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ABSTRACT

Scholars now recognize that there is no clear evidence to trace the ritual meal in 1 Corinthians 11:17-33 back to the historical Jesus, or to existing Jewish meals. Similarly, evidence is lacking to prove that the ritual meal originated with Paul’s community, or any other first century community. Later church liturgies reflect a variety of forms, making it similarly impossible to trace the ritual backwards through the various Jesus groups. Scholars now suggest that each community developed its own ritual, based upon the rituals, prayers and banquets of their immediate context.

In this thesis, the banquets of the voluntary associations are examined in order to provide a socio-cultural context for the Corinthian meal. In finding an analogy for the Corinthian Jesus-meal in the meal practices of the voluntary associations, we note similar honour/shame values typical of the Greco-Roman world. Tensions and divisions are attributable to this code of values and occur both in the Corinthians’ behaviour and in Paul’s attempt to modify the code to reflect more Christian values. Other comparisons between the association banquets and the Corinthian banquet are explored in the expectation that the association banquet traditions may shed some light on the Corinthians’ actual meal practices. Association banquets offer useful analogies to help explain the timing, location, provisions and funding, and the ritual of the Lord’s Supper itself. The banquet rituals of the associations thus prove to be a rich tradition upon which Paul draws in order to create a new social identity for his community, albeit one based upon Christian values.
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In the rough-and-tumble of social interaction, groups are known to exploit the ambiguity of inherited forms, to impart new evaluations or valences on them, to borrow forms more expressive of their interest, or to create wholly new forms to answer to changed circumstances. Furthermore, if we think of such interactions not as causative in its own terms but as responsive to larger economic and political forces, the explanation of cultural forms must take account of that larger context, that wider field of force. A ‘culture’ is thus better seen as a series of processes that construct, reconstruct, and dismantle cultural materials, in response to identifiable determinants.


**Chapter One**

**Introduction**

There has been increasing recognition by scholars studying the social-historical Greco-Roman world of the first century that a larger database of group discourses and practices is desirable for understanding the social banqueting practices behind Paul’s words concerning the Corinthian banquet of 1 Cor 11: 17-33. Scholars such as Theissen, Meeks, Klinghardt, Glancy and Bach, and Smith, have mined the elite commensality literature of the ancients, such as Athenaeus, Pausanius, Juvenal and Ovid and have established that a standard form of the Greco-Roman banquet underlies banqueting practices of the time. However, Andrew McGowan stresses that “various groups seem to have had different explicit understandings and purposes in mind and to have used eating

---

and drinking together in a variety of ritual forms." Likewise, Willi Braun cautions against allowing our collective study of the Christian banquet traditions to get “washed into the homogeneous stew of Greco-Roman banquets so as to leave us in the rather unremarkable (and ultimately not very interesting) position of saying that ‘Christians were simply following a pattern found throughout their world.’” Richard Ascough echoes this sentiment in his paper on voluntary association commensality, cautioning that “there existed no one standard ‘association banquet practice’ any more than there existed any one standard association.”

Following Braun’s recommendation that we examine what specific groups do with meals, we will suggest that different communities in the first century used meals to reflect and shape their different value systems. The Jewish communities reflected their commitment to their covenant and their community in their dietary laws and meal customs, such as the Passover Seder, as well as the Jewish community ritual of re-integration and the ritualization of scriptural metaphors. Philo’s *Therapeutae* in Alexandria and the Qumran community in the Palestinian desert reflected an ascetic, contemplative and monastic value system. The voluntary associations reflected the honour/shame system of their time, rewarding patrons and officials within a hierarchical ranking system.

---


In this thesis, we will argue that in 1 Corinthians 11:17-34, in the ritual of the Lord’s Supper, Paul is attempting to change the value system of the traditional Greco-Roman meal, which reflected the honour/shame system of the Mediterranean world, into a new value system which reflected Christian values of humility, mutual upbuilding and love. As Rouwhorst points out, citing Mary Douglas’ work, when a group constructs a ritual tradition, it is constructing a social identity. Groups and communities use meal customs as important indicators of their identity.” Every meal – especially when taken together by more than one person – encodes significant messages about social and hierarchical patterns prevailing in the group.” Changing the meal customs can result in changing the social identity.

Similarly, Bradshaw, Rouwhorst and McGowan urge caution in presuming uniformity in the early liturgical traditions of the Last Supper. As McGowan points out, “traditional and revisionist accounts alike have also often failed to acknowledge fully the local diversity now generally assumed of ancient liturgy, as of other aspects of early Christian thought and practice.” Scholars such as McGowan and Rouwhorst now believe it is doubtful that there was a standard Eucharistic ritual in the first and second centuries.9

In trying to discover authentic origins of the tradition, scholars are hampered, but by no means daunted, by the fragmentary and difficult nature of the evidence in the various sources. Discussion of the authentic origins of the Last Supper centres around three major areas. First, scholars dispute as to whether the NT accounts (Matt. 26:17-30; Mark 14:12-26; Luke 22.7-38; 1 Cor. 11:23-6) are reliable descriptions of the historical last meal of Jesus and how far the later traditions were read back into these accounts by the Gospel writers. Some, following Bultmann, have argued that the narratives are creations of the early Church, and are not original to Jesus, and have been read backwards into the last meal of Jesus. Others, following Jeremias, argue that there is an original version that can be traced back to the historical Jesus. Because there are significant differences between the different versions, scholars have been divided over which of the

---

9 Gerard Rouwhorst, “Table Community in Early Christianity, 73.
versions maintains the original, which Jesus celebrated with his disciples. McGowan broadens the discussion to other historical meals of Jesus. He points to Jesus’ usual role as that of guest, rather than host, and to the representation of values of exclusivity and judgment, rather than egalitarianism, which were built into Jesus’ use of the Messianic banquet. As McGowan summarizes, “we have simply peeled away the historical onion of eucharistic origins and found that it has no clear center. Jesus’ own meal practice was simply the meal practice of his first-century Jewish milieu.”

Second, debate has also raged over whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal. The chronology in the Synoptic Gospels is irreconcilable with that of the Fourth Gospel. As has been summarized by Jeremias, a number of details in the synoptic versions do not seem to fit with the Passover explanation. Some have attempted harmonization involving calendrical reckoning. As well, Jewish meals and prayers have been discussed as the originators of the Supper, but are problematic due to lack

---


of evidence of their existence before the fall of Jerusalem, such as the *zebah todah*, the sacrifice of praise/thanksgiving. It is questioned whether some existed at all. For instance, the *kiddush* meal never was a meal, but was simply a *kiddush* or special blessing at the beginning of each Sabbath or festival, or the *haburot mishwah* meals, which were used exclusively for circumcisions, weddings and funerals.

Third, discussion has centred on how to account for the differences in later liturgies such as the clearly Jewish form of prayer found in the Didache and in the writings of second CE bishop, Papias, the references to an agape meal, and the different orders of ritual and food consumption. Lietzmann’s theory of a double strand of eucharistic ritual, one strand based on a joyful fellowship meal, and the other on Paul’s memorial of the death of Christ, has been gradually disproved, with the recognition that with the pluriformity of Jesus-groups, there were also a pluriformity of meal rituals. As Rouwhorst summarizes, “it emerges from a careful analysis of the sources available that, for quite a long time, a type of Eucharist that more or less conformed to the Last Supper did not exist: it came into being only gradually during the second and perhaps even the third and fourth centuries.” Other meals found in the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas and John, and the Pseudo-Clementine writings, were considered just as sacred by their communities. Evidence of the Lord’s Supper eucharists are “only attested by later sources dating of the third or even the fourth century.” Therefore, it is now possible to look at the Corinthian’s Last Supper ritual

---

14 See Andrew McGowan, “Naming the feast: The *agape* and the diversity of early Christian meals,” *Studia Patristica* v.30, 1997) for a discussion of the references to an *agape* meal (Jude; 2 Peter; Ignatius of Antioch; the Epistula Apostolorum; Tertullian and the Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas; Clement of Alexandria and perhaps Origen; the Sibylline books; possibly some of the apocryphal Acts and the Apocalypse of Paul) and the likelihood that the term is not to be considered an essentially separate tradition, but probably describing a ritual meal in Asia and Syria where most of the references occur, and in the second century probably an alternative or synonym for ‘*eucharist*’. See also “Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in Early North African Christianity” (*Studia Liturgica* v. 34 No. 2, 2004).
17 Rouwhorst, “Table Community in Early Christianity,” 73.
18 Rouwhorst, “Table Community in Early Christianity,” 73.
as a distinct tradition, because “the distinct meal tradition emerged with the distinct community itself.”

A subject that is of particular concern to Pauline scholars is the division within Paul’s Corinthian community. Gerd Theissen first analyzed the social conditions of the Corinthian community and convincingly demonstrated that there was a ‘marked internal stratification’ which promoted divisions within the community. Theissen interprets the verb prolamba/nw (prolambano) in verse 21 as a reference to wealthier Christians who begin their private meal before the communal meal, receiving larger portions for themselves than for the others. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor’s book, *St. Paul’s Corinth*, published in 1983, draws on the evidence around Corinth of archaeological remains of several wealthy villas with *triclinium* (dining room) and atrium, and speculates that the villa at Anaploga represents the type of home owned by a wealthy Corinthian patron of the Jesus-community. He reasons that the host (perhaps Gaius) entertains the eight wealthiest members of the community in the *triclinium* of his villa (which seats nine) relegating the rest of the Corinthian group to inferior dining in his villa’s atrium. As Linton points out, there are perhaps six smaller church groups in Corinth who would join together to celebrate the Lord’s Supper. Perhaps more than 35 participants are dining.

Peter Lampe describes the distinction between the “First Tables,” which is a dinner which is attended by the leisured elite, and the “Second Tables” which is the later symposium, attended by the working guests who arrive later, and receive a lesser portion

---

20 Theissen, *Social Setting*, 151-4; idem *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics and the World of the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992). He also pointed out that associations recognized benefaction from their members by offering them larger portions of food and drink. This point was not taken up by subsequent scholars, but will be discussed in more detail later. See also E.A. Judge, *Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation* (London: Tyndale, 1960); Abraham Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1977).
23 Gregory Linton, in “House Church Meetings in the New Testament Era,” in *Stone Campbell Journal* Vol. 8 No.2, 220-244 (2005) 233, suggests that there are six small groups meeting in the homes of the following people in Corinth: Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:2-4); Titius Justus (Acts 18:7); Crispus (Acts 18:8); Chloe (1 Cor 1:11); Stephanas (1 Cor 1:16); and Gaius (Rom 16-23). The church in neighbouring Cenchreae meets in the home of Phoebe (Rom. 16: 1-2).
consisting of sweet desserts and fruit, or perhaps spicy dishes, seafood and bread. Lampe discusses both the elite and the cultic meal custom of the *eranos*, a meal wherein each member brought his or her own food basket to the communal meal, where it was cooked and shared. This Greco-Roman “potluck” custom Lampe traces back to Homer’s time and forward to the second century CE, in the sacrificial meal of the Sarapis cult (Aelius Aristides, *Sarapis* 54.20-28, Dindorf). With Theissen, he posits that there were three social problems at the Corinthian meals. First, the portions were inequitable. Second, there was no common starting point for the meal, and third, the latecomers, whose jobs delayed them, were consigned to the atrium or *peristyle*.

