 1967b, pp. 173-174; Dimakopoulou 1968a, pp. 155-156; Raftopoulou 1999c, pp. 183-184; Papaioannou 2002, App. 172.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART041</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH or ER - EByzantine</td>
<td>Kotsone plot (O.T. 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karapanayiotou 2000a, pp. 133-138, figs. 8-9, pls. 58-60; Papaioannou 2002, App. 173.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART046</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late 2nd or early 3rd CE</td>
<td>Northwest of sports ground</td>
<td>Nicholls 1950, pp. 287-289, fig. 14; Waywell 1979, p. 303; Papaioannou 2002, App. 178.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART052</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>Lymberakou plot, Pergantis plot (Odos Kypros)</td>
<td>Panayiotopoulou 1998, p. 113, p. 117, figs. 10.1, 10.6; Papaioannou 2002, p. 258, pl. 89d, App. 185.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART055</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Lambrinou and Xanthakou plots (bb 40)</td>
<td>Spyropoulos 1988f, p. 139, pl. 50a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 246, App. 188.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART057</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moustakakes plot, Odos Brasidos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART059</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leopoulou plot (O.T. 124)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dimakopoulou 1968b, p. 200, pl. 142b; Papaioannou 2002, App. 192.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART065</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odos Thermopylon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spyropoulos 1989a, p. 90, fig. 1; Papaioannou 2002, App. 198.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART071</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Odos Theodorakopoulos, Vatse plot (O.T. 392)</td>
<td>Zabbou 1999b, p. 174, fig. 3; Papaioannou 2002, App. 204.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART078</td>
<td>ER - R and EByzantine</td>
<td>Odos Platanista (works by electricity provider DEH)</td>
<td>Karapanayiotou 2000b, pp. 138-140, fig. 10, pl. 61a; Papaioannou 2002, App. 211.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>SPART079</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>From Section II, Odos Herakleidon (O.T. 136)</td>
<td>Themos 2000a, p. 129, fig. 6; Papaioannou 2002, App. 212.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART080</td>
<td>Name: 2nd CE</td>
<td>Location: Odos Kallikratide (O.T. 131)</td>
<td>Appendices References: Thermos 2000b, pp. 132-133, fig. 7; Papaioannou 2002, App. 213.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART081</td>
<td>Name: Uncertain</td>
<td>Location: Floros plot, 4km from modern Sparta</td>
<td>Appendices References: Raftopoulou 1997j, p.110; Papaioannou 2002, App. 214.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART082</td>
<td>Name: R</td>
<td>Location: Alley A and E Karra, B' Public School</td>
<td>Appendices References: Dimakopoulou 1968a, pp. 155-156; Steinhauer 1983c, pp. 76-77; Spyropoulos 1988a, p. 135; Spyropoulos 1988k, pp. 121-137; Raftopoulou 1997i, p. 108; Papaioannou 2002, App. 214b.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART083</td>
<td>Name: R</td>
<td>Location: Chatzidemtriou plot</td>
<td>Appendices References: Cating 1989, p. 35; Spyropoulos 1988b, pp. 135-136; Papaioannou 2002, p. 269, n. 202.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART084</td>
<td>Name: Early 4th CE</td>
<td>Location: Foustanos property</td>
<td>Appendices References: Weil 1876, pp. 175-176; Dressel and Milchofer 1878, pp. 429-431; Engelmann 1882, p. 127, pl. 6; Christou 1966, p. 136; Asemakpoulou-Atzaka 1973, p. 249, no. 64; Waywell 1979, p. 302.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART085</td>
<td>Name: Late 3rd/early 4th</td>
<td>Location: Mourabas property</td>
<td>Appendices References: Engelmann 1882, pp. 127-132, pl. 6; Christou 1966, p. 136; Asemakpoulou-Atzaka 1973, pp. 247-248; Waywell 1979, p. 302.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART086</td>
<td>Name: Late 3rd CE</td>
<td>Location: Alexopoulou property</td>
<td>Appendices References: Christou 1966, pp. 135-138, pls. 137-38b; Daux 1966, p. 796, fig. 6; Asemakpoulou-Atzaka 1973, pp. 248-249, pl. 28b; Waywell 1979, p. 302.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART087</td>
<td>Name: Late 3rd/early 4th CE</td>
<td>Location: Sinakidis property</td>
<td>Appendices References: Frothingham 1889, p. 379; Christou 1966, p. 138-141, pls. 138-40; Daux 1966, pp. 795-796, figs. 1-4; Asemakpoulou-Atzaka 1973, pp. 249-250, pl. 29b; Waywell 1979, p. 303.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sparta</td>
<td>ID Number: SPART088</td>
<td>Name: First half of the 3rd CE</td>
<td>Location: Site of sports ground</td>
<td>Appendices References: Nichols 1950, pp. 287-289, figs. 12, 14, 15, pl. 28; Waywell 1979, p. 303; Bonini 2006, p. 560, Sparta 3.</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Appendices References:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANAG001</td>
<td>TANAG001</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1km W of town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackman 2002, p. 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANAG003</td>
<td>TANAG003</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N of TANAG001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackman 2002, p. 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANAG004</td>
<td>TANAG004</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Outside of settlement area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitkey 2003, p. 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vounteni</td>
<td>VOUNT001</td>
<td>Complex B</td>
<td>C - ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 36; Whitley et al. 2007, pp. 264-267.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B: Achaean Houses with Evidence for Household Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Number of Potential Shrines:</th>
<th>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</th>
<th>Type of Evidence:</th>
<th>Figure Number(s):</th>
<th>Bibliography:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN007</td>
<td>H/ER - LR (destroyed in 267 CE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Niche in Room 8; another niche in Room 1</td>
<td>Two niches. The niche in Room 1 has a rectangular structure before it, possibly an altar.</td>
<td>322 - 326, 372</td>
<td>Shear 1940, pp. 272-273; Thompson 1949, p. 218; Thompson 1968, p. 69 and p. 71, fig. 12; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, p. 185, fig. 46; Frantz, Thompson, and Travlos 1988, p. 35; Baldini-Lippolis 2001, p. 156; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 39-41, p. 50, p. 51, p. 53, pp. 56-57, p. 61, p. 76, pl. 13c; App. 12; Bonini 2006, pp. 249-250, Atene 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN020</td>
<td>3rd - 4th CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Figurines found in house.</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 6; Zachariadou 2004, pp. 53-60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN021</td>
<td>3rd - 5th CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Two herms.</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Whitley 2005, p. 6; Zachariadou 2004, pp. 53-60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN025</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd CE with 4th CE finds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NW corner of courtyard</td>
<td>Niche.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frantz, Thompson, and Travlos 1988, p. 36; Papaioannou 2002, App. 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN034</td>
<td>5th/4th BCE - c. 2nd CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In courtyard to right of entrance into large reception space</td>
<td>Votive relief of Demeter and Kore.</td>
<td>344 - 345</td>
<td>Vanderpool 1960, p. 268, plan 1; Travlos 1971, p. 289 and p. 292, fig. 380; Papaioannou 2002, p. 39 and pp. 86-87, pl. 5a, 13a, App. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN047</td>
<td>2nd - 3rd CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room 6, under the floor</td>
<td>Votive deposit under Room 6 of burnt animal bones and a single 2nd CE lamp.</td>
<td>346, 349 - 350</td>
<td>Eleutheratou 2008, pp. 189-190.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN055</td>
<td>2nd - 3rd CE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rooms 5 and 7</td>
<td>Hearth in Room 5; Fragment of statue of Artemis of Ephesus and a large square structure with fresco painting on its two exposed sides in Room 7, possibly an altar.</td>
<td>346, 359 - 363</td>
<td>Eleutheratou 2008, pp. 193-194.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN059</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Three shrines: S of courtyard; two rooms to W of courtyard; under courtyard floor</td>
<td>Four room suite which may be a sacellum to Cybele; a marble relief of enthroned Cybele from reception space off of courtyard to west; a terracotta figurine of Cybele with Kore from a previous phase of room further W; votive deposit of burnt animal bones and two complete lamps in a brick-lined pit under courtyard.</td>
<td>364 - 366</td>
<td>Bouyia 2008, pp. 207-229.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN066</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In apsidal room</td>
<td>Small statues and reliefs of Cybele, Asklepios, Hygieia, and possibly Eros in apsidal room with niches</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Zachariadou 2000d, pp. 190-207; Bouyia 2008, pp. 220-221.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN001</td>
<td>Room A9 has hearth; Room B13 has hearth; Room B14 has foundation deposit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room A9</td>
<td>Nine statuettes dated from the 1st to 4th CE were found in Room A9 along with wall painting suggestive of a sacellum; statuettes depict Artemis (2), Roma, Europa, Pan, Herakles, Dionysus, and Asklepios (2).</td>
<td>135 - 137</td>
<td>Blackman 1997, pp. 22-24; Blackman 1999, pp. 21-22; Sanders 1999, pp. 443-444, fig. 2; Blackman 2000, p. 24; Blackman 2001, pp. 17 and fig. 30; Papaioannou 2002, p. 105, pp. 111-112, p. 125, p. 129, p. 134, pp. 139-140, p. 144, p. 145, p. 148, p. 153, pl. 37-a-c, App. 49; Whitley 2003, p. 19; Burkhalter and Touchais 2003, pp. 24-34; Sanders 2005, pp. 259-269; Whitley et al. 2006, p. 21, fig. 36; Bonini 2006, pp. 322-323, Corinto 7; Stirling 2008, pp. 89-161.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN002</td>
<td>Second half of 1st BCE - 3rd CE</td>
<td>Room A9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hearth; votive deposit of a lamp, coin, and a tortoise.</td>
<td>138 - 139</td>
<td>Corinth Excavation Notebook 929; Sanders 1999; Blackman, 2002, pp. 17-18; Herbst and Lepinski forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN005</td>
<td>1st CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Terracotta figurine and statuette fragments found.</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Corinth Excavation Notebooks 137, 244, 245, and 257; Robinson 1965, pp. 78-79; Robinson 1966, p. 100, pl. 105a; Anderson 1967, pp. 1-12, fig. 1, pls. 1-6; Robinson 1968, pp. 134-136; Papaioannou 2002, p. 104, pl. 112, p. 144, pl. 32a and 38a, App. 46; Bonini 2006, p. 317, Corinto 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN006</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sacellum</td>
<td>A poros stone altar with figurines and 12 terracotta masks found in one room.</td>
<td>TAPA 1997, p. 70; Blackman 1999, p. 21; Papaioannou 2002, p. 105, App. 48.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN014</td>
<td>1st BCE, 1st CE-4th CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mold-made head (Eros?) and a mask from deposits in cellar.</td>
<td>165 - 166</td>
<td>de Grazia and Williams 1977, pp. 58-62; Shne 1986; Bonini 2006, p. 316, Corinto 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House</td>
<td>Type of Evidence</td>
<td>Figure Number(s)</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS001</td>
<td>2nd CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middle room of S terrace</td>
<td>Terracotta altar and libation trough</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Philios 1889, pp. 77-82, pls. 4-6; Kourouniotes 1938, pp. 4-14; Mylonas 1961, pp. 172-173, fig. 4, L1; Papaiouannou 2002, p. 73 n. 224, pl. 23a, App. 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA028</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Courtyard?</td>
<td>Structure next to well could be an altar; votive plaque found in fill elsewhere in house.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1983c, p. 106, pl. 60g; Catling 1984, p. 31; Papaioannou 2002, App. 72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA057</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Room X7</td>
<td>Possible table altar carved from marble found with three headless female terracottas, a grotesque, a cupid and a foot lamp; from elsewhere in house a marble satyr head from a herm found.</td>
<td>227 - 239</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984a, pp. 68, figs. 1-2, pls. 52-4d; Papaioannou 2002, p. 180, p. 196, pl. 71a, App. 100; Bonini 2006, p. 474, Patrasso 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA060</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Small scale sculpture found in atrium, possibly an altar.</td>
<td>242 - 247</td>
<td>Petsas 1974, pp. 149-155, figs. 1-2, pls. 127-131, 140d; Papaioannou 2002, p. 180, pl. 64d, App. 103; Bonini 2006, pp. 496-497, Patrasso 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA062</td>
<td>ER - 1st half of 1st CE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Possible altar found with dedicatory base dated based on pottery to the 1st CE under the later peristyle atrium; a hearth.</td>
<td>248 - 249</td>
<td>Dekoulakou 1983a, pp. 100-102, fig. 1; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 181-182, pp. 195-196, pl. 65d, App. 104; Bonini 2006, pp. 484-485, Patrasso 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA078</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Room X1</td>
<td>Mosaic depicting offerings on an altar, a knife, cock, goose and garlands and may be revealing practices of domestic worship.</td>
<td>261 - 262</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984e, p. 76, fig. 6, pl. 57d and 58a; Papaioannou 2002, p. 196, p. 217, pl. 76b, App. 122; Bonini 2006, pp. 478-479, Patrasso 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA082</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Corridor behind reception space</td>
<td>Painted niche with associated wall painting of enthroned figure; fragments of a circular hearth elsewhere in house.</td>
<td>267 - 270</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984f, pp. 77-80, fig. 8; Papapostolou 1985h, p. 86; Kotsaki 1995, p. 127, pl. 82b; Papaioannou 2002, p. 197, p. 209, pl. 73a and c, App. 127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA110</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two niches: courtyard; kitchen</td>
<td>Semicircular wall niches, one associated with cooking.</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Panagiotopoulou, Platonos, and Matsas 1987c, pp. 144-147, fig. 11, pl. 43a; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 180, n. 94, p. 197 n. 176, App. 154c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA119</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>Two hearths.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1979e, pp. 358-360.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA129</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Phiale found in atrium tank.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Papapostolou 1984e, p. 76, fig. 6, pl. 57d and 58a; Bonini 2006, p. 478, Patrasso 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE001</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Figurines of Cybele found associated with the house.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whitley 2004, p. 7; Grigoropoulos 2005, p. 96, Table 1, no. 10; Axioti 2009, pp. 489-495.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE002</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Room 32</td>
<td>Room with painted walls and a statuette of enthroned Cybele.</td>
<td>374 - 378</td>
<td>Steinhauer 1988a, pp. 41-44; Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 107-120, Table 1, no. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines:</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House:</td>
<td>Type of Evidence:</td>
<td>Figure Number(s):</td>
<td>Bibliography:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE003</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Stone altar found.</td>
<td>379 - 382</td>
<td>Steinhauer 1988a, pp. 41-44; Grigoropoulos 2005, pp. 107-120, Table 1, no. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE004</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Marble statuette of Cybele.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Petritaki 2002c, p. 74; Grigoropoulos 2005, Table 1, no. 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPART015</td>
<td>LH - EByzantine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Marble female torso.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Themos 2004a, pp. 159-161; Whitkey 2005, p. 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPART030</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Small marble relief plaque which may have decorated an altar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spyropoulos 1988i, pp. 142-143; Catling 1989, p. 36; Papaioannou 2002, p. 242, pp. 243-244, p. 268, p. 269, pl. 86d, App. 162.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPART038</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Potable terracotta altars.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Themos 1999, pp. 177-178, fig. 5, pl. 60 a-b; Themos 2000b, pp. 130-133, fig. 7; Papaioannou 2002, p. 269, App. 170.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number of Potential Shrines</td>
<td>Location of Shrine(s) in House</td>
<td>Type of Evidence</td>
<td>Figure Number(s)</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPART044</td>
<td>Late 2nd or early 3rd CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Terracotta plaques which may have decorated an altar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steinhauer 1979a, pp. 283-285, fig. 1, pl. 183; Zabbbou 1999c, p. 176; Papaioannou 2002, pp. 247-248, pp. 261-262, p. 268, pl. 88c, App. 176; Bonini 2006, p. 563, Sparta 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Flooring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Marble/Tile Floor</th>
<th>Mosaic</th>
<th>Dirt</th>
<th>Plaster/Mortar Floor</th>
<th>Pebble Floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN002</td>
<td>Courtyard: marble chip floor; Alcove and small room to E: tile chip floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN003</td>
<td>Courtyard: marble chipped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN004</td>
<td>Courtyard: marble paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN005</td>
<td>Triclinium: polychrome geometric and figural mosaic pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN006</td>
<td>Classical mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN007</td>
<td>Room 8: marble chip</td>
<td>Most rooms dirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN008</td>
<td>Courtyard: marble-chipped floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN010</td>
<td>Room in E: mosaic with emblemata depicting a rosette flanked on the left by an urn and on the right by two doves with a wave pattern border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN011</td>
<td>Two rooms have white marble chip mosaic floors with simple geometric patterns in dark blue stone</td>
<td>One room has bedding for mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN013</td>
<td>Dated 2nd century CE, of parrots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN018</td>
<td>Courtyard: stone-paved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN023</td>
<td>Triclinium: mosaic of a star and diamond pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN024</td>
<td>Black, white and red tessellated mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN025</td>
<td>Courtyard: paved square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN026</td>
<td>Floors mostly clay</td>
<td>Middle of the central W unit: bedding for a possible cement floor</td>
<td>Courtyard cobbled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN027</td>
<td>Floors mostly clay</td>
<td>Middle of central W unit: bedding for a possible cement floor</td>
<td>Courtyard cobbled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN029</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floors mostly clay</td>
<td>Central W unit: bedding for a possible cement floor</td>
<td>Courtyard cobbled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floors mostly clay</td>
<td>Central W unit: bedding for a possible cement floor</td>
<td>Courtyard cobbled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN031</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floors mostly clay</td>
<td>Central W unit: bedding for a possible cement floor</td>
<td>Courtyard cobbled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN032</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floors mostly clay</td>
<td>Central W unit: bedding for a possible cement floor</td>
<td>Courtyard cobbled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN036</td>
<td>White tessellated mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN037</td>
<td>White tessellated mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN039</td>
<td>Mosaic pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN040</td>
<td>Mosaic floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN041</td>
<td>Tessellated mosaic of cubes in perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN044</td>
<td>In three rooms and corridor: Mosaics are late 4th CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central room: hard floor of pebbles and cement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN046</td>
<td>Courtyard: marble mosaics; Room 11: series of mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN047</td>
<td>Courtyard, Room 3, Room 6: marble mosaic floors</td>
<td>Rooms 4, 5, 6, and 7: paved with clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN048</td>
<td>Courtyard: marble mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN055</td>
<td>Possible courtyard: fragments of a mosaic floor; Room 4: mosaic floor</td>
<td>Room 7: dirt floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN056</td>
<td>Triclinium: mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN059</td>
<td>Marble chips in dirt; opus spicatum floor</td>
<td>Dirt floors; bedrock floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN063</td>
<td>One room: white mosaic floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN001</td>
<td>A8: slab floor</td>
<td>A3 and A2: mosaic</td>
<td>Several dirt floors</td>
<td>Lime floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN003</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic with dolphins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN005</td>
<td>Peristyle: marble slabs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN007</td>
<td>Room 7: polychrome geometric and figural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN009</td>
<td>Five rooms: polychrome figural and geometric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN011</td>
<td>4th BCE mosaic</td>
<td>Floors of clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN012</td>