Carolyn Osiek and David Balch, Bradley Blue, Dennis Smith and Hal Taussig, Henk de Jonge and others, also propose that the Corinthians assembled in a room of the private house of a well-to-do patron. De Jonge and Linton accept that the wealthy brought their own food, consisting of meat and other delicacies, which they ate without sharing with the later-arriving poorer members. A number of recent commentators, such as Witherington, Thiselton, Keener and Fee adopt a similar position. Nevertheless, there have been recent challenges to this theory, and additional suggestions of locations. White states that “it is now believed that it was highly unlikely that Christians assembled in any regular fashion in the atrium of a large Campanian style villa.” Horrell questions the dating, location and presumption of dining in the villa at Anaploga, as well as the speculation that Gaius or any of the Corinthians would likely have been of an economic...

status to have owned a large sumptuous villa.\textsuperscript{32} Also problematic, we will argue, is the assumption that there were at least nine such wealthy leisured members of the Corinthian community able to eat and drink all the food in the luxurious \textit{triclinium} before the other, lower-status members arrived. A more serious problem comes from the situation described in 1 Corinthians 14:23-25, where Paul is worried about the opinion of outside observers. The privacy of the villa would prevent outsiders or unbelievers from freely entering while the whole church met together, and certainly from freely challenging the speaker that s/he is out of her/his mind. Paul talks of the outsider entering, speaking and joining their community to worship. The Corinthians must have banqueted and worshipped in a much more accessible location than a private villa of the elite, where invitations were customary for members and their guests.

Murphy-O’Connor’s more recent suggestion of a shop space on the ground floor of a tenement building, such as that owned by Prisca and Aquila, is a more likely suggestion, although he calculates that it might hold a group of only 10-20 believers.\textsuperscript{33} Horrell postulates, with ‘disciplined imagination’, the buildings east of the Corinthian theatre, which may have been butchery kitchens, artisan workshops, or domestic space, above which, on the upper floors, the community could have shared meals.\textsuperscript{34} This suggestion has the advantage of suiting the sub-elite status of the majority of members, as well as allowing for entry by outsiders. Henk de Jonge proposes that a rental hall or room could also have been used.\textsuperscript{35} Although archaeological findings in Corinth have not produced such a room, Carolyn Osiek proposes that the domicile of Julia Felix in Pompey was one such accommodation, for it contained three different dining areas, a \textit{biclinium} connected to a garden, a \textit{triclinium} with fountain and a multi-use area with several smaller \textit{triclina}.\textsuperscript{36}

This indicates that there is increasing recognition, as Justin Meggitt points out, that there is little firm evidence of the status level of the Corinthians and that there may

\textsuperscript{33} Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “Prisca and Aquila,” \textit{Bible Review} (December, 1992) 49-50.
\textsuperscript{34} Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 364-8.
possibly have been no one in the group who could afford a wealthy villa. Space does not permit here for an in-depth analysis of the Theissen/Meggitt discussion over the economic status of the Corinthians, but Meggitt’s point has produced, as Horrell notes, “a somewhat revised, more cautious” attitude concerning their economic status. This also indicates that the wealthy/poor split proposed by Theissen and so quickly endorsed by subsequent scholars is now recognized as a twentieth century reading back into the first century world. There arises, again, therefore, the question as to the cause of the divisions amongst the Corinthians.

Robert Jewett offers an important alternative solution for the *triclinia* location in the community at Thessalonikē. Jewett draws upon Meeks’ and Malherbe’s conclusions that the early Christian converts probably lived in the *insulae* of the inner cities rather than in private villas. Jewett references Lampe’s analysis of Roman Christians as probably living in the slums of Trastevere or Porta Capena, and analyzes the Roman Christian names as overwhelmingly persons with very low social status, such as slavery. Jewett therefore posits the idea of “tenement churches” in addition to “house churches” as locations for early Christian meals. Using the instance of the *Iobacchi* as well as the Qumran community, Jewett theorizes that a situation of daily communal meals was possible for the Jesus-group in Thessalonikē, where the food was provided by the community members, rather than a patron. While Jewett’s conclusions regarding

---


41 For discussion, see Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, “Families in the New Testament World: Households and Household Churches,” in *The Family, Religion, and Culture*, ed. Don S. Browning and Ian S. Evison (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997) 22-23. Balch and Osiek find no evidence of archaeological remains for slum apartment buildings in pre-Neronian Rome, its port Ostia, or anywhere else, but comment that “the archaeological remains we have from the mid-first century, in Pompeii and
association meals need rectification, as we shall see that there are virtually no instances of daily communal association meals in the Greco-Roman world, Jewett, with Lampe, has pointed the way forward to examining the voluntary associations for locations of meals and their food provision method in the first century.

Richard Ascough describes the associations as banqueting in a diversity of banqueting locations: in the open air, in rented spaces and tabernae, in buildings belonging to them, in multi-purpose meeting places adjacent to their shops and in cult or temple structures. Three association banqueting buildings are particularly noted: first, the meeting place of the Dionysiac Bukoloi ("cowherds") on the middle acropolis of Pergamum, which could accommodate about seventy participants in the triclinium, second, the building belonging to a wealthy traders’ association in Pompeii, which could accommodate up to one hundred diners in five separate rooms, and third, the Building of the Triclinia in Ostia, with four triclinia which could accommodate up to fifty participants.

Furthermore, Ascough makes an important point about divisions at the banquets of the associations. “Segregative commensality is not limited to those in the upper ranks – its strength lies in the ability of groups to be (self-)selective about who can join in the eating and drinking.” He points to boundaries erected at the association banquets between members, differences emphasized between patrons and members, even while holding up an ideal of member-belonging and acceptance, and group solidarity effected through insider/outside distinctions. The voluntary association banqueting customs

Herculaneum, are for condominiums for the wealthy, while the literary evidence points to the poor living in the third to fifth floors of the tall, narrow Roman apartment buildings.”


44 Ascough, “Forms of Commensality,” 10-14.
contain much evidence for divisions within a dining group - divisions which are not directly predicated upon wealth.

As we move away from the concept of the Corinthian divisions being predicated upon an economic rich/poor split, we move into ideas of groups determining their own distinctions between themselves and fellow members, as well as between insiders and outsiders. Social or group identity is now being established. The associations determined their social identity largely through the honour/shame code, as will be discussed in detail in the next chapters. If associations prove to provide some good analogies for Paul’s Corinthian community, and there is now a growing consensus that they do, determination of social identity is also at the heart of the divisions of the Corinthian community.45 This thesis will argue that the social identity and divisions evident at the Lord’s Supper in Paul’s Corinthian community are also based upon the honour/shame code of the Mediterranean world of the time. This will lead us to re-examine the divisions within the community, and suggest that they derive, not from economic status, but from divisions caused by the search for honour through patronage and office-holding.

Inscriptions, papyri and other archaeological buildings and artifacts, such as mosaics and vases, also provide us with many examples of cultic banquets, which we will argue form good analogies for the customs and piety undergirding the banquets, and of the variety of venues used for their banqueting. Rituals actually used by the associations are in scarce supply, however, perhaps because of the nature of epigraphy, and thus, only one example can be found which substantiates the elite banqueting ritual of two parts to

the meal: the meal itself and the symposium afterwards, accompanied by prayers, libations, and other forms of discussion or entertainment. However, Paul’s community is predominantly Gentile, and we will argue that he adapts the Greco-Roman banquet when instituting the ritual for his Jesus-group, albeit leading to significant problems.

Burton Mack promulgates that there is a relationship between social formation and the dynamic process of mythmaking and challenges us to explain “why and how a given combination occurs, of why the people were thinking and acting as they were, in what they were interested, and what the effective difference might be of each factor of social construction and mythmaking”. 46 This thesis is an attempt to further our knowledge in this regard through examining the banqueting practices of the associations in order to compare them to those discussed in 1 Corinthians 11:17-33. The second chapter describes the banqueting practices of the associations, with reference in particular to the importance of the banquet to the associations, the physical elements of dining facilities, traditional customs, and food rituals. The third chapter discusses the sociological elements inherent in the banquet, highlighting the honour/shame code. The significance of the banquet for identity formation, for individuals and groups, both in life and in death commemoration is explained. The fourth chapter applies this information to Paul’s Corinthian community banquet. First, the honour/shame code is argued to be present in the Corinthian banquet, just as it is in the voluntary associations. Given this similarity, other analogies are possible, which shed some light on the actual practices of the Corinthians. Analogies are discussed in the areas of banquet scheduling, banquet locations, provisions and funding, and order of banqueting ritual. The conclusion provides a summary description of the Corinthian banquet, as seen through the lenses of the association banqueting traditions.

Now the greatest external good we should assume to be the thing which we offer as a tribute to the gods, and which is most coveted by men of high station, and is the prize awarded for the noblest deeds: and such a thing is honour, for honour is clearly the greatest of external goods.

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 4.3.9-12 (LCL)

Chapter Two

**Banqueting Rituals of the Voluntary Associations**

This chapter briefly describes ‘voluntary associations’, discussing their membership, status, composition, diversity, classifications, popularity and pervasiveness within the Mediterranean world. Their banquets were popular opportunities for conviviality, but more importantly, inscriptions reveal that banquets were valued as suitable venues for displays of piety through monetary donations or ritual devotion. Archaeological discoveries evidence a wide variety of association dining locations around the Mediterranean world. Association inscriptions provide us with some knowledge of the menus of their banquets, as well as varying methods of fund-raising.

**Voluntary Associations**

As Willi Braun has noted, the early Christians in Paul’s community did not invent their banquet from nothing.\(^{47}\) There was a long-standing tradition of banqueting in their world, practiced by virtually every social level. All over the Mediterranean world, from earliest times, voluntary cultic associations joined together for conviviality and to express their piety in regularly scheduled sacrificial banquets.

The term “associations” and its cognates (e.g., “clubs,” “guilds,” the Latin “collegia”) is used by modern scholars to refer to a large number of chronologically and geographically diverse groups of people in antiquity. These relatively small groups of men and/or women with a common interest or connection met regularly for social and religious interaction.\(^{48}\)

---

\(^{47}\) Braun, “Typology of Form,” 2.