<td>Two polychrome figural and geometric, one polychrome geometric with rosette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN013</td>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN014</td>
<td>Basement: dirt floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESYL001</td>
<td>Mosaic of charioteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS003</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic pavements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS004</td>
<td>Mosaic pavements in open areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS006</td>
<td>Tile floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two rooms: cobblestone floors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENCH001</td>
<td>Marble slabs in sunken part of peristyle</td>
<td>Large room and perisyle: mosaics; Rooms to east: plain white mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENCH002</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENCH003</td>
<td>Mosaic floor: stone and glass tesserae, is a series of geometric pattern bands around an emblema of a wreathed Silenus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KORON001</td>
<td>Mosaic of Dionysos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUKO001</td>
<td>Mosaics in many rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE001</td>
<td>Room 4: tile floor; Rooms 11 and 12: opus sectile</td>
<td>Two rooms: preserved mosaic floors, one mosaic depicts Dionysus and Ariadne as well as the villa owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE002</td>
<td>Library: opus sectile floor</td>
<td>Antichamber to library: polychrome geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA001</td>
<td>Terracotta and broken brick in mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA003</td>
<td>Black and white geometric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA007</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA008</td>
<td>Two black and white geometric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA010</td>
<td>Opus spicatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenistic pebble floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA013</td>
<td>Black, white and red geometric and vegetal mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA021</td>
<td>Terracotta tile floor</td>
<td>Mosaic of three Graces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA023</td>
<td>Black and white geometric with white marble slabs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA024</td>
<td>Mosaic of large white tesserae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA025</td>
<td>Stone and brick</td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td>Pebble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA026</td>
<td>Stone and brick floor, stone and tile floor</td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td>Pebble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA028</td>
<td>Terracotta tile floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA029</td>
<td>Terracotta tile floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA031</td>
<td>Mosaics: one of birds with geometric border, one of fish, one octagonal polychrome with Three Graces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA033</td>
<td>Mosaics: two are geometric, one is polychrome geometric</td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble and tile floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA036</td>
<td>Opus spicatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA037</td>
<td>One marble slab floor; one herring bone brick floor; one stone slab floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038</td>
<td>Terracotta tile floor</td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA039</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA040</td>
<td>Terracotta tile floor</td>
<td>One cement floor; one mortar floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA041</td>
<td>One hunt mosaic, one geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA043</td>
<td>Stone and brick flooring</td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA044</td>
<td>Black and white figural and marine mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA045</td>
<td>Opus signinum floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA046</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA049</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA050</td>
<td>Black and white mosaics of Helios and geometric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA051</td>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA052</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA053</td>
<td>Marble slab floor</td>
<td>Two black, white, and red geometric mosaics; mosaic, one with kantharos and vines, one geometric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA054</td>
<td>Opus sectile</td>
<td>Mosaic with hive and geometric, mosaic with fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA055</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black and white geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortar floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA058</td>
<td></td>
<td>One geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA059</td>
<td>Polychrome vegetal mosaic, polychrome geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA060</td>
<td></td>
<td>One geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA062</td>
<td>Stone floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA063</td>
<td>Gray and white marble floor</td>
<td>Nilotic mosaic; hunt mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA064</td>
<td>Marble floor</td>
<td>Opus sectile surrounded by black and white tesserae bands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA065</td>
<td>Mosaic alternating with opus sectile</td>
<td>Two geometric mosaics, one vegetal mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA066</td>
<td>Mosaics; Rooms 21-23: black and white geometric with vegetal frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA067</td>
<td>Figural mosaic with geometric frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA070</td>
<td>One polychrome mosaic with cultic theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA073</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic with tondo of male figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA075</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic with cultic border; white mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA077</td>
<td>Black, white, and red geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA078</td>
<td>Polychrome sacred scene mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA079</td>
<td>Terracotta floor; white marble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA081</td>
<td>Polychrome geometric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA082</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td>Polychrome half geometric, half chains and birds mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pressed mortar floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA083</td>
<td>Marble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA084</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td>Two mosaics, one with figural, geometric, and vegetal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA086</td>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA087</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA088</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td>Polychrome geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA091</td>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA094</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA095</td>
<td>Black and white mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA096</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geometric mosaic with spirals; geometric framing Caldonian boar hunt mosaic</td>
<td>One dirt floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA097</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black and white vegetal mosaic, gladiatorial mosaic</td>
<td>One dirt floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA098</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA100</td>
<td>Marble slabs and mosaic pieces together</td>
<td>Mosaic of three Graces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA101</td>
<td></td>
<td>One figural mosaic; one geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA103</td>
<td>Marble floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA104</td>
<td>Opus figlinum floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA106</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black and white mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA108</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster, mortar, ceramic fragments, brick fragments, and rubble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA113</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortar floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA114</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geometric mosaic fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA115</td>
<td>Marble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster floor later added</td>
<td>Gravel floor later added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA116</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA119</td>
<td>Marble slabs and terracotta tiles together</td>
<td>Later mosaic floors, one geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA120</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black and white mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA125</td>
<td>Room 1: terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA126</td>
<td>Terracotta floor, limestone floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA127</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA128</td>
<td>Marble floor</td>
<td>Black and white mosaic with marble slabs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone or terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA133</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Plaster/Mortar Floor</td>
<td>Pebble Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA139</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Vegetable and geometric mosaics, one of Aphrodite with mirror</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA141</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Bichrome geometric with ivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA143</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Room 1: brick paved floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA145</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>White mosaic with irregular stone slabs, Geometric mosaic, white mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA146</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Polychrome mosaic with birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA150</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA152</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Terracotta floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA154</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Geometric mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA156</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE001</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Courtyard: pebble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE002</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Possibly beaten earth floors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE003</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Possibly beaten earth floors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE005</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Atrium, north hall: Pebble floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE006</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE007</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE008</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Tile floor to SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE009</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Bedrock floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE010</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Bedrock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Courtyard: tiles set on edge; three rooms: cobble floors, Remaining rooms dirt floors</td>
<td></td>
<td>One room: pebble and mortar floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP002</td>
<td>Marble/Tile Floor</td>
<td>Cobble floor remains</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pebble floor remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D: Walls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Wall Construction</th>
<th>Wall Revetment</th>
<th>Wall Painting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN001</td>
<td>Some walls cut into hillside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN002</td>
<td>Walls of rubble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN003</td>
<td>Cut into hillside</td>
<td></td>
<td>SE room: large rectangular panels separated by floral ornament in red and green, placed over dado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paneled wall decoration in white with purple, red, yellow, black, and green borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN007</td>
<td>Cut into hillside</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traces of refined wall painting in several rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN013</td>
<td>Limestone orthostates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall paneling and marble antae embellishing the doorway to W room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN017</td>
<td>Opus incertum foundation with stone block stylobate and mud brick superstructure up to 8 courses and 1 string course</td>
<td>Marble veneers</td>
<td>Painting imitating marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N wall: wall painting of the lower part of a lamp stand resting on a red band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments of the painted plaster decoration found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN026</td>
<td>Built of sundried brick and stone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN027</td>
<td>Built of sundried brick and stone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall decorations preserved in the two rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN029</td>
<td>Built of sundried brick and stone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN030</td>
<td>Built of sundried brick and stone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN031</td>
<td>Built of sundried brick and stone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN032</td>
<td>Built of sundried brick and stone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Wall Construction</td>
<td>Wall Revetment</td>
<td>Wall Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall paintings with linear designs and in Pompeian first style imitating marble; late Roman wall paintings dated to 3rd CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall paintings with linear designs and in Pompeian first style imitating marble; late Roman wall paintings dated to 3rd CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN040</td>
<td>Hymettian marble, rubble, and tile construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Painted stucco with red and black vertical lines over yellow ground, in panels was a duck and an Attic column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 10: fresco fragments included floral and linear motifs as well as a face of a youthful figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vestibule: wall fresco of imitation marble revetments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painted plaster fragments: black rectangles and red splatter in one room; red, brown, and gold in another room; shrine suite: white plaster with yellow and red lilies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN063</td>
<td>Rubble, stone, tile, and lime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN001</td>
<td>Limestone blocks with mudbrick superstructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rooms A5, A7, A9 and A12: frescoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN002</td>
<td>Field stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments of fresco to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN005</td>
<td>Four courses of large limestone blocks for foundations set in trenches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN009</td>
<td>Field stone with marble socles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of masonry style painted plaster in rooms with mosaics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN010</td>
<td>Constructed of various stones with mudbrick superstructure, except the shared facade which used opus quadratum foundation and opus reticulatum of rubble, tile and cement for the lower walls with mudbrick for upper floors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pompeian 3rd style fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN011</td>
<td>Mud brick superstructure</td>
<td>Marble veneers</td>
<td>One room: decorated with frescos of white ground with black and red vertical and horizontal bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Wall Construction</td>
<td>Wall Revetment</td>
<td>Wall Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN012</td>
<td>Poros blocks, small stones, and tiles all with mortar</td>
<td>Central room: marble revetment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN014</td>
<td>Poros blocks with small blocks and bricks in the spaces between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble revetments</td>
<td>Paneled wall painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble revetments</td>
<td>Wall paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS006</td>
<td>Grey stone walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENCH001</td>
<td>Brick and mortar</td>
<td>Rooms to east: cement remains</td>
<td>Fragments of painted plaster, some with small scale human figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENCH002</td>
<td>Brick masonry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE001</td>
<td>Local stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE004</td>
<td>Walls built of reused stone and mud, with some tile and ceramic fragments filling in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA003</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum, opus testaceum, or irregular zones of stones and bricks</td>
<td>Thin mortar on walls, no paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA009</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum, rows of stone, brick and ceramic</td>
<td>Geometric design revetments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA012</td>
<td>Stone and brick; brick and mud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA014</td>
<td>Rough-hewn stone and yellow mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA016</td>
<td>Vaults of brick, walls of large stones and gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA018</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA019</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA021</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA022</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA025</td>
<td>Rough-hewn blocks and square bricks, later brick work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA026</td>
<td>Rough-hewn blocks and square bricks, later brick work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA027</td>
<td>Large rough-hewn limestone blocks, ceramics and rubble in mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA028</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Wall Construction</td>
<td>Wall Revetment</td>
<td>Wall Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA030</td>
<td>Weathered stone walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA031</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations, opus testaceum, opus mixtum, opus reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA033</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations; opus testaceum apse; opus mixtum and opus quasi reticulatum walls</td>
<td>Remains of glass and ivory wall decoration set in mortar</td>
<td>Room 9: wall painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA034</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA035</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum, successive rows of stones and ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA037</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue and white alternating panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038</td>
<td>Opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA040</td>
<td>Large stone block façade, rubble foundations, stone and ceramic or opus quasi reticulatum superstructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA042</td>
<td>Brick walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA043</td>
<td>Rough hewn blocks and square bricks, later brick work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA044</td>
<td>Stone and mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA046</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA048</td>
<td>Brick work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA051</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red and black painting fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA052</td>
<td>Opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster, no paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA053</td>
<td>Opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural style wall painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA055</td>
<td>Rubble and cement alternating with brick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA058</td>
<td>Concrete and opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA060</td>
<td>Reused stone H walls</td>
<td>Marble revetments</td>
<td>Wall painting fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA062</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA067</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA069</td>
<td>Rubble periboloi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Wall Construction</td>
<td>Wall Revetment</td>
<td>Wall Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA075</td>
<td>Plaster, no paint Wall revetment fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster, no paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA078</td>
<td>Brick construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA080</td>
<td>Opus testaceum, opus reticulatum, reused stone walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA081</td>
<td>Concrete and brick work</td>
<td>Marble wall revetments</td>
<td>Plaster, no paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall painting of enthroned figure and running animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA083</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble revetments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA088</td>
<td>Rubble and mortar foundations, opus testaceum superstructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA089</td>
<td>Opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA090</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA091</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum and opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA092</td>
<td>Opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA098</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum and opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA101</td>
<td>Brick work and earlier walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA102</td>