\(^{48}\) Richard S. Ascough, “Associations, Collegia, Clubs” in *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*,
Membership numbers were generally small, averaging perhaps fifteen to one hundred, and were mainly drawn from the urban poor, slaves, and freedmen.\textsuperscript{49} While there was a range of wealth within the category of freeborn and freed, the majority of these were far from wealthy in comparison to the elites.\textsuperscript{50} Intersecting social relations in the Greco-Roman world played a major role in the formation of voluntary associations, for while the members were mainly the urban poor, slaves, and freedmen, their patrons could be both wealthier and of a higher status group.\textsuperscript{51} Many people belonged to more than one association.\textsuperscript{52} With a few exceptions, such as ancient societies and Jewish synagogues, they were declared illegal under various Roman legislations occasionally enacted after 184 BCE, but they continued to thrive despite sporadic suppression.\textsuperscript{53} During this first century, with its migration and intermixing of peoples, powers and ideas, the presence of associations was felt throughout the entire Roman Empire, especially in urban areas, where they played a significant role in mediating various kinds of social exchange.\textsuperscript{54} An association became the “socially constructed replacement for the family.”\textsuperscript{55}


\textsuperscript{55} Ascough, “A Question of Death,” 519, citing Jonathan Z. Smith in “Here, There and Anywhere,” unpublished keynote address to the conference entitled, “Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and
Our main sources of information for associations are the thousands of inscriptions dating from as far back as the fifth century BCE. To date, 15 fragmentary inscriptions possibly belonging to voluntary associations have been found at Corinth.\textsuperscript{56} Extensive excavations at Ephesus have uncovered the existence of 41 trade associations and 19 cultic associations. Twenty-four voluntary associations are attested on Delos, 46 at Thessalonikē, and 59 in Ostia.\textsuperscript{57} Archaeologists in Petra, Nabatea, speculate that as many as 40 associations (marzeah) established sanctuaries in the high places of the canyon.\textsuperscript{58} James Rives points to the importance of this source of information for social and religious life in antiquity, which fills the gaps left by literary sources and gives us “a view of civic life at ground level as well as from the heights.”\textsuperscript{59} From these inscriptions we are able to determine their membership, the behavioral and leadership requirements pertaining to meetings, banquets, and rituals, and the penalties exacted for transgressing group norms (e.g., fines, floggings, and expulsions).\textsuperscript{60}

The classification of associations has proved to be exceptionally difficult, both because of the range and variety of the associations, and the specific focus of the scholar involved in the interpretation.\textsuperscript{61} Harland’s five classifications are provided here. First, there is evidence for family/household groups, such as the Dionysian initiates set up around 160 CE by Pompeia Agrippinilla in Torre Nova, Italy which included persons from such widely varying status groups as free, freed, servile, and mistress;\textsuperscript{62} or the I BCE cult of Zeus established in Philadelphia, Lydia, set up in response to a dream by

\textsuperscript{57} Peter Richardson, \textit{Building Jewish in the Roman East}, 193.
\textsuperscript{60} Harland, \textit{Associations, Synagogues and Congregations}, 52.
\textsuperscript{62} \textit{IGUR} 160 (Philadelphia).
Dionysios, for the men, women, free people and house slaves of his household.63 Second are those associations organized by profession. These comprised “producers and dealers of foods (bakers, fishers), clothing manufacturers (leather-cutters, linen-workers, purple-dyers), builders (carpenters, masons), other artisans (potters; copper, silver or gold smiths), and merchants or shippers, soldiers and elite associations such as the Arval Brethren of senatorial imperial offices at Rome.64 “Among Poland’s list of 1,200 associations and Waltzing’s almost 2,500 collegia, many fall in to the class of associations organized around a common profession.”65 Although there were exceptions, the membership was mainly male and homogeneous. The third type were neighbourhood associations, consisting of people with similar social status.66 The general guideline for association status was the closer to the centre of the city, the more respectable the association.67 Fourth were associations primarily organized around the worship of gods such as Asclepios at Pergamon or Zeus Hypsistos at Philadelphia, Egypt. Similar to the household associations, a range of socio-economic backgrounds was possible. The fifth set of social contacts was established by those of similar ethnic background. These groups too included a range of socio-economic status groups.68 This grouping included Jewish and Christian groups, who both saw themselves and were seen by others as voluntary associations.69

While many associations, especially professional guilds, show no evidence of women members, there are records of women in some associations. Household cults necessarily involved members from different ranks of society. For instance, the cult of Zeus in Philadelphia in the early first century BCE includes both men and women,

63 SIG3 985.
66 IEphesus 454, 3080. See also IGR IV 788-91 (Apameia, Phrygia); IPergamon 393, 424,434; ISmyrna 714, as referenced by Harland in “Connections with Elites,” 390.
68 IGR 1 392; IGUR 85-87; DFSJ 13 (Phoceae, III CE), DFSJ 16 (Teos III CE); DFSJ 31 (Nysa, III CE); DFSJ 33.
69 Richardson, Building Jewish, 187. Christians too were viewed as collegia: John Kloppenborg, “Edwin Hatch, 228: “Pliny’s statement that Christians in Bithynia ceased meeting after Trajan’s edict banning hetaeriae indicates both that the Christians involved saw themselves as constituting an association, and that this judgment was shared by Pliny.” See also Pearson, “Associations” 137; Klauck, The Religious Context of Early Christianity, 54; Wilken, The Christians as the Romans Saw Them, 44-46; Harrison, “Paul’s House Churches and the Cultic Associations,” 31-33; Barton & Horsley, “A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches,” 28-38; Ascough, Paul’s Macedonian Associations, 71-94.
slave and free.\textsuperscript{70} The Koinon of the Tenth Day on Delos around 166 BCE included 7 women and 9 men.\textsuperscript{71} Women as well as men received the honour of crowns.\textsuperscript{72} For instance, on Mykonos, the Dionysias Association of Ameinichos in the early second CE crowned Theano, daughter of Sopatros for she increased the revenue of the god Dionysus.\textsuperscript{73} There were also associations composed exclusively of women. We have inscriptions from five Roman collegia, several Greek and one Alexandrian association, which attest to women’s associations.\textsuperscript{74} There is evidence of women members in Philo’s Jewish group of Therapeuteae in Alexandria. They adopted the same contemplative life as the men.\textsuperscript{75} Eileen Schuller questions the earlier conclusion of scholars that the society of the Qumran scrolls was completely male. “It is becoming increasingly clear that when we consider all the material…a significant number of major texts of differing genres speak plainly of women (and often children) and assume a community in which marriage was the norm.”\textsuperscript{76}

These groupings of people must be seen against the backdrop of a fourfold order of ancient society. The four main orders of ancient society were: first, the senatorial aristocracy which was composed of the imperial elites (probably about 1 percent of the total population) and consisted of about 600 male members of the Roman senate, belonging to a few powerful families possessing birth and wealth and property of about

\textsuperscript{70} Barton & Horsley, “A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches,” 17. Also see Ascough, Paul’s Macedonian Associations, 56.
\textsuperscript{71} IG XI/4 1227; see also IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2347 (Salamine, second half IV BCE).
\textsuperscript{72} Riet van Bremen, studying inscriptions, cautions, however, that honours and membership in associations for women were always connected to family relationships, and must not be seen as an indication of political power: Riet van Bremen, The Limits of Participation: Women and civic life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1996). Contrast Joan Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World,” Greece & Rome 14 (1998) 143-165, studying the commensality literature concerning women from Homeric legend to the first century BCE, found that, towards the first century CE, women attended banquets as equals, not only in non-status roles such as slaves/prostitutes, and used banquets for power politics in similar ways to men.
\textsuperscript{73} IDelos 1522; also see Foucart 64.
\textsuperscript{74} Ascough, Paul’s Macedonian Associations, 55-58.
one million sesterces; second, the rank of *equestrian*, which required a minimum of 400,000 sesterces, and was composed of hereditary members who held the more prestigious administrative and military positions in Rome and the provinces; third, the *decurions* or civic elites, made up of wealthy families of the provinces who occupied important civic positions, including membership on the council and probably made up about 10 percent or less of the city’s population. Fourth, and below these three classes of elite, separated by a vast gulf, lay about 90% of the population, the *plebeians* or sub-elites. The plebeians were very diverse, both socially and economically. Status varied enormously depending upon ethnic background, legal standing (free, freed or slave), occupation, citizenship (civic or imperial), family, wealth, education, skill, and achievement. Shippers and traders, while still of the sub-elite, could gain wealth and honours (though far below the wealth of the elites) within the civic communities, while the freed slaves of the Augustales enjoyed great power and wealth.

**Conviviality and Piety (*eusebeia*) in the Banquets of the Associations**

Central to the rituals of the voluntary associations was the sharing of a meal. While Dennis Smith considerably overstates the case when he states that conviviality was *the* primary purpose of the voluntary associations, scholars such as Dunbabin, Donohue and Ascough agree that conviviality was one of the primary reasons for their banquets. Conviviality consolidated groups, which were helping “to fill the void created by the rather unsettled and lonely circumstances of city life for a poor person.”

---

77 Harland, “Connections with Elites,” 406 n. 2: “To give some sense of the magnitude of this wealth, it is worth noting that an average laborer made about 1,000 sesterces per year, and would, therefore, have to work a total of 1,000 years without spending a penny in order to approach senatorial wealth.”


The banquet was equally important as an opportunity to demonstrate piety to the gods. It is difficult for modern readers to understand the socio-cultural importance of suitable behaviour to the various gods, because we have tended to adopt “the prevailing notion that all who inhabited the non-urban landscape and were not much touched ‘by the civilizing knowledge of Christianity...did not have a religion in the proper sense of the term’.” However, in the ancient world, religiosity was very much a part of life, inextricably intertwined with their social and political world. Their beliefs were not represented as creeds or dogmas, but “found expression in people’s behaviour.” The world was charged with the presence of the divine which was intimately connected with people’s experiences. “One did not speak of “believing in the gods” but of “having gods,” just as a city might “have laws or customs.” In fact, piety to the gods constituted two of the four cardinal virtues. Piety to the gods consists of two elements: ‘being god-loved (θεοφιλοτής) and god-loving (φιλοθεοτής) and is demonstrated by loyalty and faithfulness. Piety was concerned with “the proper performance of cultic acts in order to maintain fitting relations between communities and the gods,” and was sometimes feasts for different reasons. The members of the mystery cults, such as the Mithras cult, the Isis cult and Eleusinian cult, enjoyed the company of fellow initiates, who had taken the oath, been accepted through initiation ceremonies and now enjoyed the intimacies gained by their sacred relationship with each other and their gods. The professional associations, such as the bakers, goldsmiths, singers, actors, fishermen, etc. enjoyed the opportunity to relax and dine with similar-minded friends and competitors who shared a common professional calling. Ethnic groups were able to enjoy their shared heritage and culture and values, while seeking the protection of the familiar gods of their homeland. Neighbourhood groups were similar, sharing the common bond that living nearby brings. Low-status groups, such as slaves and women, could enjoy privileges of the banquet that were denied to them in any other banquet setting. Associations with shared political views, such as those associated with the polis, or in ancient times, the tribes and phratries, celebrated anew their ties with the state and consolidated their hold on power and/or citizenship.

---

83 Rives, Religion in the Roman Empire, 89.
motivated by fear of the wrath of the gods which could affect the state and each community, but also by belief in the beneficence of the gods.\textsuperscript{86}

The gods were perceived as having immense power – “power that had an actual or potential impact on day-to-day life; hence the importance of acknowledging that power when people felt that they had encountered it in the natural world.”\textsuperscript{87} People turned to the gods for everyday concerns, as well as in times of crisis, such as travel, agricultural disasters, and health concerns, offering votive gifts and dedications. Piety was expressed in the form of a gift – the gift of the sacrifice of an animal or bird, flour cakes, and wine (first fruits), followed by a cultic meal partaken of by the sacrificers, who shared in the foods offered for sacrifice.\textsuperscript{88} Hymns, pledges and petitions were part of this ritual. As Batten has pointed out, piety was often connected with donation of money, with the idea that “the more one gives to the gods the greater will be the assurance of protection.”\textsuperscript{89}

The protection of the gods was important, but it was also important that their neighbours should know of their piety. Social identity of the association and its members was bound up with the display of outward piety to the gods. In the fourth century BCE founding document of a Piraeus \textit{thiasos}, the display of piety of all members is stressed: “if a member should be wronged, they and all the friends shall come to his assistance, so that everyone might know that we show piety to the gods and to our friends.”\textsuperscript{90} Piety towards the Imperial gods of the Roman empire was equally important, as seen in this I CE inscription of the Hymnodists in Hypapipia, Asia:

\begin{quote}
since it is proper to offer a visible exhibition of piety (\textit{eusebeias}) and of every intention befitting the sacred to the Sebastan household each year, the hymnodists from all Asia, coming together in Pergamum for the most sacred birthday of Sebastos Tiberius Caesar god, accomplish a magnificent work for the glory of the
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{87} Rives, \textit{Religion in the Roman Empire}, 93.
\textsuperscript{88} Arthur Darby Nock, “The Cult of Heroes,” \textit{HTR} 37 (1944) 149 clarifies that the sacrifice was considered a gift, an honour to persuade the powerful gods.
\textsuperscript{89} Alicia Batten, “The Moral World of Greco-Roman Associations,” \textit{SR} 36/1 (2007) 140.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{IG II²} 1275. All translations of inscriptions courtesy of the Toronto Hellenistic Texts Seminar, unless otherwise noted.
\end{flushright}
synodos (at Pergamum), hymning the Sebastian house, accomplishing sacrifices to the Sebastian gods, leading festivals and banquets.\textsuperscript{91}

Inscriptions to honour officials, and priests show that piety was often encouraged by generously rewarding $\textit{philotemia}$ or “love of honour” (also “public-spiritedness”), as in the 281 BCE decree of the Piraean Thiasotai of the Mother of the Gods honouring the priest:

Whereas Kephal-ion of Herakleia, having been chosen priest during the archonship of Nikios in the month of Boedromionos, has well and zealously supervised both the affairs of the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods and of the thiasotai; for good fortune, the thiasotai resolved to commend Kephal-ion of Herakleia, and to crown with an olive wreath.\textsuperscript{92}

Presidents, including female presidents, were also honoured for their $\textit{philotemia}$ as exampled in this third century BCE Attica decree: “And (it seemed good) to also praise and to crown the female president, because all the sacrifices sacrificed ...in the appointed way.”\textsuperscript{93} The display of piety evidently reflected well upon the association itself and its members.

Every voluntary association expressed its piety and identity by closely linking itself with at least one god. The names of many associations were taken from the god’s name: the Dionysiasts, the Sarapiasts, the Heraclitiasts, the Yahwists, the Christians.\textsuperscript{94} In the early years before Solon, there were many local gods worshipped by small kinship groups, whose duty it was to maintain good relations with these gods and heroes.\textsuperscript{95} Sometimes small shrines were established for them, which in later years grew until occasionally they became public cults with many pilgrim visitors, such as the shrine of Apollo on Delos, Demeter at Eleusis or Poseidon at Tinos. Many more, however, remained very small and private, the shrine or sacred grove maintained solely by its dedicated cult.

\textsuperscript{91} \textit{IEphesus} VII 3801.
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{IG II}² 1273.
\textsuperscript{93} \textit{IG II}² 1292.
\textsuperscript{94} Hans-Josef Klauck, \textit{The Religious Context of Early Christianity}, 44.
The banquets were considered to be the banquets of the gods, and the gods and heroes were thought to be either hosts or guests. Although not common, because the participation was considered to be between the sacrificers, there are occasional examples where the association entertained the god/dess as a guest at the meal. In Athens, Zeus Philios, (Zeus of the Friends), was provided with a kline (banqueting couch) at the banquet and reliefs show him present at the feast. In the Dorian area, vase paintings and reliefs picture the Dioskouroi provided with two klinai and breakfasted in the Pyrtaneion with cheese, cakes, olives and leeks. In Delphi, at the Theoxenia, Apollo and other god/desses are provided with klinai and a sacred table, from which eventually the food is distributed to the waiting banqueters.

Banquets were scheduled at regular intervals, because their members defined themselves in cult terms and reinforced “their identities through shared sacrifices to particular deities.” It has been customary for some modern scholars to view the banquets of the voluntary associations as exclusively convivial occasions. For instance, Robert Parker comments:

What of dining- and drink-clubs? Were they in any sense religious associations of the type we are considering?....Still, none of this is enough to show that any one of the hetaireiai was a religious association in the sense that its formal purpose was to honour a god or hero.

However, inscriptions reveal that honouring the patron-god was an integral part of every association banquet. For instance, the 261 BCE decree concerning the joint procession from Athens to Piraeus of two ancient cult groups from Athens (founded in 431 BCE)

---

96 Nock, “The Cult of Heroes,” 152-53, who says that “in Homer, a sacrifice is called a ‘meal of the gods’ (Odys. III 336).”
99 Nicholas R.E. Fisher, “Greek Associations, Symposia and Clubs,” in Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean Greece and Rome. Vol. 2, ed. Michael Grant and Rachel Kitzinger (New York: Charles Scribners & Sons, 1988a) 1168: “most, if not all, of these groups defined themselves, at least in part, in cult terms, reinforcing their identities through shared sacrifices to particular deities....such gatherings regularly involved shared feasting on the sacrificed meats and shared drinking of wine.”
101 Parker, Athenian Religion, 335.
and Piraeus worshipping the Thracian goddess, Bendis, include the meal as important “so that it will go well and piously for the entire ethnos in matters concerning the gods.”

Meals could also be the occasion for religious observances of prayer and worship, such as the sacred drama dramatizing the Dionysian myth with hymns from a hymnbook prepared by their priests.  

The earliest names for the voluntary associations were eranos, orgeones and thiasos. Inherent in these names is the sharing of sacrificial food. Athenian members, in one fifth century BCE inscription, called themselves orgeones which means “sacrificial companions” or “sacrificing associates” - people who come together in order to celebrate a sacrificial meal in common.” In the fifth and fourth centuries, we find hereditary groups of orgeones devoted to the cult of a hero or a god. It was important to the self-identity of these small self-perpetuating groups of neighbors and kinsmen to maintain good relations with the multitude of Attic heroes and heroines whose supernatural activity was locally limited. The Areopagus of Athens contains a fourth century BCE inscription of orgeones dedicated to the hero, Echelos, originating probably in the middle fifth century BCE, which describes the feast which they were planning in conjunction with the neighbouring Heroine-worshipping orgeones.  

In the Odyssey, Athena comments on the suitors eating at Telemachos’ table:  

“What feast is this, what gathering? How does it concern you? A banquet, or a wedding? Surely, no communal dinner (eranos).” (Odyssey 1.225-226, trans. Lattimore). The main function of the eranos was stated by Aristotle (Nic. Ethics 1160a, LCL): “some of the associations seem to exist for the enjoyment...[of their members], for the sake of

---

102 IG II2 1283.  
104 Ferguson, “Attic Orgeones,” 128; Klauck, Religious Context, 44.  
105 Ferguson, “Attic Orgeones,” 129.  
106 Ferguson, “Attic Orgeones,” 97, 114-17. As early as 411/10 BCE, there is evidence also of communities of aliens who organized themselves as orgeones dedicated to particular gods. An annual fete and banquet, the Bendideia, were celebrated at Piraeus in the shrine of the Goddess, with its attached cookshop, on the nineteenth/twentieth of Thargelion, by foreign orgeones of Bendis, the Mother of the Gods. (IG II2 1301). The Dionysiai, a group of about 15 family orgeones, heroized their priest, the patriarch, over three generations. They assembled monthly for sacrifices, paid for out of the endowment, and held annual meetings for business purposes in Poseidon, the month of the rural Dionysos.
The *eranos* was at first considered to be a meal to which all contributors brought equal contributions. However, unlike other associations, such as the *thiasoi* and *orgeones*, the *eranos* associations evolved rapidly and early on into a type of mutual lending association, wherein members sought the mutual financial advancement of their fellow members.

In Aristotle, we also find the term *thiasos*, which was the name of a group concerned with the holding of feasts (*Ath. Pol.* 20, 21, LCL). These *thiasoi* were societies which organized themselves into a recognizable group by celebrating sacrifices, processions and other ceremonies in honour of a god, and had a good time in doing so. *Thiasos* is the most important single term for associations. The first mentioned *thiasotai* were the *Dipoliastai* whose members celebrated the *Dipolieia* and were vendors in a sales record of land around 330 BCE. Slaves and non-citizen groups, most of which were termed *thiasoi*, recognized the advantages of forming into groups in the third century. At the centre of their communal life was normally their own private shrine. In the first three centuries CE, *collegia* called themselves “college of messmates” (*collegium*


109 Later the word meant both an association of women, metics and slaves with only a few citizen members, as well as a loan which was collected from a group of people; cf. Leiwo, Martii. “Religion, or Other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens,” in *Early Hellenistic Athens: Symptoms of a Change*, ed. Jaakko Frösén, 103-17. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens. (Helsinki: Finnish Institute at Athens, 1997) 108 and Nicholas K. Ruah, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion Economy, and Trade Society at Hellenistic Roman Delos*, 166-87 B.C. (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1993) 260. There is an inscription from 324/3 (*IG* II 2 2935) which is found on a stele bearing a relief of Zeus: “Eranistai dedicated to Zeus Philios in the archonship of Hegesias.” (Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 337) There was also a group of *eranistai*, who sacrificed to ‘Zeus Saviour and Heracles and the Saviours’ (*IG* II 2 1291), whom Parker thinks were likely the *Dioscuri* (339 n. 33).


111 Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 334. There were also *Paianistai*, which were citizen clubs honouring Greek gods, such as Pan, in the late fourth century (Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 335). There was a *thiasoi* of Heracles whose main cult-activity was dining in honour of the great diner Heracles (Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 333). A cult-table, *trapeza* from about 400 BCE has been found, which belonged to Simon of Kydathenai, priest of Heracles and the *koinon* of *thiasotai* of 15 members (*IG* II 2 2343).