<td>Opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA103</td>
<td>Opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA106</td>
<td>Rubble and mortar, brick and yellow mortar; Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red paint on mortar fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA107</td>
<td>Rubble and clay, opus testaceum, opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA112</td>
<td>Stone walls</td>
<td>Marble revetment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA113</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA115</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble revetments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA116</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum or rubble, tile, and brick pieces in mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA117</td>
<td>Concrete, opus testaceum and opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA118</td>
<td>Rubble and mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Wall Construction</td>
<td>Wall Revetment</td>
<td>Wall Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA120</td>
<td>Reused building materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA121</td>
<td>Reused architectural fragments, bricks, stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA122</td>
<td>Filed stone, rubble, and mortar walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA123</td>
<td>Older walls: stone and brick; newer walls: rubble</td>
<td>Possible revetments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA125</td>
<td>Concrete and brick work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA126</td>
<td>Concrete with rows of rubble and tile</td>
<td>Plaster, no paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA127</td>
<td>Concrete with stone and brick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA128</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum and later brick and stone in rows</td>
<td>Painted plaster in oven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA129</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum, later opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA132</td>
<td>Opus testaceum or opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA133</td>
<td>Opus quasi reticulatum and testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA134</td>
<td>Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA139</td>
<td>Opus testaceum, opus reticulatum, Hellenistic foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA141</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall painting fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA143</td>
<td>Opus testaceum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA152</td>
<td>Opus testaceum and opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA155</td>
<td>Opus reticulatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA156</td>
<td>Opus testaceum, opus mixtum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE002</td>
<td>Local limestone socles</td>
<td>Room 32: wall painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE003</td>
<td>Local limestone socles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE004</td>
<td>Reused materials, mud brick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE005</td>
<td>Local limestone socle; later pebbles and mortar added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE008</td>
<td>Small stone, reused rubble, mud brick, and mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Wall Construction</td>
<td>Wall Revetment</td>
<td>Wall Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE009</td>
<td>Quarry remains used as walls; limestone blocks, small stones, mortar, and tiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE010</td>
<td>Carved stone and small stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE012</td>
<td>Poros blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>Rough-hewn stone foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP002</td>
<td>Ashlar block socle, mud brick superstructure</td>
<td>Painted and drafted plaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix E: Other Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Tank/Impluvium</th>
<th>Column(s)</th>
<th>Well(s)</th>
<th>Fountain</th>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Drainage/Supply Pipes</th>
<th>Other Embellishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Octagonal well in courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard U and Room 10 had columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornice and ceiling panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard: 8 columns around garden connected with balustrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apsidal water feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well in courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well in courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard: 4 columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apsidal room with cistern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain in courtyard</td>
<td>Courtyard surrounded by flower beds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN028</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-columnar courtyard; peristyle courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN033</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Four large seated statues of philosophers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of a balneum, a private bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain which connects with the city drain outside the house</td>
<td>Central room: basin or tub bedding were found near the S wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN046</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td>Room 5: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W of the corridor: latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN047</td>
<td>Ionic pillar base</td>
<td>Courtyard: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW side of Room 8: latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN048</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latrine; marble pather table leg from well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard: many cisterns and wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN051</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 3: a latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN053</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td>Courtyard: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 7: a latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN054</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 2: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN055</td>
<td>Possible courtyard: a well; Room 7: a cistern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain into street sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN057</td>
<td>Courtyard: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN059</td>
<td>Courtyard: tank, possible impluvium</td>
<td>Colonnaded courtyard, ionic bases</td>
<td>Courtyard: well and cistern</td>
<td>Courtyard: garden</td>
<td>Drain from cistern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN061</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bath complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN001</td>
<td>A2: impluvium</td>
<td>A1 and A10: Two possible peristyle courtyards</td>
<td>Two wells</td>
<td>Room A8: octagonal fountain</td>
<td>A10 and/or A16: garden</td>
<td>Room A10: channel around peristyle; Room A16: pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nymphæum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN005</td>
<td>Marble slab impluvium</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large threshold block for doorway to temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN006</td>
<td>Impluvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bath attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN007</td>
<td>Room 6: impluvium</td>
<td>Room 6: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe leads from outside house, through impluvium to well in Room 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN008</td>
<td>Tank, phase 2</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard, phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN009</td>
<td>Marble lined impluvium</td>
<td>Tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe in SE corner of atrium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balustrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South room: marble threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN014</td>
<td>Two wells in basement from early phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well of W wall in basement may have been a drain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main entrance: five block with threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEUS004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three cisterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIZI001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remains of a bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENCH001</td>
<td>Peristyle: Bluish marble columns</td>
<td>Niche in peristyle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rooms to E: tunnel under rooms and pipes in back of niche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KORON001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vault mosaic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGA001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble architectural fragments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUK0001</td>
<td>Stoaa halls with granite columns and Corinthian and Ionic capitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nymphaeum complex; small bath complex; much sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARAT001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canopus; much sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE001</td>
<td>Impluvium</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two open areas: wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE002</td>
<td>Impluvium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large marble sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 1: court with a clay pipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE004</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 4 is a service area with a sink and bathtub overlapping the heating system of the Hellenistic building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA001</td>
<td>Drains and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA003</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA004</td>
<td>Marble-lined brick tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drains and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA007</td>
<td>Tank with pipe and trough</td>
<td>One well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Hypocausts in one room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA008</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA010</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA012</td>
<td>Two tanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA021</td>
<td>Tank possible lined with broken plates</td>
<td>Ionic capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA023</td>
<td>Tank with brick lined with hydraulic mortar and semi-circle projections in corners</td>
<td>Limestone column bases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drains and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA024</td>
<td>Tank with terracotta slabs on E end and marble on W end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA025</td>
<td>Room 14a: terracotta lined well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA026</td>
<td>Room 8: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA027</td>
<td>Plaster lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA028</td>
<td>Two tanks lined, only mortar remains</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtyard: well with spout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA029</td>
<td>Brick lined tank</td>
<td>North side of tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA031</td>
<td>Square outside in brick, octagonal inside terracotta-lined</td>
<td>Courtyard: well with marble top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA032</td>
<td>Tank lined with hydraulic mortar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA033</td>
<td>Three tanks, one is marble-lined, one is polychrome marble-lined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Limestone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA034</td>
<td>Terracotta-lined tank</td>
<td>Room 11: well in tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA035</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA036</td>
<td>One half column in brick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA037</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td>Well with spout</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank with jets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA039</td>
<td>Marble lined tank, another built later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA040</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA041</td>
<td>Tank with unknown lining</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain in tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone threshold in situ; private bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA042</td>
<td>Tank lined with polychrome marble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA043</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA044</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypocausts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA046</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain</td>
<td>Hypocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA050</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA051</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA052</td>
<td>One plaster-lined tank, one terracotta-lined tank</td>
<td>A well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA053</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td>Two engaged columns</td>
<td>A well with marble head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drains and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA054</td>
<td>Polychrome marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA055</td>
<td>One marble-lined tank repaired w/ terracotta, one hydraulic plaster lined tank, one tile-lined tank</td>
<td>Distyle porch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA056</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td>Ionic columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA057</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Limestone threshold and reused steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA058</td>
<td>Concrete lined tank with hydraulic mortar</td>
<td>Tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td>Stone threshold and door jamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA059</td>
<td>Green marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Large sculpture decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA060</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tanks, one with four pillars</td>
<td>Peristyle with parapets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Marble threshold, marble lined lustral basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA061</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tanks</td>
<td>Atrium: columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Marble sima spout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA062</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tanks, a 3rd marble-lined elliptical tank</td>
<td>Limestone tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble-lined fountain and stepped</td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA063</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tank</td>
<td>Tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td>One limestone lined well, one terracotta well</td>
<td>Marble-lined fountain and stepped</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone threshold; marble tub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA064</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td>Brick built columns in atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain in tank</td>
<td>Possibly with tank and fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low parapet around tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA065</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tanks; one octagonal tank; two square tanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Stone thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA066</td>
<td>Partial tank; later a marble lined octagonal tank; one in 21-23 was marble lined</td>
<td>Tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA068</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible peristyle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden courtyard</td>
<td>Stone thresholds, triclinium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA069</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank with terracotta floor</td>
<td>Peristyle garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible fountain</td>
<td>Peristyle garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA070</td>
<td>Three semi-circular tank</td>
<td>Peristyle garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peristyle garden</td>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA071</td>
<td>Semi-circular tanks lined with marble for players</td>
<td>Possible peristyle garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible peristyle garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA072</td>
<td>Square tank with semi-circular projections, floor of tile, sides and rim of marble</td>
<td>Brick peristyle garden</td>
<td>A well</td>
<td>Peristyle garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA073</td>
<td>Brick tank lined with hydraulic plaster</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>Tank converted to garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA075</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 2: a well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible niche fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td>Vaulted room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td>Private bath, limestone threshold and door jambs, latrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypocaust bath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypocaust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA092</td>
<td>Room 3: opus spicatum tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA094</td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA096</td>
<td>Niches maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for nymphaeum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA097</td>
<td>Two marble-lined tanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marble-lined tank with jets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA098</td>
<td>Hydraulic mortar lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA099</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA101</td>
<td>Stone threshold in situ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA104</td>
<td>Terracotta tile lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA106</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA107</td>
<td>Hexagonal tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA108</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone thresholds, steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments of architectural members and sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wide marble steps; marble thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA111</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank, gamma shaped on inside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA113</td>
<td>One marble-lined tank, one older tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA116</td>
<td>Large, marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone thresholds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA118</td>
<td>Marble-line tank with repairs in terracotta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA120</td>
<td>Two tanks, older one lined</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA124</td>
<td>Room 2: Corinthian columns</td>
<td>Stone well; another well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble architectural elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone threshold and door jamb; latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA129</td>
<td>Tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA131</td>
<td>Rubble tank with mortar lining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA132</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td>A well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA139</td>
<td>One marble-lined tank; second tank found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA140</td>
<td>Two consecutive tanks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain and supply pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA146</td>
<td>Tank; later two tanks added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypocausts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA148</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tank has jet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA150</td>
<td>Marble-lined tank</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>A well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Tank/Impluvium</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
<td>Well(s)</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Drainage/Supply Pipes</td>
<td>Other Embellishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA153</td>
<td>Square tank with semi-circular projections, floor of tile, sides and rim of marble</td>
<td>Brick tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE001</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td>At least eight wells and cisterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE002</td>
<td>Marble-line tank</td>
<td>Tetrastyle atrium</td>
<td>Two cisterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE003</td>
<td>Large tank paved with sea pebbles in pink mortar</td>
<td>Limestone tetrastyle courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain under Rooms 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two cisterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drain pipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE005</td>
<td>Distyle porch; colonnaded courtyard</td>
<td>Courtyard: one cistern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE008</td>
<td>Circular tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRAE012</td>
<td>Courtyard: impluvium</td>
<td>Peristyle courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stone threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTAM001</td>
<td>fluted columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>Possibly a threshold block to support columns</td>
<td>One well with stone well head</td>
<td>Possible garden to south</td>
<td>Courtyard floor slopes S to drain room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thresholds preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP002</td>
<td>Courtyard: one well</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andron: drain</td>
<td>Andron identified by raised floor border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Map of Greek Provinces under the Roman Empire
Alcock 1993, p. 15, fig. 3.
Figure 2: Examples of syntax analysis from Hillier and Hanson 1984 p. 150, fig. 93.