112 Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 338: “Sometimes they are...societies of foreigners gathered round a native god. Aphrodite and Adonis are honoured, it seems, by Phoenicians, the only named worshipper of Zeus Labraundos of Caria is a Carian, and two of the three known thiasotai of the Phrygian hero Tynaros bear foreign-sounding names.” There was a *thiasos* of slaves at Eleusis sacrificing to Zeus Soter and Hygieia (*SEG* XXXII 149; Robert OMS VII.720-29 in Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 339, n. 33) This group met monthly for sacrificial meals in the treasurer’s house. A society of shipowners and traders who sacrifice to Zeus Xenios in the first century BCE call themselves *oi katakleimenoi*, ‘banqueters’ who honour the Great Gods and a deity beginning with A.
comestorum), “drinking buddies” (sodales ex symposia), and “table companions who customarily share banquets together” (convictores qui una epula vesci solent).\textsuperscript{113}

Ritual Dining Rooms

There is archaeological evidence of small dining rooms connected with the shrines of cult associations from the eleventh century BCE.\textsuperscript{114} Beginning in 1000 BCE, cults banqueted in the round hearth-house temples at Perachora near Corinth, and on Crete, at Dreros and Kommos, and in Thermos in the sanctuary of the Aetolians.\textsuperscript{115} In Thebes, too, at the sanctuary of the Kabeirote mysteries, similar evidence of seats for six to ten people and food debris is apparent.\textsuperscript{116}

The eighth century BCE saw the beginning of the long-standing Mediterranean fashion of reclining upon couches. This fashion originated with the elite of the Near East and by the seventh century BCE permeated all Mediterranean societies, including the cult

\textsuperscript{113} John F. Donahue, \textit{The Roman Community at Table During the Principate} (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004) 126; Dunbabin, \textit{The Roman Banquet}, 99.

\textsuperscript{114} Ascough, “Forms of Commensality,” 3.

\textsuperscript{115} Frederick Cooper and Sarah Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings,” in \textit{Symposia: A Symposium on the Symposion}, ed. Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 66. Evidence was found in the sanctuary of Kommos of tableware and deposits of bones, ashes, shells next to the four altars and bench-like structures for sitting. For the Aetolians, see Burkert, \textit{Greek Religion}, 89.

\textsuperscript{116} Cooper and Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings,” 66.
banquets. Diners reclined on the left elbow and ate with the right hand. At the Greek banquets, only the men and their courtesans reclined, while the women and young sons (if their presence was deemed acceptable) sat on the couches. Later, in the Roman period, respectable women also reclined.

Fig. 2.3 Hall of Benches, Sarapeion A. This private dining hall was erected by Egyptian residents of Delos around 220 BCE. Photo by R. McRae, 2006.


Archaeologists have identified two well-established standard types of sanctuary dining-rooms in early Greek civilization. These dining-rooms evidenced the following features: square rooms, paved or cemented floor with a raised border along the walls for seven or eleven reclining couches, an off-centre door, drainage, wall stucco and access to water. They tended to be built in rows, comprised of two to six units (the Brauronian stoa), or up to fifteen units (the South Stoa on the Athenian Agora), each with its own door opening from a common porch or portico. The seven-couch type was only employed in the Archaic period, while the eleven-couch type continued on from the Archaic times into the Hellenistic period. The dining-rooms of the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth were established in the sixth century BCE and in the fifth century, expanded to include facilities for cooking, washing and reclining.

---

119 Bergquist, Birgitta, “Sympotic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining-Rooms,” in *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*, ed. Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 37. Bergquist speculates that rooms such as these at Megara (room A) and at Agia Pelagia in which there were two hearths, were probably divided into sub-groups with the symposiasts on “four to nine couches comfortably communicating within a three-and/or two-couch distance in both directions.” Hanging textiles across the rooms may have furthered an effective division of the room into more intimate dining spaces.

120 Bergquist, “Sympotic Space,” 37-47. Bergquist speculates that rooms such as these at Megara (room A) and at Agia Pelagia in which there were two hearths, were probably divided into sub-groups with the symposiasts on “four to nine couches comfortably communicating within a three-and/or two-couch distance in both directions.” Hanging textiles across the rooms may have furthered an effective division of the room into more intimate dining spaces.

121 Nancy Bookidis, “Ritual Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth: Some Questions” in *Sympotica. A Symposium on the Symposium*, ed. Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Oxford Press, 1990) 92. There are sketches of the dining rooms attached to her article and also in John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003). The stewing and boiling of food was carried out in a variety of cooking-pots, either directly on the floor or on a raised hearth with burners of clay.
In the second century BCE, small dining rooms called *triclinia* appeared, which seemed to be reserved for dining. The Latin word *triclinium* describes a long, narrow, fairly small room with three broad couches set in a *Pi* shaped formation, with either a single table in the middle, or a long shelf running alongside the couches for cups and dishes. The word has now come to describe both the room as well as the distinctive configuration of the couches. From Palmyra, Africa, McLaughlin has identified inscriptions and *tesserae*, of the same period, which reference the *marzeah* as both a ritual banqueting-hall and the members of a ritual banqueting group.\(^{122}\) *Biclinia* are also recorded in the Greco-Roman world, in which there are two couches, and later, in the third and fourth CE, *stibadas* or *sigma* arrangements appeared, where the couch is in a semi-circle at the end of the room. *Triclinia* are identified by the configuration of the couches, as well as the decorated mosaic floor, and painted walls.\(^{123}\) The chart in Appendix A lists archaeological evidence of the locations, dates, and number of dining-rooms of 48 cult associations around the Mediterranean.


\(^{123}\) Dunbabin, *Roman Banquet*, 36-52.
Inscriptions occasionally include records of gifts specifically directed to the sanctuary dining-room: at Ostia, an inscription records, amongst other gifts, six benches, four tables and two stools, six mattresses and four cushions.\textsuperscript{124} The patron of the temple to Malagbel and Bebelahamon and Benefal and Manaval in Dacia endowed it with a kitchen.\textsuperscript{125} The third CE synagogue of Stobi, Macedonia, bears an inscription commemorating the donation of C. Tiberius Polycharmos of his private house for a synagogue, \textit{triclinium} and \textit{tetrastoon}, in fulfillment of a vow.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{124} Peter Richardson, \textit{Building Jewish}, 198.
\textsuperscript{125} Ramsay MacMullen, \textit{Paganism in the Roman Empire} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981) 38. We find in a Piraeus inscription dating around 222 BCE that they honour their appointed supervisors that year because they “have taken responsibility, after the members voted to repair the kitchen and the...and, displaying their public spirit, they donated...drachmae from their own resources and were zealous to accomplish the matters that had been vote upon.” (\textit{IG II} \textsuperscript{2} 1301).
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{CIJ} 694.
Ritual dining of small associations also occurred in rented accommodations, such as inns, or large villas such as the House of Julia Felix. This large establishment in Pompey contains three different dining areas: a *biclinium* connected to a garden; a *triclinium* with fountain and Nilotic decoration, and multi-use area with several smaller *triclinia*. A large vineyard near the amphitheatre at Pompeii is another rental possibility for it contained two masonry *klinai*. Association members met in dining rooms which were attached to major civic temples, such as the Builders of Ravenna who met in the columned portion of the temple of Neptune. At Pompeii, the millers, apple-sellers, gardeners, and well-diggers borrowed a corner cafe. The poorest associations met in the *popinae*, or corner cafes, which also served as houses of prostitution.

Both the inscriptions and artistic renditions indicate that ritual dining occurred mostly out of doors, where “a bed of twigs, *stibas*, takes the place of seats or banqueting couches, and the house is replaced by an improvised hut, *skenē* – misleadingly translated as tent.” For instance, a 200 BCE calendar engraved by a cult in Mykonos indicates that feasting will occur out of doors: “On the tenth of (the month of) Bacchion, at Deiras,

---

129 MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*, 86.
130 Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 107; see also MacMullen, *Social Relations*, 68.
to Dionysus Baccheus, a he-goat of the finest quality; the officials shall provide the cost and take part of the feast; they shall have the feast on the spot.”131 The regulations of the Andanian mysteries, inscribed in 96 BCE, indicate the celebration of their feasts occurs in tents, with the tents of the male officers being limited to thirty-square feet with lavish expenditures strictly controlled: “no leather coverings, nor curtains...Let no one have a couch in (his) tent, nor silver jewelry worth more than three hundred drachmai.”132 The Arval Brothers, priests to the Dea Dia in Rome, held their frequent ritual banquets in a sacred grove.133

**Sacrificial Food**

Throughout the Greco-Roman period, meat was incorporated as part of the sub-elite diet during the sacrifices to the many cult deities which were held throughout the year. Rarely was a sacrifice completely burnt. Instead portions were dedicated to the gods and the rest divided and given to the priests and to the banqueters.134 In the ancient Greek polis, there were many public festivals in the year, and each polis had its own calendar.135 In the Roman era, banquets were part of eight public festivals.

Associations also celebrated their own banquets, often at monthly intervals, as well as at stated times of the year, such as the anniversary festival of the group’s founding day, birthdays of patrons, festivals and birthdays of gods, and at funerals.136 Parts of the 479 BCE inscription from Miletus, Ionia give us some idea how a smaller cult would organize their sacrificial days and how they would distribute the wine and the meat from the victims. The Molpoi (singers) were a cultic fraternity dedicated to Apollo, with its presidents serving as eponymous magistrates at Miletus:

They shall begin to sacrifice the victims...from these to the Delphic Apollo. And mixing bowls [kraters in which wine and water are formally mixed] are mixed as the Paean [hymn to Apollo] is chanted in the ceremony; the outgoing magistrate shall sacrifice to Istia from half (?) and he shall dedicate the mixing bowls and

---

131 Syll² 1024=LSCG 96.
132 IG 5/1 1390.
133 MacMullen, Paganism, 35.
134 For detailed information on the ritual of sacrifice, see Burkert, Greek Religion, 54-98.
135 Burkert, Greek Religion, 227.
136 See, for instance, the lobacchoi IG II² 1368.
chant a paean. On the tenth day of the games two mature victims shall be given by the molpoi to the stephanaphoroi and they shall be sacrificed to the Delphic Apollo and the stephanaphoroi, both the new and the former, shall compete and they shall drink wine and mixing bowls shall be dedicated just as in the ceremony....Roasting the entrails, boiling the meat, boiling and dividing the loin and the fifth part to which the stephanaphoroi are entitled, and allotment of the sacred portion....The Onitadai shall receive from the molpoi all of loins apart from those to which the stephanaphoroi are entitled, all the hides, three sacrificial offerings, from each victim, and the leftovers of the sacrifices, the wine that is left over in the kraters.\textsuperscript{137}

There are many inscriptions which itemize the recipient of each part of the sacrifice. For example, an inscription from Mykonos around 200 BCE contains a long list of sacrifices drawn up when the union of two cults caused the revision of their calendar of sacrifices.\textsuperscript{138}

The associations sought and rewarded patrons who undertook the important role of contributing to their food supply, or paying for their private banquets, and took care to honour them in various ways.\textsuperscript{139} In Thera, Santorini, between 210 and 195 BCE, a heroic cult was established by Epicteta who made a large donation of money (3000 drachma) to an Andreion of relatives for three days of sacrifices and banquets every year, on the understanding that the association would enshrine Epicteta, her husband, Phoinix, and two sons, Cratesilochos and Andragoras, as heroes.\textsuperscript{140} The endowment was to be invested in land mortgages, yielding a yearly income of 210 drachma to pay for the sacrificial victims, (one per day), wine, (three refills), wheat cakes, dry cheese, fish, crowns, music and perfumes for the sacrifice, and for the banquet and entertainment each night. This income was to be supplemented by contributions from the new official of rank each year, as well as the contributing members. The officiant prescribed the parts of the sacrificial victims which were to be sacrificed to the heroes, and which parts to be divided among

\textsuperscript{137} LSAM 50.
\textsuperscript{138} LSCG 96 (Mykonos, 200 BCE); see also IG XX/3 436 (Thera, Santorini; IV BCE); IG XII/3 436 (Thera; IV BCE).
\textsuperscript{139} For two invaluable tables of meals received from benefactors, see Donahue, \textit{Roman Community}. One table itemizes one-time meals, and the other itemizes annual feasts.
\textsuperscript{140} IG XII/3, 330.
the members for the banquet. The club members decided on the banquet and how much it would cost.

The Roman *collegium* of Aesclepius and Hygia in 153 CE honoured Salvia Marcellina, daughter of Gaius Salvius who donated in memory of her father Flavius Apollonius, procurator of the Augustans and Caieto, her husband, not only land for a dining solarium, but also banquets for the 60 members, with the income to be reserved for monetary presents for the officials, and presents of bread and wine to be distributed on the scheduled days of September 19, November 9, January 9, February 22, March 14 and 22 and May 11:

it was also agreed (that) on the 9th of November the anniversary of the collegium, they shall distribute from the above-mentioned income in our schola near the (temple of)Mars: to the curators, 4 denarii and bread (worth) 3 assaria each; to the quinquennalis, 9 sextarii of wine; to the pater collegi, 9 sextarii of wine; to dues-exempt members, 6 sextarii of wine each; to the curators, 6 sextarii of wine each; to individual members, 3 sextarii of wine each....

(It was) also (decided) that on the day before the Ides of March there shall be a dinner in the same place, which Oflius Hermes, the quinquennalis, has promised to provide each year for all present, and to give out the presents as is customary.\(^{141}\)

Inscriptions often indicate that the *boule*, the *demos* and the private associations cooperated in the passing of an honorific decree for benefactors who had ‘fed the city in difficult times’, or provided the oil for the *gymnasiarchy*, as can be seen from inscriptions in Phyrgian Apameia.\(^{142}\) The city of Athens provided the lunch for the private *orgeones* of the Thracian traders in Piraeus, who participated in the civic annual procession

---

\(^{141}\) *CIL* VI 10234. There are many examples: In Delos, the Association of merchants, shippers and warehousemen, calling themselves the *Poseidonias tae* of Berytos, in the mid II BCE honoured their patron, Marcus Minatos, son of Sextus, for, amongst many other things, donating a public dinner in the *triclinia* in their sanctuary (*IDelos* 1520). In Athens, in 37 BCE, Diodoros son of Sokrates, founder, hosted the association members at his own expense, “spending not a little money” (*IG* II\(^{2}\) 1343). In Ostia, A. Egrilius Faustus left in his will a sum of 4,000 *sesterces* to his guild for an annual banquet commemorating his birthday: Russell Meiggs, *Roman Ostia* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960) 326. In the first century, the *Mystai* of Zeus Dionysos, an association in Thessalonikë were given a vineyard by Julius (cognomen unknown) which provided fruit for the banquet held each year (*IG* X/2 259).

\(^{142}\) Onno van Nijf, *The Civic World of the Professional Associations in the Roman East* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1997), 183.
celebrating the Thracian goddess, Bendis. The orgeones of this cult were given the right to found and own a sanctuary on Attic soil, around 431 BCE. Subsequently the festival of the Bendideia was adopted by Athenian citizens, and the goddess, Bendis, was processed by both orgeones and Athenian citizens from the Athens sanctuary to the Pireaean sanctuary.\(^{143}\)

As an alternative to, or in conjunction with having the patron/city supply the food, many associations collected membership fees to subsidize their banquets. A Delian association of Greeks from Egypt around the second century BCE encouraged both methods to fund their banquets, by honouring two patrons as well as exacting fees paid into the common fund.\(^{144}\) In 223 BCE the Egyptian association of Horus Behoudti agreed to assemble in the temple of Horus in the village of Souchos Pisai, to sacrifice to the brother-sister gods, King Ptolemaios and Arsinoe, and all the benefactor gods of Egypt, and hold a monthly feast there, giving 1 qite of silver as dues to subsidize the festival.\(^{145}\)

Roberts, Skeat and Nock cite the example of a Tebtunis, Egypt series of regulations, made for one year each, by cult associations between 180, 79 and 137 BCE: “We will assemble before Suchos on feast days. We will give our contributions on feast days, paying them to our president: if any man does not pay, the president shall take security and shall make the man pay a fine in addition.”\(^{146}\) There is evidence of entertainment

\(^{143}\) For inscriptions and comments on the Thracian cult of Bendis, see IG II\(^2\) 1283 (ca 260 BCE), 1284, (259/58? BCE), 1255 (337/36 BCE), 1256 (329/28 BCE), 1361 (2\(^{nd}\) half of IV BCE), 1324 (early III BCE); See also IG II\(^2\) 1327; Ferguson, “The Attic Orgeones,” 97-98; van Nijf, Civic World, 197.

\(^{144}\) PLille 29. See also PMich V 244).

\(^{145}\) Colin Roberts, Theodore C. Skeat and Arthur Darby Nock, “The Gild of Zeus Hypsistos,” HTR 29 (1936), 81. In Philadelphia, the Guild of Zeus Hypsistos (circa 69-58 BCE) inducted their president in a document, commanding him to “make for all the contributors one banquet a month in the sanctuary of Zeus, at which they should in a common room, pouring libations, pray, and perform the other customary rites on behalf of the god and lord, the king” (PLond VII 2193). The koinon of the Poseidonists in the mid second century BCE in Delos charged their treasurer to withdraw 150 drachmae annually from the common fund for a private association meal honouring their benefactor, Marcus Minatius son of Sextus, (IDelos 1520). Penalties for non-conformance were 1000 drachmae! The cult of lobacchoi specified monthly dues for wine, plus an entrance fee, as well as monetary penalties for all disorderly conduct, which may have helped to finance the banquets (IG II\(^2\) 1368). A value-commensurate donation of wine was expected from every lobacchoi member who received a legacy or honour or appointment, or to celebrate a marriage, birth, Pitcher festival, coming of age and citizenship. Three officials were also required to provide additional wine donations on festival occasions.
costs in a few papyri inscriptions from Philadelphia in the Fayoum, with financial records available for the payment of wine, a flute-player and a catamite.\textsuperscript{147}

The symposium literature vividly illustrates the sumptuousness of the food served at the feasts of the elite. Inscriptions and archaeological finds unfortunately do not give many details of the food served at association feasts. The collegium of Diana and Antinous specified good wine, bread worth two asses, four sardines, sausages, a single place setting, and warm water and utensils. The formal meals such as epulum (feast) and cena (formal dinner) were the preferred choice, yet something less could often be offered, typically cake (crustulum) and sweet wine (mulsum) along with a distribution of cash (sportulum), which may have been used to add to the fare received, if they chose to do so.\textsuperscript{148} The members of the cult of Mēn may have dined solely on meat, bread and fruit.\textsuperscript{149}

In the second century CE, the cult of Asclepius and Hygia in Rome specified that in addition to a dinner provided on the day before the Ides of March, the diners be given sportulae of differing amounts of wine, bread and money, depending on their status, presumably to augment the feast.\textsuperscript{150}

There are two instances of association members bringing their own food, found in a Tebtunis guild of slaves in the first century CE. The regulations specified that members must bring one drachma and two loaves to the funeral banquet for a member.\textsuperscript{151} The first century CE Attica inscription from the cult of the god, Men, which was made up of slaves, also suggests members bringing food:

> If anyone fills a (offering) table for the god, let him receive a half-portion (of its contents)....Association members shall provide what is fitting for the god, (namely) a right leg and a hide and a kotyle of oil and a chous of wine and a measure’s worth of well-kneaded cake and three sacred cakes, two measures of small cakes and [hard-shelled fruits].\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{148} Donahue, Roman Community, 130; see also Ilaria Gozzini Giacosa, A Taste of Ancient Rome, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992) 197, for a recipe from the cooking treatise of Apicius for mulsum: Mix 1 bottle aromatic dry white wine and 3 tbs. liquid honey, and leave to ferment for a month.
\textsuperscript{149} See more on this cult’s menu below.
\textsuperscript{150} CIL VI 10234.
\textsuperscript{151} PMich V 243 (early I CE, Tebtunis); P Lille Dem. 29 (223 BCE, Fayum, Egypt).
\textsuperscript{152} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1366.
There is evidence of abundance at some banquets. The supply of wine or beer to some associations may have provoked Cyprian, as well as Philo, the Jewish philosopher from Alexandria, to rail against the drunken excesses of Greco-Roman associations.\textsuperscript{153} As well, in Rome, Varro complained that collegia were partly to blame for the high price of food.\textsuperscript{154} In 161 BCE, a sumptuary tax was passed setting limits to the amount of money that could be spent on each dinner. It was decreed that only 120 asses (HS 48) could be spent on each dinner in addition to vegetables, bread and wine; that only native women could be served; and that only one hundred pounds of silverware be supplied for a banquet.\textsuperscript{155}

One inscription provides details of the order of the ritual of sacrifice. The foundation of Epicteta specifies different times for the bread sacrifice and wine libation. The food offerings are described this way:

the one who officiates the first day will offer to the Muses a victim and offerings consisting of cakes made with 5 choinix of wheat and a dry cheese (costing?) a stater. In addition, he will provide crowns for the gods and all the other necessary things for all the sacrifices. And from these things he will prescribe for the gods the parts of the victim that are sacred, and a cake.

The one who officiates the second day will offer to the heroes Phoinix and Epicteta victim and offerings, consisting of cakes made with 5 choinix of wheat and a dry cheese (costing?) a stater. In addition, he will provide crowns for the heroes and all the other necessary things for the sacrifice, and he will prescribe the parts of the victim that are sacred, a cake, a bread, a parax [perhaps a cake] and three fish.