Figure 3: Examples of syntax analysis from Hillier and Hanson 1984 p. 151, fig. 94.
In figure “a”, rooms 7 and 8 have the most intimate in the building as they have a depth value of 3, an RA of 0.500 and are only accessible through one entrance. The rooms with a depth value of 2 in this figure also have a high level of privacy because they can only be accessed through one room, room 1, which controls the access to all the rest of the rooms of the structure. Their RA values are 0.321 and 0.250 showing a significant level of relative asymmetry. In figure “b”, the most private space would be room 8 with a depth value of 4 and an RA of 0.321; however, there is less privacy overall in the structure compared to figure “a” because most of the rooms have multiple entrances or points of access, making it easier to permeate into the deeper rooms. In fact, despite Room 8’s depth, its RA is lower than four other rooms in the structure indicating that it is not the most restricted. The most private rooms of figure “c” are 6, 7 and 8 with a depth value of 2 and an RA of 0.250, 0.285 and 0.285 respectively, but again all of the rooms are interconnected with multiple access points to each. This indicates that if there was privacy in any of them it did not come from permanent or physical barriers. Figure “d” has the highest level of privacy with room 8 which has a depth value of 6 and an RA of 0.571. This depth value and RA are a result of the singular means to penetrate the structure one room at a time.
Figure 5: Plan of East House on the Northeast slope of Areopagus
Shear 1973a, fig. 4.

Figure 6: Plan of East House on the Northeast slope of Areopagus
The room numbers have been assigned by the author, not the excavators.

Room 1: courtyard

Plan based on Shear 1973a, fig. 4.
### Figure 7: Spatial analysis chart for East House on the Northeast slope of Areopagus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 8: Justified access map for East House on the Northeast slope of Areopagus
Figure 9: Visibility diagram from main entrance for East House on the Northeast slope of Areopagus

Figure 10: Visibility diagram from courtyard for East House on the Northeast slope of Areopagus

Since the nature of the rooms around the courtyard is not understood, I selected the larger room near the entrance and the largest room of the house as potential reception spaces.
Figure 11: Plan of House of Many Colors

Rooms a-b: main workroom with light well  
Rooms d-f: andron and antechamber  
Room e: pastas  
Room i: courtyard  
Room j: exedra  
Room k: kitchen  
Room g: bath

Cahill 2002, fig. 17.
Figure 12: Plan of House of Many Colors
Based on Cahill 2002, fig. 17.

Figure 13: Justified access map of the House of Many Colors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>4.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.385</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.252</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.912</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Spatial analysis chart for House of Many Colors
Figure 15: Visibility diagram from the main entrance of the House of Many Colors

Figure 16: Visibility diagram from the reception space of the House of Many Colors
Figure 17: Remains of the permanent altar from the courtyard, House of Many Colors. Robinson 1946, pl. 173, no. 1.

Figure 18: Reconstructions of portable stuccoed marble altars from room 6, House of Many Colors. Robinson 1946, pl. 172, no. 2 and 3.

Figure 19: Drawing of one of the portable stuccoed marble altars from room 6, House of Many Colors. Robinson 1946, pl. 170.
Figure 20: Plan of House of the Snakes

Room 7: corridor
Room 8: kitchen
Rooms 5-6: storage
Rooms 9 and 4: courtyard
Rooms 1-3: reception spaces

Haagsma 2003, fig. 2.25.
Figure 21: Plan of the House of the Snakes
Based on Haagsma 2003, fig. 2.25.

Figure 22: Justified access map for House of the Snakes
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.378</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Spatial analysis chart for House of the Snakes
Figure 24: Visibility diagram from the entrance for House of the Snakes

Figure 25: Visibility diagram from the courtyard for House of the Snakes
Figure 26: Hearth and buried jar from the House of the Snakes
Haagsma 2003, fig. 2.23.

Figure 27: Buried jar from the House of the Snakes
Haagsma 2003, fig. 2.24.
Figure 28: Plan of House E

s: stairs
Rooms 19 and 20: courtyard
Room 16: kitchen
Room 17: bath
Rooms 11-13: shop?

Ault 2005, fig. 19.
Figure 29: Plan of House E  
Based on Ault 2005, fig. 19.

Figure 30: Justified access map of House E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>3.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairs</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.692</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.887</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31: Spatial analysis chart for House E
Since the nature of the rooms do not indicate any reception spaces, the courtyard is the only room known which likely had visitors.
Figure 34: Inscribed blocks from room 24, House E
Ault 2005, pl. 69.
Figure 35: Justified access maps for all four Greek houses
A: East House on the NE slope of Areopagus, Athens
B: House of Many Colors, Olynthos
C: House of the Snakes, Halos
D: House E, Halieis
Figure 36: Three houses from the residential district on the Viminal Hill
Figure 37: Plan of the House of the Skeleton

Room 18: storage
Rooms 11 and 14: dining area
Room 21: kitchen and bath
Room 20: secondary food preparation space

Bruno and Scott 1993, fig. 32.
Figure 38: Justified access map of the House of the Skeleton
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.059</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>1.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.471</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairs</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>7.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.732</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 39: Spatial analysis chart for the House of the Skeleton
Figure 40: Visibility diagram from the main entrance for the House of the Skeleton
Figure 41: Visibility diagram from two reception spaces for the House of the Skeleton
Figure 42: Plan for Casa del Sacello di Legno, V.31

Room 1: service and storage
Room 2: cubiculum with aedicula
Room 3: reception space
Room 5: reception space ?
Room 6: corridor and light well
Room 10: atrium
Room 11: corridor
Room 12: storage

Van Binnebeke 1993, Figure LV, 1.
Figure 43: Plan for Casa del Sacello di Legno, V.31
Based on Van Binnebeke 1993, Figure LV, 1.

Figure 44: Justified access map for Casa del Sacello di Legno
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.643</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>6.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 45: Spatial analysis chart for Casa del Sacello di Legno
Figure 46: Visibility diagram from main entrance for Casa del Sacello di Legno
Figure 47: Visibility diagram from reception spaces for Casa del Sacello di Legno
Figure 48: Lararium from Casa del Sacello di Legno
Mols 1999, fig. 142.

Figure 49: Reconstruction of lararium from Casa del Sacello di Legno
Mols 1999, figs. 145 a and b.
Figure 50: Plan of the Casa delle Pareti rosse
Figure 51: Plan of the Casa delle Pareti rosse (VIII, 5, 37)

Room 1: atrium
Room a: kitchen
Room e: reception space. There seems to have been a large window at the back of Room e which is not represented on this plan.
Room q: garden
Rooms p and r: dining spaces
Rooms c, b, i, k: cubicula


Figure 52: Justified access map for Casa delle Pareti rosse
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>7.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>1.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>3.444</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>1.358</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.719</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 53: Spatial analysis chart for Casa delle Pareti rosse
Figure 54: Visibility diagram from the main entrance for Casa delle Pareti rosse

Figure 55: Visibility diagram from reception spaces for Casa delle Pareti rosse
Figure 56 (Above): Lararium from Casa delle Pareti rosse
Boyce 1937, plate 31, no. 2.

Figure 57 (Below): Closer photo of lararium from Casa delle Pareti rosse
Boyce 1937, plate 31, no. 1.
Figure 58: Plan of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (VI, 16, 7)

Room A: main entrance
Room B: atrium
Room C: cubiculum
Room D: cubiculum and storage
Room E: reception space
Room F: peristyle garden
Room G: dining and utilitarian space
Rooms 01 and S: stairwells
Room 03: storage cupboard
Rooms I, J, M, N, R, Q: cubicula (mixed utilitarian, living, and storage space)
Rooms K and X: latrine
Room L: storage
Rooms O: main dining space
Room P: garden and storage space
Room U: secondary entrance
Room V: kitchen with stairwell

Figure 59: Justified access map for Casa degli Amorini Dorati
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>3.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>11.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.577</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 60: Spatial analysis chart for Casa degli Amorini Dorati
Figure 61: Visibility diagram from main entrance for Casa degli Amorini Dorati

Figure 62: Visibility diagram from main reception spaces for Casa degli Amorini Dorati
Figure 63: View of *lararium* in Casa degli Amorini Dorati
Boyce 1937, pl. 38.2.

Figure 64: View of *sacellum* in Casa degli Amorini Dorati
Allison 2004, p. 145, fig. 6.6.
Figure 65: Plan of Domus della Fortuna Annonaria

Rooms 5, 6, 7: service area
Room 8: furnace room
Room 9: dining room
Rooms 10 and 15: reception spaces
Room 14: courtyard
Room 16: latrine

Boersma 1985, fig. 51.

Figure 66: Plan of Domus della Fortuna Annonaria in 2nd century CE
Based on Boersma 1985, fig. 51.
Figure 67: Justified access map for Domus della Fortuna Annonaria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.579</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>1.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.211</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1.587</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.263</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.737</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>1.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.684</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.684</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>3.263</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.876</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 68: Spatial analysis chart for Domus della Fortuna Annonaria
Figure 69: Visibility diagram from entrance for Domus della Fortuna Annonaria

Figure 70: Visibility diagram from courtyard for Domus della Fortuna Annonaria
Figure 71: Lararium in Domus della Fortuna Annonaria
Bakker 1994, plate 12.
Figure 72: Justified access maps for all four examples
A: The House of the Skeleton, Cosa
B: The Casa del Sacello di Legno, Herculaneum
C: The Casa delle Pareti rosse, Pompeii
D: The Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii
E: The Domus della Fortuna Annonaria, Ostia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site of Sample House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculaneum</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa delle Pareti rosse, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 73: Chart of averages from the eight sample houses
Figure 74: Plan of Delos
Figure 75: Plan of Maison de Dionysos, Scale 1:200

Room a: vestibule
Room c: courtyard
Room e: shop
Rooms f, l, and i: reception spaces
Rooms g and m: bathroom and/or kitchen
Room m: latrine

Trümper 1998, fig. 65.
Figure 76: Plan of Maison de Dionysos
Based on Trümper 1998, fig. 65.

Figure 77: Justified access map for Maison de Dionysos
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>6.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairs</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.458</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 78:** Spatial analysis chart for Maison de Dionysos
Figure 79: Visibility diagram from entrance of Maison de Dionysos

Figure 80: Visibility diagram from reception space f of Maison de Dionysos
Figure 81: Visibility diagram from reception space i of Maison de Dionysos

Figure 82: Visibility diagram from reception space I of Maison de Dionysos
Figure 83: Stucco boukrania from possible altar from Maison de Dionysos Chamonard 1906, p. 534, figs. 13a and 13b.

Figure 84: Club of Herakles from Maison de Dionysos Bruneau 1964, p. 163, fig. 10.

Figure 85: Cybele from Maison de Dionysos Chamonard 1906, p. 559, fig. 22.
Figure 86: Plan of Maison de Q. Tullius Q. f. (House IE of Stadium Quarter) The limits of the domestic unit have been highlighted in gray. Scale 1:200

Room a: vestibule
Room b: latrine
Room c: service area
Room d: courtyard
Rooms e and f: reception spaces

Trümper 1998, fig. 22.
Figure 87: Plan of Maison de Q. Tullius Q. f.
Based on Trümper 1998, cat. no. 28.

Figure 88: Justified access map for Maison de Q. Tullius Q.f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>5.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 89: Spatial analysis chart for Maison de Q. Tullius Q.f.
Figure 90: Visibility diagram from the entrance for Maison de Q. Tullius Q.f.

Figure 91: Visibility diagram from the reception spaces for Maison de Q. Tullius Q.f.
Figure 92: Plan of Maison des sceaux in its final building phase in the early 1st century BCE

Room η: vestibule and staircase
Room θ: courtyard
Rooms μ and ξ: reception spaces
Room ζ: latrine
Rooms υ and ω: storage area
Room τ: workshop
Evidence for a kitchen and cult space from second floor over rooms υ and ω

Trümper 2005, fig. 7.
Figure 93: Plan of Maison des sceaux
Based on Trümper 2005, fig. 7.

Figure 94: Justified access map of Maison des sceaux
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
<td>4.421</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>4.947</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>5.895</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>5.053</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ′</td>
<td>3.263</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>4.947</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι′</td>
<td>4.947</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.316</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.263</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 95: Spatial analysis chart of Maison des sceaux
Figure 96: Visibility diagram from the entrance of Maison des sceaux

Figure 97: Visibility diagram from the reception space of Maison des sceaux
Figure 98: Herm base with traces of bronze from herm from Maison des sceaux
Siebert 2001, pl. 71, fig. 2.