The one who officiates on the third day will sacrifice in the same manner in the honour of the heroes, Cratesilochos and Andragoras, as it has been prescribed for the honour of Phoinix and of Epicteta.

When the officiants offer these sacrifices, they will hand over to the club all the cake and half of the entrails, and will keep the rest for themselves.

Earlier in the inscription, there appears this resolution:

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{153} MacMullen, \textit{Social Relations}, 178, n.74 referencing Cyprian: Ep. 67.6.2; Philo: \textit{In Flaccum} 4.
\textsuperscript{154} MacMullen, \textit{Social Relations}, 178, n.74 referencing R.R. 3.2.16.
\textsuperscript{155} Donahue, \textit{Roman Community}, 56.
\end{footnotesize}
It has been resolved to accept the proposal of (Epicteta), and to hold the meeting after the first payment and, after the meal, to pour all of the first cup, as a libation in the honour of Muses, Phoinix, Epictete, Cratesilochos and Andragor.\textsuperscript{156}

Other inscriptions, while not nearly so precise, list the food offerings first and the wine libation later. In Priene, an inscription recording the sale of the Dionysian priesthood records that

he shall receive from the civic sacrifices a shoulder, tongue, skin as portions from the altar. But he should supply the incense, barley, frankincense, cakes, and one tetarteuś \textsuperscript{a measurement of barley\textquoteleft } for cow, one hemiektēus \textsuperscript{a measurement of barley\textquoteleft } for sheep, one-half, for a suckling pig, a two-choinix measure.\textsuperscript{157}

Front seats in the theatre, a gold crown, and a long robe follow next, and then: “he shall sacrifice the (inaugural) sacrifices in the theatre of Dionysos Melponos and shall place the frankincense (on the altar) and shall begin the drink offering and offer the prayers on behalf of the city of the Prienians.” The drink offering seems to be offered later than the food offering, and possibly at the beginning of a series of libations.

**Summary**

It is evident that ritual banquets were important to the voluntary associations from the eleventh century BCE onward, for there are many archaeological finds of dining rooms attached to shrines around the whole of the Mediterranean. Associations used at least five types of dining accommodations: special rooms attached to their shrines, sites at burial locations, rented rooms, public taverns and sacred spaces outdoors. The banquet played a major role in these associations as vehicle for the demonstration of pious behaviour towards the powerful gods. Patrons and membership fees paid for the vast majority of the sacrifices and subsequent meals, with only two inscriptions indicating that members brought food themselves. *Eranos* associations, who brought shared food, quickly became money-lending institutions, and died out for the most part in the third century BCE. Quality and quantity of food varied, with conspicuous consumption.

\textsuperscript{156} IG XII/3, 330 (my emphasis).
\textsuperscript{157} IPriene 174, II BCE.
deplored in some associations, while others reveal a sparcity of food, probably dependent upon the monetary resources of the individual association. In regulations about the meals, there is little evidence for the order of the meal, with only one clear example from a funerary banquet in Thera. This indicates a type of meal with two parts, one which begins with the breaking of bread and eating of food, and the second, which begins with libations of wine to the gods.
Therefore the great-souled man is he who has the right disposition in relation to honours and disgraces.... since it is honour above all else which great men claim and deserve.

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 4.3.9-12 (LCL)

Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,
Is the immediate jewel of their souls.
Who steals my purse steals trash: 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him.
And makes me poor indeed.
Shakespeare, *Othello* 3.3.155-161.

**Chapter Three**

**Honour and Shame at the Banquet**

In Chapter two, we discussed the banquet as an essential part of the behaviour of the voluntary associations, and described the variety of dining rooms and food rituals. In this chapter, in response to Braun’s challenge to examine what groups do with meals, we will examine the Mediterranean socio-cultural code of honour and shame, which governed the behaviour of the associations and their members. In public banquets, processions, theatres, and funerary monuments, associations competed with the civic institutions to reward their members and patrons with public recognition and honourable status. The intense competition, however, could result in detrimental behaviour and faction-making, against which the associations found it necessary to legislate using fines and suspensions.

**Honour and Shame**

Banquets were also important for establishing social identity in the ancient world. “It is becoming an accepted fact that honour and shame were pivotal values in antiquity that structured the daily lives of peoples around the Mediterranean.”¹⁵⁸ The voluntary associations subscribed to the same cultural agonistic social values of honour and shame

as the Mediterranean society in which they lived. In this code of values, honour was a social construct, a male person’s claim to self-worth, both individually (of secondary importance) and collectively (of prime importance), ascribed (the passive acquisition through birth, family connections or endowment by notable persons of power) and acquired (actively sought and achieved, often at the expense of one’s equals). Honour belonged to the male and indicated his social standing and rightful place in society – in other words, his social identity. One’s honour position was drawn according to one’s power, gender and position on the social scale, and “the ‘language’ of praise and blame was utterly conventional.” For honour to work, the claim to honour must be acknowledged, usually by one’s extended family and village. Honour functioned within a worldview of “limited good” or perception of scarcity, where all good things existed in limited quantity. Honour was gained at someone’s expense.

Shame or dishonour resulted from lack of acknowledgement by those whose opinion one values. Aristotle claims that shame adheres to those who fail to demonstrate the four cardinal virtues (Rhet. 2.6.3-4, LCL). Honour was constantly challenged, for every social interaction outside the family or immediate circle of friends was perceived as a challenge to honour. Such a society is called an “agonistic society,” with its intensely competitive nature and its common envy towards successful persons. The head symbolized the seat of honour, and thus, honour is displayed when the head (or bust) is crowned, anointed, touched or covered. The head of the table or the head of an organization is similarly a seat of honour.

“Throughout their lives, individuals in antiquity were embedded in some collective or group – either the family, which was the dominant institution of that social world, or peer groups at the gymnasium, symposium, army, synagogue, or assembly of citizens in the polis.” Belonging to the group not only conferred worth and respect to its individual members, but also conferred worth and respect by virtue of association. Holding office in the group conferred great honour, for in a voluntary group, it was the group and the office, which bore the quality of honour.

---

160 Neyrey, Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew, 10.
161 Neyrey, Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew, 28.
The Association Banquet

The associations and their banquets were seen by their membership as an acceptable (i.e. honourable) source of social identity. As Claude Grignon observed, commensality (banqueting) tends to “approve and express discontinuities that separate human groups” allowing members to “assert or to strengthen a ‘We’ by pointing out and rejecting, as symbols of otherness, the ‘not We’, strangers, rivals, enemies, superiors, or inferiors.” Entrance criteria for admittance to the group and therefore to the banquet were well defined in the association inscriptions, encouraging this method of ‘othering’. Some groups set membership fees, as well as recognizing inheritance rights, such as the Athenian Iobackchoi, who exacted a higher admittance payment for those without inheritance rights. The cult of Bendis charged lifetime dues. Some associations, such as the Andanian mysteries, observed a period of initiation and consecration, while others, such as the Mystai of Zeus demanded an oath. An eranos in Athens in II CE convened a club who declared that “it is not lawful for anyone to enter this most holy assembly without being first examined as to whether he is holy (agios) and pious (eusebeus) and good (agathos).”

---

162 Van Nijf, Civic World, 28.
165 IG II² 1368 (175-6 CE).
166 For more examples of membership dues, see IDelos 1521 (Synodos of Greeks from Egypt, II BCE); IDelos 1519 (Tyrian Merchants and Shippers, 153/2 BCE); IG II² 1283 (Cult of Bendis, Piraeus, 261/0 BCE); IGII 1327 (Piraeus); SIG3 1106 (Foundation of Diomedon Kos, 300 BCE); IG IX/1,670 (Dionysiac Thiasos, Phycos, II CE); PMich V 243 (Tebtunis, Fayum, I CE); P.Lille Dem. 29 (Association of Horus Behoudti, Souchos, Egypt, 223 BCE); P. Cairo Dem. 30605,6 (Association of Souchos, Tebtunis, 157/56 BCE); CIL XIV 2112 (By-Laws of Society of Lanuvium 136 CE). PMich V 244 (Tebtunis, slave association of Apolysimi on an imperial estate, 43 CE); PMich V 243 (Tebtunis, I CE).
167 For examples of oath-taking, see IG II² 1369 (Athens, II CE); IG II² 1291 (Piraeus, III BCE); IG II² 1361 (Piraeus, 350 BCE); IG II² 1365 and IG II² 1366 (The Rule of Men, Laurion, I CE); IG V/1 1390 (Andanian Mysteries, 96 BCE); IG X/2 259 (Mystai of Zeus Dionysos, Thessalonica, I CE); SIG3 985 (Private Cult of Zeus, Philadelphia, Lydia, I BCE).
168 IGII 1369.
All associations set behavioural rules and penalties if the rules were broken. The meal was part of the system of reward and punishment of the association’s honour/shame code. If members broke the rules, they could be fined or expelled from the meal. Fines, which were considerable, went into the association’s treasury, and all would know, to his/her shame, that this fine probably funded the next meal. If expelled - treated as if they were outsiders - they would suffer three-fold dishonour: personally, they would be denied the sharing of conviviality; semi-publicly, their expulsion would be known to all ‘insider’ members; publicly, in their polis, their expulsion would be apparent, as dates of association meals were published on stela located in public places.

The banquet was the chief venue for publicly recognizing and rewarding significant contributions to the association. Inscriptions often included the wish that their association “increase by zeal for honour,” or that “there shall be a rivalry among everyone to strive for honour among them, everyone knowing that they will be honoured in a way worthy of those who themselves show kindness.”

Members competed for official leadership positions within their associations – positions that, because of their rank and status would have been denied them in their civic institution. Through these positions they were able to exert some measure of control over their collegium, and provide a structure for negotiating relationships with the officials of the municipality and the elite. Positions such as quinquennalis (collegia president), magister cenarum (collegia master of the banquet), archisynagogos and archon (president of the Greek banquet), archeranistes (master of the Greek banquet), epimeletes (supervisors) and tamias (treasurer) were desirable and highly respected, although often financially onerous, requiring considerable disbursement of their private funds.