Figure 99: Reconstruction of herm from Maison des sceaux
Siebert 2001, R. XVIII.
Figure 100: Inscribed incense burner, Delos A7725
Siebert 1988, p. 766, fig. 34.

Figure 101: Votive relief from Room ω, Delos 7724
Siebert 1988, p. 766, fig. 36.
Figure 102: Plan of Maison de l'Inopos A, Scale 1:200

Rooms d, c, and f: reception spaces
Room g: courtyard
Rooms h and k: entrances
Rooms i and m: service area
Room j: latrine
Room l: kitchen/bathroom

Trümper 1998, fig. 34.
Figure 103: Plan of Maison de l'Inopos A
Based on Trümper 1998, fig. 34, cat. No. 36.

Figure 104: Justified access map of Maison de l'Inopos A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 105: Spatial analysis chart for Maison de l’Inopos A
Figure 106: Visibility diagram from the entrances for Maison de l’Inopos A. The gray star indicates the location of the round altar.

Figure 107: Visibility diagram from the reception spaces for Maison de l’Inopos A.
Figure 108: Athena statuette from Maison de l’Inopos A, A 4153 Couvé 1895, p. 477, fig. 3.
Figure 109: Plan of Maison des dauphins, Scale 1:200

Room a: vestibule
Rooms b, b'', and b''': kitchen/bathroom
Room b': latrine
Room d: courtyard
Room h with rooms i and j, and possible rooms f and g: reception spaces

Trümper 1998, p. 247 fig. 35.
Figure 110: Plan of Maison des dauphins
Based on Trümper 1998, p. 247 fig. 35.

Figure 111: Justified access map of Maison des dauphins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>1.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b&quot;</td>
<td>3.385</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'''</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>3.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.506</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 112: Chart of spatial analysis for Maison des dauphins
Figure 113: Visibility diagram from the main entrance for Maison des dauphins
Figure 114: Visibility diagram from the secondary entrance for Maison des dauphins
Figure 115: Visibility diagram from the reception space for Maison des dauphins
Figure 116 (above): Mosaic from vestibule of Maison des dauphins

Figure 117 (right): Detail of Sign of Tamit from mosaic in vestibule of Maison des dauphins

Photographs by author.
Figure 118: Plan of Maison des triton, Scale 1:200

Room AC: courtyard
Room AI: kitchen
Room AI': latrine
Room AJ and AN: service areas
Rooms AE, AF, AG, AH with AH': reception spaces
Rooms AL and AM: bath complex?

Figure 119: Plan of Maison des tritons
Based on Trümper 1998, fig. 14.
Figure 120: Justified access map of Maison des triton

Figure 121: Reconstruction of courtyard of Maison des triton
Bruneau et al. 1970, p. 93, fig. 80.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>4.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>1.707</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH'</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI'</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK'</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.914</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 122: Spatial analysis chart for Maison des triton
Figure 123: Visibility diagram from entrance for Maison des tritons with parapet walls

Figure 124: Visibility diagram from entrance for Maison des tritons without parapet walls
Figure 125: Visibility diagram from reception space for Maison des triton with parapet walls

Figure 126: Visibility diagram from reception space for Maison des triton without parapet walls
Figure 127: Marble niche from entrance

Figure 128: Poros niche from entrance

Figure 129: Rectangular altar from courtyard

Figure 130: Round altar from courtyard
Figure 131: Plan of Maison aux frontons

Figure 132: Plan of Maison aux frontons
The lararium is located in Room X.
Based on Trümper 1998, fig. 14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site of Sample House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculanum</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa delle Pareti rosse, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maison du Dionysos</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Q. Tullius</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de l’Inopos A</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des dauphins</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des tritons</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>1.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 133: Chart of average RRA from the six Delian sample houses and Greek and Roman house examples
Figure 134: Plan of Corinth
Gray squares represent areas with domestic structures
Based on Bonini 2006, p. 311.
Without at least one entrance into the house or most of the interior doorways uncovered it is difficult to calculate the accessibility or study visibility of this structure overall. Unfortunately, most of the walls of this structure were robbed out leaving behind only the trenches where they once stood.

Room A2: atrium
Rooms A1 and A10: peristyle courtyards
Room A8: fountain room
Room A9: Possible shrine room

Figure 136: Room A9 find spots of statuettes
Stirling 2008, fig. 27.

Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.
Figure 138: Plan of CORIN002
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavation.

Figure 139: Votive foundation deposit from CORIN002
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavation.
Figure 140: Plan of CORIN004
Stikas 1957, fig. 1.

Figure 141: Plan of CORIN005
Anderson 1967, fig. 1.
Figure 142: Plan of CORIN007

The doorways to Rooms 8, 9, 10, and 11 are unknown, but based on the published information for this structure, there might have been connections between Rooms 8 and 9 and Room 12. However, there is not such indication of how Rooms 10 and 11 are related to Room 9, Corridor B, or each other.

Room 1: vestibule
Room 3: atrium
Room 6: utilitarian room
Room 7: reception space
Room 12: courtyard

Miller 1972, fig. 2.
Figure 143: Justified access map for CORIN007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>2.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>1.427</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>2.196</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 144: Spatial analysis chart for CORIN007
Figure 145: Visibility diagram from the main entrance of CORIN007

Figure 146: Visibility diagram from the reception space of CORIN007
Figure 147: Plan of CORIN008

Room 1: vestibule
Room 2: courtyard (phase 1), atrium (phase 2)
Room 7: stairs

Pallas 1955, fig. 3.
Figure 148: Justified access map for CORIN008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 149: Spatial analysis chart for CORIN008
Figure 150: Visibility diagram from main entrance of CORIN008

Figure 151: Visibility diagram from atrium of CORIN008
Figure 152: plan of CORIN009
Shear 1930, pl. 1.

Figure 153: Visibility diagram from entrance for CORIN009
Figure 154: Plan of CORIN010 (and CORIN015)

There are too few rooms to this structure to make calculating spatial analysis worthwhile. However, with so few rooms, it is very easy to see from the plan how the rooms relate and are symmetrically arranged.

Rooms 1 and 2: commercial space?
Room 3: kitchen

Williams 2005, fig. 8.4.
Figure 155: Plan for CORIN010
The black rectangle represents the hearth and the black three dimensional rectangle represents the possible niche/aedicula/wall painted shrine
Based on Williams 2005, fig. 8.4.

Figure 156: Visibility diagram from main entrance for CORIN010
Based on Williams 2005, fig. 8.4.
Figure 157: Figurine of Aphrodite (MF-1985-12) from CORIN010
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.

Figure 158: Figurine of Aphrodite (MF-1985-48) from CORIN010
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.
Figure 159: Incense burner (L-1984-1a-b) from CORIN010
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.

Figure 160: Figurine of Athena (MF-1983-41) from CORIN010
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.
Figure 161: Plan of CORIN011
Williams and Zervos 1983, fig. 3.
Figure 162: Altar (A-1982-2) from CORIN011
Image courtesy of the ASCSA
Corinth Excavations.

Figure 163: Plaque (S-1982-4) from CORIN011
Image courtesy of the ASCSA
Corinth Excavations.
Figure 164: Plan of CORIN012
Broneer 1935, fig. 1.
There are too few rooms for calculations of mean depth, relative asymmetry, and control value to be useful. However, with too few rooms it is easy to see how they are related and accessible to one another.

Slane 1986, fig. 1.

Figure 166: Visibility diagram from main entrance for CORIN014
Based on Slane 1986, fig. 1.
Figure 167: Plan of CORIN015 (and CORIN010)  
Williams 2005, fig. 8.4.

Figure 168: Wall painting of Room 2 from CORIN015  
Gadbery 1993, p. 56, fig. 7.
Figure 169: Niche from CORIN015
Image courtesy of the ASCSA
Corinth Excavations.

Figure 170: Dog rattle (MF-1988-22) from CORIN015
Image courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.
Figure 171 (above, left): Figurine of Eros (MF-9035)

Figure 172 (above, right): Figurine of Asklepios (MF-9034a-c)

Figure 173 (below, left): Statuette of Aphrodite (S-2548)

All three found in the commercial building in Panayia Field.

Images courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.
Figure 174 (above, left): Bust of Julius Caesar (S-2771)

Figure 175 (above, right): Figurine of Antoninus Pius (T-1047)

Figure 176 (below, left): Hekataion (S-2302)

All three found in secondary contexts.

Images courtesy of the ASCSA Corinth Excavations.
Figure 177: Plan of KENCH001, 2nd-4th century CE phase

It is unclear from the publications how Rooms 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 relate to the rest of the house. Therefore, access analysis cannot be done on this structure. I have drawn up a tentative access map which reveals that this western part of the house was asymmetrical and non-distributive.

Bonini 2006, p. 388
Figure 178: Justified access map for western rooms of KENCH001
Figure 179: Visibility diagram from the main entrance of KENCH001

Figure 180: Visibility diagram from the reception space of KENCH001
Figure 181: Plan of STYMP001

Room 3: columns in entrance and cobble floor?
Rooms 6 and 7: cobble floor and domestic pottery
Room 10: bathing room?
Area 14: garden?


Figure 182: Justified access map for STYMP001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>3.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.643</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.762</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 183: Spatial analysis chart for STYMP001
Figure 184: Visibility diagram from main entrance for STYMP001

Figure 185: Visibility diagram from secondary entrance for STYMP001
Figure 186: Visibility diagram from possible reception for STYMP001
For this house, there is no identified entrance from the street along Rooms 5 and 6. There appear to be two entrances into Rooms 6 and 1 from the other side of the house, but it is unclear from the publication if this is from outside the house or from another part of the structure. Therefore, spatial analysis could not be conducted.

Williams et al. 2002, plan 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Houses</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculaneum</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa delle Paretirosse, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison du Dionysos, Delos</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Q. Tullius, Delos</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de l’Inopos A, Delos</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des dauphins, Delos</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des tritons, Delos</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des sceaux, Delos</td>
<td>1.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Houses</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORIN007</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN008</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 189: Chart to compare RRA among the Roman Corinthian houses and with those of pre-Roman Greece, Italy, and Hellenistic Delos
Figure 190: Map of Patras

Ridge between upper and lower city highlighted in red. The black lines delineate the possible area of the Hellenistic lower city.

Rizakis 1998, map 1.
Figure 191: Detailed map of Roman Patras
Rizakis and Petropoulos 2005, p. 45, fig. 40.
Figure 192: Plan of PATRA002
Petropoulou 2009a, p. 298, fig. 8.

Figure 193: Plan of PATRA003
Georgopoulou 1999, p. 216, fig. 6.
Figure 194: Plan of PATRA005
Petropoulou 2009b, p. 299, fig. 10.

Figure 195: Plan of PATRA007
Alexopoulou 2000, p. 206, fig. 10
Figure 196: Plan of PATRA012
Alexopoulou 2004, p. 254, fig. 2.

Figure 197: Plan of PATRA021
Papakosta 2005f, p. 255, fig. 2.
Figure 198: Plan of PATRA025, PATRA026, and PATRA043
Papapostolou 1984m, p. 87, fig. 14;

Figure 199: Plan of PATRA027
Dekoulakou 1983d, p. 107, fig. 4.
Figure 200: Plan of PATRA029 and PATRA116
Papapostolou 1979a, p. 352, fig. 5.

Figure 201: Plan of PATRA033
Papapostolou 1985f, p. 83, fig. 1.
Figure 202: Plan of PATRA031
Panaghiotopoulou et al. 1987b, p. 145, fig. 10.

Figure 203: Justified access map of PATRA031
Figure 204: Plan of PATRA035
Papapostolou 1988a, p. 175, fig. 1.

Figure 205: Plan of PATRA036
Alexopoulou 1999a, p. 212, fig. 4.
Figure 206: Plan of PATRA038, PATRA088, PATRA089, PATRA090, PATRA091
Dekoulakou 1979a, plan A.
Figure 207: Plan of PATRA038

Room 1: utilitarian space
Room 2: reception space
Room 3: phase 2 corridor
Room 4: courtyard
Room 5: atrium

Based on Dekoulakou 1979a, plan A.
Figure 208: Justified access map for PATRA038 from phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 209: Spatial analysis chart for PATRA038 from phase 1
Figure 210: Justified access map for PATRA038 from phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 211: Spatial analysis chart for PATRA038 from phase 2
Figure 212: Visibility diagram from main entrance of PATRA038 from phase 2

Figure 213: Visibility diagram from reception space of PATRA038 from phase 2
Figure 214: Plan of PATRA039
Petritaki 1990b, p. 110, plan 2.

Figure 215: Justified access map of PATRA039
Figure 216: Plan of PATRA042
Papapostolou 1984c, p. 73, fig. 4.

Figure 217: Justified access map of PATRA042
Figure 218: Plan of PATRA041
Papapostolou 1979d, p. 356, fig. 8.

Figure 219: Drawing of
PATRA044
Petsas 1974, p. 158, fig. 4.

Figure 220: Plan of PATRA048
Dekoulakou 1983b, p. 105, fig. 3.
Figure 221: Plan of PATRA053
ADelt 1977, p. 72, fig. 3.

Figure 222: Plan of PATRA054
Papapostolou 1984g, p. 81, fig. 10.
Figure 223: Plans of PATRA040 and PATRA055
Dekoulakou 1983f, p. 110, fig. 6.

Figure 224: Justified access map of PATRA055
Figure 225: Plan of PATRA056
Papapostolou 1988h, p. 161, fig. 3.

Figure 226: Plan of PATRA058
Dekoulakou 1983e, p. 109, fig. 5.
Figure 227: Plan of north part of PATRA057
Papapostolou 1984a, p. 69, fig. 1.

Figure 228: Plan of south part of PATRA057
The arrow indicates the entrance to Room 7.

Papapostolou 1984a, p. 70, fig. 2.
Figure 229: Possible cult room from PATRA057
Image courtesy of the ΣΤ’Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities

Figure 230: Possible cult room from PATRA057
Image courtesy of the ΣΤ’Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities
Figure 231: Visibility diagram of Room 7 with open doorway from atrium of PATRA057

Figure 232: Visibility diagram of Room 7 with closed doorway from atrium of PATRA057
Figure 233: Grotesque figurine
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 53.

Figure 234: Eros figurine
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 53.

Figure 235: Possible Artemis/Amazon figurine
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 53.
Figure 236: Possible Artemis/Amazon figurine
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 54.

Figure 237: Draped female figurine
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 54.

Figure 238: Satyr herm
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 54.

Figure 239: Sandal lamp
Papapostolou 1984a, pl. 54.
Figure 240: Plan of PATRA059
Kokkotaki 1996, p. 139, fig. 1.

Figure 241: Plan of PATRA065
Petritaki 1990a, p. 109, fig. 1.
Figure 242: Plan of PATRA060
Petsas 1974, pp. 152-153, figs. 1 and 2.
Without all of the rooms, spatial analysis calculations cannot be done, but a justified access map can reveal some information about the access and mobility of the house.

Room 1: vestibule
Room 3, 13, and 14: reception space
Room 5: possible courtyard
Rooms 6, 12, and 15: atria
Room 11: storage space

Based on Petsas 1974, pp. 152-153, figs. 1 and 2.
Figure 244: Justified access map of PATRA060
Figure 245: Visibility diagram from entrance of PATRA060
Figure 246: Visibility diagram from three atria of PATRA060
Figure 247: Visibility diagram from reception spaces of PATRA060
Figure 248: Plan of PATRA062 and PATRA084

The circle indicates the location of the possible altar.

Dekoulakou 1983a, p. 101, fig. 1.

Figure 249: Possible altar from PATRA062
Image courtesy of the ΣΤ’ Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities
Patras: PATRA063 and PATRA067

Figure 250: Remains of PATRA063
Papapostolou 1988c, pl. 79.

Figure 251: Plan of PATRA067
Papapostolou 1985g, p. 85, fig. 2.
Figure 252: Plan of PATRA066 phase 1
Alexopoulou 1997a, p.132, fig. 3.

Figure 253: Plan of PATRA066 phase 2
Alexopoulou 1997a, p.133, fig. 4.

Figure 254: Plan of PATRA066, later octagonal fountain
Papapostolou 1984d, p. 75, fig. 5.
Figure 255: Plan of PATRA069
Papapostolou 1984h, p. 84, fig. 12.

Figure 256: Justified access map of PATRA069
Figure 257: Plan of PATRA068 and PATRA071
Papakosta 1993, p. 152, fig. 3.

Figure 258: Plan of PATRA070
Papapostolou 1979f, p. 361, fig. 11.
Figure 259: Plan of PATRA072
Stavropolou-Gatsi 1992a, p. 141, fig. 2.

Figure 260: Plan of PATRA073
Papakosta 1988c, p. 192, fig. 14.
Figure 261: PATRA078 and PATRA129
Papapostolou 1984e, p. 77, fig. 6.

Figure 262: Mosaic floor from PATRA078
Papapostolou 1984e, pl. 57δ
Figure 263: Plan of PATRA079
Papapostolou 1984k, p. 85, fig. 13.

Figure 264: Plan of PATRA080
Agallopoulou 1979i, pp. 98 and 99, figs 1 and 2.
Figure 265: Plan of PATRA081
Dekoulakou 1984d, p. 112, fig. 8.

Figure 266: Plan of PATRA083
Papapostolou 1988b, p. 176, fig. 2.
Figure 267: Plan of PATRA082

Circle indicates location of niche and wall painting.

Papapostolou 1984f, p. 79, fig. 8.
Figure 268: Wall niche from PATRA082
Image courtesy of the ΣΤ’ Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities
Figure 269: Detail of wall painting associated with niche from PATRA082
Image courtesy of the ΣΤ’ Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities

Figure 270: Detail of wall painting associated with niche from PATRA082
Image courtesy of the ΣΤ’ Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities
Figure 271: Plan of PATRA085
Petritaki 1990d, p. 113, fig. 4.

Figure 272: Plan of PATRA086
Agallopoulou 1979f, p. 370, fig. 4.
Figure 273: Plan of PATRA087
Alexopoulou 1999b, p. 213, fig. 5.

Figure 274: Plan of PATRA092
Stavropolou-Gatsi 1990b, p. 118, fig. 7.
Figure 275: Plan of PATRA096

Circle indicates location of double niches.

Sotiriou 1998a, p. 112, fig. 1.

Figure 276: Plan of PATRA097

Papapostolou 1988e, p. 158, fig. 1.
Figure 277: Plan of PATRA101
Papapostolou 1977, p. 226, fig. 15.

Figure 278: Plan of PATRA107
Gkadolou 2000fp. 201, fig. 7.
Figure 279: Plan of PATRA104, Hellenistic phase
Georgopoulou 2000, p. 197, fig. 3.

Figure 280: Plan of PATRA104, Roman phase
Georgopoulou 2000, p. 195, fig. 2.
Figure 281: Plan of PATRA108
Gkadolou 2000ep. 200, fig. 5.

Figure 282: Plan of PATRA110
Circles indicate location of niches.
Panagiotopoulou Platonos, and Matsas 1987c, p. 146, fig. 11.
Figure 283: Plan of PATRA117
Papapostolou 1979bp. 353, fig. 6.

Figure 284: Plan of PATRA124
Agallopoulou 1979g, p. 372, fig. 6.
Figure 285: Plan of PATRA125 and PATRA126
Dekoulakou 1984a, p. 106, fig. 5.

Figure 286: Plan of PATRA128
Dekoulakou 1984c, p. 110, fig. 7.
Figure 287: Plan of PATRA132
Papapostolou 1985o, p. 90, fig. 4.

Figure 288: Justified access map of PATRA132
Figure 289: Visibility diagram from courtyard of PATRA132
Figure 290: Plan of PATRA134
Papakosta 1988d, p. fig. 16.

Figure 291: Plan of PATRA139 and PATRA140
Kotsaki 1989a, p. 143, fig. 3.
Figure 292: Plan of PATRA142
Petropolou 1989, p. 145, fig. 4.

Figure 293: Justified access map of PATRA142
Figure 294: Plan of PATRA143
Gatsi 1989, p. 147, fig. 5.

Figure 295: Plan of PATRA146
ΣΤ Εphoreia 1989d, p. 121, fig. 3.
Figure 296: Plan of PATRA147
ΣΤ' Ephoreia 1989e, p. 212, fig. 12.

Figure 297: Plan of PATRA148 and PATRA149
Kotsaki 1989b, p. 85, fig. 2.
Figure 298: Plan of PATRA151
Petritaki 1989, p. 89, fig. 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Houses</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculanum</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa delle Pareti rosse, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison du Dionysos, Delos</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Q. Tullius, Delos</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de l’Inopos A, Delos</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des dauphins, Delos</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des tritons, Delos</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des sceaux, Delos</td>
<td>1.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORIN007</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN008</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038, phase 1</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038, phase 2</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 299: Chart to compare RRA among the Roman Patrean and Corinthian houses and with those of pre-Roman Greece, Italy, and Hellenistic Delos.
Figure 300: Map of Messene

Circles indicate locations of the two *villae urbanae*.

Figure 301: Plan of MESSE001
Themelis 2004, p. 83, fig. 5.
Figure 302: Plan of MESSE001 highlighting the walls and entrances. Dotted lines indicate where walls are uncertain.

Room 4: mausoleum with two terracotta tile sarcophagi
Rooms 6, 9, 19 and 21: utilitarian spaces
Room 12: atrium
Rooms 24α and 24β: possible dining spaces

Based on Themelis 2004, p. 83, fig. 5.
Figure 303: Justified access map of MESSE001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>3.364</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.682</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>2.877</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.727</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.136</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.273</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>1.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.227</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.773</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>2.318</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.409</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>4.364</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24β</td>
<td>4.364</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.773</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.186</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 304: Spatial analysis chart for MESSE001
Figure 305: Visibility diagram from entrance for MESSE001

Figure 306: Visibility diagram from reception spaces for MESSE001
Figure 307: Plan of MESSE002
Themelis 2006, p. 40, fig. 3.
Figure 308: Visibility diagram from reception spaces of MESSE002
The blue is the visibility from the possible library. The red is the visibility from the atrium.
Figure 309: Plan of POTAM001
Valmin 1930, p. 170, fig. 32.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculanum</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa delle Pareti rosse, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison du Dionysos, Delos</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Q. Tullius, Delos</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de l’Inopos A, Delos</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des dauphins, Delos</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des tritons, Delos</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des sceaux, Delos</td>
<td>1.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORIN007</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN008</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038, phase 1</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038, phase 2</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE001</td>
<td>1.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 310: Chart to compare RRA among the Roman Messenian, Patrean and Corinthian houses and with those of pre-Roman Greece, Italy, and Hellenistic Delos
Figure 311: Plan of Athens

Orange houses represent areas of the city where houses have been found.

Bouyia 2008, p. 208, fig. 1.
Figure 312: Plan of Industrial Area to the west of the Areopagus
Each colored area is a house occupied in the Roman period.

Red: ATHEN001
Green: ATHEN002
Purple: ATHEN003

Yellow: ATHEN008
Blue: ATHEN009
Brown: ATHEN010
Orange: ATHEN011

Young 1951, p. 136, fig. 1.
Figure 313: Plan of ATHEN002
Thompson and Wycherly 1972, p. 183, fig. 45.

Figure 314: Justified access map of ATHEN002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>5.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10α</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10β</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairs</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.495</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 315: Spatial analysis chart of ATHEN002
Figure 316: Visibility diagram from entrance of ATHEN002

Figure 317: Visibility diagram from reception space of ATHEN002
Figure 318: Plan of ATHEN004
The door between the central courtyard and the room to the east is not preserved. This arrangement is based on my understanding of the relevant passages in the excavation notebooks. Although much of the house can be reconstructed, a few of the interior doorways and some rooms are missing; therefore, calculations would not be useful.

Room 2: vestibule
Room 10: bi-style atrium
Rooms 16 and 28: courtyards
Room 25: possible dining space
Room 26: food storage area
Room 27: possible kitchen, where hearth, Eros statuette and possible brazier or altar found

Travlos 1971, p. 395, fig. 508.
Figure 319: Justified access map of ATHEN004
Figure 320: Visibility diagram from entrance of ATHEN004
Star indicates location of hearth.

Figure 321: Visibility diagram from reception space of ATHEN004
Figure 322: Possible brazier or portable altar from Room 2 of ATHEN004
Image courtesy of ASCSA Athenian Agora Excavations

Figure 323: Statuette of Cybele from excavation of ATHEN004
Image courtesy of ASCSA Athenian Agora Excavations
Figure 324: Plan of ATHEN007

Room F: garden fountain area
Room 2: possible service space
Room 8: possible reception space

Thompson and Wycherly 1972, p. 184, fig. 46.
Figure 325: Justified access map of ATHEN007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6α</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>2.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6β</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6γ</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>2.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6δ</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>2.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairs</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 326: Spatial analysis chart of ATHEN007
Figure 327: Visibility diagram from possible entrance of ATHEN007

Figure 328: Visibility diagram from reception space of ATHEN007
Figure 329: Plan of ATHEN014
Travlos 1971, p.401, fig. 520.

Figure 330: Justified access map of ATHEN014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>1.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2α</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2β</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>2.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2γ</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2δ</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>3.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>2.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.818</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 331: Spatial analysis chart of ATHEN014
Figure 332: Visibility diagram from entrance of ATHEN014

Figure 333: Visibility diagram from two larger rooms of ATHEN014
Most of the rooms appear to be missing, therefore, spatial analysis is not helpful.

Shear, 1973a, p. 135, fig. 2.
Figure 336: Locations of houses ATHEN017, ATHEN018, and ATHEN019 under the Library of Hadrian

Choremi-Spetsieri and Tigginagka 2008, p. 121, fig. 5.
Figure 337: Plan of remains of ATHEN020 and ATHEN021
Zachariadou 2004, p. 55, fig. 1.
Figure 338: Plan of ATHEN026, ATHEN027, ATHEN029, ATHEN030, ATHEN031, and ATHEN032

These houses were constructed in the Classical period, but were occupied into the Roman period.

Travlos 1971, p. 396, fig. 509.
Figure 339: Plan of ATHEN026, ATHEN027, ATHEN029, ATHEN030, ATHEN031, and ATHEN032
Based on Travlos 1971, p. 396, fig. 509.
Figure 340: Justified access map of ATHEN026, ATHEN027, ATHEN029, ATHEN030, ATHEN031, and ATHEN032.

Since most of these houses do not have all of the interior doorways preserved, access calculations can only be done for two of these houses, ATHEN027 and ATHEN032.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.393</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 341: Access analysis chart of ATHEN027
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Mean Depth</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry</th>
<th>Real Rel. Asymmetry</th>
<th>Control Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>6.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 342: Access analysis chart of ATHEN032
Figure 343: Visibility diagram from entrances of ATHEN026, ATHEN027, ATHEN029, ATHEN030, ATHEN031, and ATHEN032
Figure 344: Plan of ATHEN028
Papaioannou 2002, fig. 15b.

Figure 345: Plan of ATHEN033
Papaioannou 2002, fig. 17a.
Figure 346: Location of ATHEN034
Travlos 1971, p. 292, fig. 380.

Figure 347: Plan of ATHEN034 with gray star indicating location of votive stele.
Travlos 1971, p. 292, fig. 380.
Figure 348: Plan of Makriyianni plot excavations

- Dark blue: ATHEN046
- Red: ATHEN047
- Brown: ATHEN048
- Gray: ATHEN049
- Yellow: ATHEN051
- Light blue: ATHEN052
- Purple: ATHEN053
- Green: ATHEN054
- Orange: ATHEN055
- Pink: ATHEN056

Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189, fig. 6.
Figure 349: Plan of ATHEN046

Since most of the interior entrances are not preserved spatial analysis cannot be conducted.

Based on Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189, fig. 6.

Figure 350: Visibility diagram from entrance of ATHEN046
Figure 351: Plan of ATHEN047

Since most of the interior entrances are not preserved spatial analysis cannot be conducted.

Based on Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189, fig. 6.

Figure 352: Visibility diagram of ATHEN047

The blue polygon represents the visibility from entrance. The red polygon represents the visibility from the reception space.
Room 2: courtyard
Rooms 4 and 5: possibly food preparation
Room 7: latrine
Room 13: reception space

Since several of the interior entrances are not preserved spatial analysis cannot be conducted.

Based on Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189, fig. 6.
Figure 356: Plan of ATHEN054
Based on Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189, fig. 6.

Figure 357: Justified access map of ATHEN054
The entrances for Rooms 2, 3, and 4 are not preserved but are hypothetically reconstructed in this map.

Figure 358: Visibility diagram from entrance of ATHEN054
Figure 359: Portable marble altar from fill of Room 3 of ATHEN054 Eleutheratou 2006, p. 67, no. 159.

Figure 360: Marble hekataion from fill of Room 3 of ATHEN054 Eleutheratou 2006, p. 70, no. 166.
Figure 361: Plan of ATHEN055

Room 4: reception space
Room 5: food storage and preparation
Rooms 2 and 7: courtyards

Based on Eleutheratou 2008, p. 189, fig. 6.

Figure 362: Justified access map of ATHEN055

Since the south part of the house is missing and a few of the interior entrances are not fully understood, access analysis cannot be conducted.
Figure 363: Visibility diagram from corridor of ATHEN055
Figure 364: Marble Ephesian Artemis from Room 7 of ATHEN055

Figure 365: Rectangular structure, possibly an altar, in Room 7 of ATHEN055
Eleutheratou 2008, p. 193, fig. 16.
Figure 366: Plan of ATHEN059

The circle indicates the location of the naiskos, the upper small rectangle is the location of the votive deposit, the larger rectangle highlights the four room suite with the arrows indicating the entrances between the rooms.

Bouyia 2008, p. 209, fig. 2.
Figure 367: Votive deposit from courtyard of ATHEN059

Figure 368: Figures of Cybele from ATHEN059.

From left to right, enthroned Cybele statuette (Λ11511) from earlier phase, Cybele naïskos (Λ9099) found face down in room to west, terracotta figurine (Ε1676) from room to north.

Bouyia 2008, p. 215, fig. 15.
Figure 369: Plan of ATHEN065

Circle indicates the location of the shrine.

Karivieri 1994, fig. 11.

Figure 370: Cybele shrine from ATHEN065
Frantz, Thompson, and Travlos 1988, Plate 44b.
Figure 371: Plan of ATHEN066

Circle indicates location of possible shrine.

Bouyia 2008, p. 221, fig. 20.
Figure 372: Lamp with Lares, from well in the Athenian Agora
Perlzweig 1961, p. 109 no. 628

Figure 373: Bronze statuette possibly of a Genius or Lares
Shear 1936, p. 18, fig. 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynthos</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halos</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosa</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herculaneum</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa delle Pareti rosse, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa degli Amorini Dorati, Pompeii</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison du Dionysos, Delos</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Q. Tullius, Delos</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de l’Inopos A, Delos</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des dauphins, Delos</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des tritons, Delos</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison des sceaux, Delos</td>
<td>1.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/House</th>
<th>Average RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORIN007</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN008</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMP001</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038, phase 1</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRA038, phase 2</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESSE001</td>
<td>1.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN002</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN007</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN014</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN027</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHEN032</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 374: Chart to compare spatial analysis calculations among the Roman Athenian, Corinthian, Patrean, and Messenian houses and with those of pre-Roman Greece, Italy, and Hellenistic Delos
Figure 375: Map of the Piraeus

Black squares are locations of houses.

Figure 376: Plan of PIRAE002 from the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} / early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE phase

Since the entrances into the house and between several of the rooms are not preserved, access analysis would not be helpful. However, a justified access map with possible connection is useful.

Grigoropoulos 2005, fig. 87.

Figure 377: Justified access map of PIRAE002
Figure 378: Visibility diagram from main entrance of PIRAE002

Figure 379: Visibility diagram from courtyard of PIRAE002
Figure 380: Cybele statuette from Room 32 of PIRAE002
Photograph by author.
Figure 381: Plan of PIRAE003 from the 2nd / 3rd century CE phase

Since the entrances into the house and between several of the rooms are not preserved, access analysis would not be helpful. However, a justified access map with possible connection is useful.

Grigoropoulos, fig. 90.
Figure 383: Visibility diagram from courtyard of PIRAE003
Figure 384: Possible altar from PIRAE003
Photograph by author.
Figure 385: Plan of PIRAE005
Hoepfner and Schwandner 1994, p. 25, fig. 16.
Figure 386: Map of the Eleusis

Circles indicate ELEUS001 (L1) to the north and ELEUS003 (L30) to the south.

Mylonas 1961, fig. 4
Figure 387: Plan of ELEUS003
Kourouniotes 1937, p. 35, plan 1.

Figure 388: Plan of ELEUS004
Blackman 1999, p. 12, fig. 13.
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