---

169 IG II² 1369 (Eranos of Liopesi, Attica, II CE) and IG II² 1292 (Cult of Sarapis, Athens, III BCE).
there were levels of leadership and honours to which members could aspire.\textsuperscript{173} An association in Piraeus erected a monument which honoured Hermes, son of Hermogenes, their treasurer of many years, because he continually acted \textit{piously} towards the gods and proved himself beneficent both to the general membership and to the individual members, putting himself at the disposal of each, and (being) both eager that the \textit{appropriate sacrifices} to the gods be made and paying for these frequently, generously, often from his own resources, and also for some who had died, when the association had no money, he paid for the tomb, so that even though they have died they might remain noble, and (he) made expenditures for repairs and he was the one who organized the original collection of the common fund, and he continually talks about and advises what is best and in all things shows himself to be high minded. For good fortune, it seemed good to the members to approve Hermes, son of Hermogenes, of the deme Paionides, and \textit{to crown him on account of the excellence which he has shown to the gods and collectively, to the membership, in order that there might be a rivalry among the rest who aspire to honour} knowing that they will receive thanks benefiting those who are benefactors of the association of the members.\textsuperscript{174}

Official tenure times varied, with many officials elected annually, some for five years, and some for a lifetime. Many religious cults considered their official priesthoods so honorific and valuable that individuals were required to purchase these offices at great expense.\textsuperscript{175} Considerable shame, as well as financial deprivation, resulted from failure to honour one’s banquet or priesthood commitments. A funerary cult in Lasos in the Imperial Period warns that, “if they do not complete the sacrifices and the banquet as prescribed…let each of the guilty pay a fine of 3000 drachmae to the one who set up the trust.”\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{173} Ascough, “Greco-Roman Philosphic, Religious and Voluntary Associations,” 15.
\textsuperscript{174} \textit{IG II} \textsuperscript{2} 1327 (my emphasis).
\textsuperscript{175} For examples of purchasing the priesthood, see \textit{Syll3} 1009 (Priesthood of Asclepios, Chalcedon, I BCE); \textit{IPriere} 174 (I BCE Priesthood of Dionysos Phileos); \textit{IPriere} 201-2 (purchase of priesthood for life for cult of Poseidon Heliconios, Anatolia II BCE).
\textsuperscript{176} \textit{IAsos} 245-246; for further examples of warnings, see also \textit{IHierapP23} (Hierapolis, third CE); \textit{IDelos} 1520 (II BCE); \textit{IG} \textsuperscript{11} \textsuperscript{2} 1368 (Athens, 178 CE); \textit{IDelos} 1521, \textit{PMich} 243; \textit{PLond} 2710; \textit{PDem.Cairo} 30605,30606,30619a and b, 31178, 31179; \textit{PDemLille} I 29.21-22 (Norsa, Elezione 9-10) and \textit{PBerl} 3115.
Wealthy patrons contributed towards the building and upkeep of association meeting halls, sanctuaries and banqueting facilities, in exchange for the ‘symbolic capital’ before gods and fellow citizens, which the association could give them.\textsuperscript{177} Individuals of religious associations benefited from the ‘kinship’ networks established between patrons and sub-elite, allowing poorer members increased access to the economic and political benefits patrons could offer.\textsuperscript{178} Patrons sometimes benefited politically from this exchange, as evidenced by election slogans from Pompeii, which indicate that associations supported their patrons’ claims to political office.\textsuperscript{179} Inscriptions on the \textit{stele} erected to honour individuals repeatedly emphasize that the patron/ess was “well-disposed to the affairs of the gods and the affairs of the \textit{synodos} with regard to seeking honour, and seeking honour privately and publicly.”\textsuperscript{180} For instance, the Delian \textit{synodos} of Greeks from Egypt set up a \textit{stele} just prior to 166 BCE declaring that they would honour two patrons (whose names are lost) by giving them a party once a year, paid out of the general fund. They would be given the couch of honour at all banquets and proclaimed and crowned with gold crowns at each drinking party of the \textit{koinon}. Their membership fee and public services would be waived, and a bronze bust would be set up for them. They are so honoured.

\textsuperscript{177} Arnaoutoglou, “Between koinon and idion,” 81.
\textsuperscript{179} Kloppenborg, “Collegia and Thiasoi,” 30, n. 66 referencing \textit{CIL} IV 206; 113; 710; 960; 826; 864; 336; 677; 743; 497; 7164; 7273; 7473, etcetera.
\textsuperscript{180} IDelos 1520 (\textit{Poseidonioniaia} of Berytos, II BCE); for contribution of an altar, see \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 2343 (Athens, 400 BCE); a \textit{stela}, see \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 1297 (Athens, 237 BCE); to repair the kitchen see \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 1301 (Piraeus 222/221 BCE); for funding and leading an embassy to Athens to ask for land for a sanctuary of Heracles on behalf of the Tyrian Merchants and Shippers of Delos, see IDelos 1519 (Delos, 153 BCE); to complete the \textit{oikos}, see IDelos 1520, (II BCE); for donation of a synagogue and \textit{triclinium} CIJ I 694 (Stobi, III CE); for donation of land for \textit{oikos}, covered solarium and marble statue of Aesculapius, see \textit{CIL} VI 10234 (Rome, 153 CE); for donation of a vineyard see \textit{IG} X/2 259 (\textit{Mystai} of Zeus Dionysos, Thessalonica, 1 CE); for purchase of plot, see CBP 455 (to Jewish or Christian Workers’ Association of City Gate, Phrygia, III CE). For Jewish donations see: for restoration of place of prayer see I DFSJ 11 (Synagogue Inscription, Olbia, Sardinia, Italy; for dedication of lamp and lampstand, see I. DFSJ 12 (Pergamum, Jewish donation); for construction of synagogue, \textit{oikos}, court and wall, see DFSJ 13 (Phocaea, III CE), DFSJ 16 (Teos III CE); DFSJ 31 (Nysa, III CE); DFSJ 33 (Julia Severa’s donation in Ercis, I CE); for donation of ornamentation, mosaics, railings, basin, raised seat and wall or floor marble ornamentation, see DFSJ 15 (Smyrna IV CE),20 (Sardis), 21 (Sardis),28 (Sardis); 36 (Side, IV CE); for fountain and inner court DFSJ 37 (Side, V CE).
in order that those who remained behind, seeing the honour shared in everlasting remembrance by good men, might become zealous imitators with equal advantages and themselves also much more eagerly (strive to) enlarge the temple, having become acquainted with the eagerness of the synod to reciprocate any act of benevolence.  

The sacrificial ceremony and the banquet were the two chief venues for announcing, awarding and parading the honorific deeds. Honours were varied:  

- erection of a stele, bust, or statue, honours at the annual or monthly banquet such as the privilege of reclining on the couch of honour, and crowning with a gold or olive or floral wreath, which was sometimes adorned with woollen or red ribbons; public announcement of their benefaction during the sacrifices and meetings; bestowal of money or honorarium or interest on mortgaged land; exemption from all membership fees for a period of time, the privilege of front seats for themselves and their guest/s during the games; for officials, honorary attendance at a sacred meal, increased share of the distributions after sacrifice or special clothing, such as priestly headband or special cloak for the sacred procession and meal.  

The physical arrangements of place setting and food at the banquet also reinforced the hierarchical honour/shame system. In the dining triclinia, the three couches and the seating on these three couches were arranged in hierarchical fashion. The place of honour on the primary couch was either in the middle or on one side, depending on Greek or Roman custom. Places on each couch ranked in descending order in relationship to the honourary guest. Competition was so fierce for honourable positions on the couches, and the status that these positions entailed, that associations, such as the Iobakchoi, in an attempt to establish some measure of

---

181 IDelos 1521 (II BCE prior to 166).  
182 Ascough, Paul’s Macedonian Associations, 24-28; Klauck, Religious Context, 44.  
183 For guests at the procession see IDelos 1520.  
184 See Appendix B for more detailed listing of honours awarded to patrons and officials.  
185 Weinfeld, The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect, 26 makes the comparison with the Qumran Sect, where seating was arranged in fixed order, where every man sat “according to his rank,” “the priests shall sit in the first seats, the elders in the next seats, and the rest of all the people shall sit, each in his definite seat” (1QS 6:4, 8-9).  
186 IDelos 1520: “and let him also share the couch (of honor) with the sacrificer/diviner on the festival of Poseidon, and first seat at table at all the other assemblies. Although three reclining guests on each couch was the luxurious standard, as many as five or seven have been evidenced on reliefs.
order, legislated and prescribed fines against the changing of places by those who competed at the banquet for better seats.\(^{187}\) The couches, especially the honoured couch, were for self-display. The Romans connected visibility with power – “the more powerful the man, the more visible he is.”\(^{188}\) Association inscriptions on stele often record the honouring of patron or official with the honourary position on the couch.\(^{189}\)

The *triclinia* themselves were also hierarchialized. As we have seen, cults and associations used more than one *triclinium* for their feasts. The *triclinia* would have been ranked in prestige, according to proximity to and visibility of the honoured guest. Portion and quality of food were also determined in a hierarchical fashion, as was seen in the distribution of the meat from the sacrificial victims, which was replicated in the public banquets given by emperors.\(^{190}\)

This agonistic spirit pervaded the culture, appearing not only in athletic events, but also in artistic and theatrical events.\(^{191}\) Divisions, factions and leadership disputes were a problem. Inscriptions from Kos, Miletus and Piraeus are concerned with challenges to the priestess’ authority from would-be priestesses to gather the *thiasos* together, to undertake the role of priestess herself, or to impose further expenses upon the association.\(^{192}\) In Philadelphia, Egypt, the guild of Zeus Hypsistos in the first century BCE commanded all to obey the president and his assistant in all matters pertaining to the association. It was not permissible for any to make factions or discuss each other’s

\(^{187}\) *IG* II\(^2\) 1368; *CIL* XIV 2112 (Benevolent Society at Lanuvium, Italy, 136 CE).


\(^{189}\) See examples of couches of honour at banquets: *IDelos* 1520 and 1521 (II BCE).

\(^{190}\) For examples in association inscriptions, see Appendix B. For public banquets, see John D’Arms, “The Roman Convivium and the Idea of Equality,” in *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*, ed. Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 309, where Suetonius records that at the largest and most spectacular of Domitian’s banquets, where large baskets of choice fare were distributed to the senators and equites, and smaller baskets given to the plebs (Suet. *Dom*.5, LCL).

\(^{191}\) Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean world from the second century AD to the conversion of Constantine* (London: Penguin Books, 1986) 69. Cities held their own competitions, which, in turn, competed for talent with the cities nearby. There were prizes for every kind of virtuosity for acrobatics, conjuring, spoken panegyrics, announcing, blowing the trumpet, and ‘Homerism,’ the valiant miming of scenes from Homeric epic. Charlotte Roueché, in *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Later Periods: A Study Based on Inscriptions from the Current Excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria* (Leeds, Gr. Britain: W.S. Maney and Son Ltd.,1993) 24 documents that in the II CE, even pantomimers and mimers were able to join in the competitions that the more respected hymn-singers and actors had previously enjoyed and gain considerable status. For instance, “The mime honoured as a ‘victor in Asian games’ at Tralles, in the late second or early third century, received the typical honours of a victor – being made a member of the council, or of the gerousia, at various cities.”

\(^{192}\) *IMilet* VI 22 (Miletus, 276 BCE); SIG\(^3\) 1012 (Kos, II/I BCE); *IG* II\(^2\) 1328 (Piraeus; 183/2 BCE).
ancestry and status, or abuse one another or indict one another. It was important not to
“bring the drinking to nought.”193 In Delos, an inscription forbids any member of the
synodos from attempting to subvert the oiling and crowning of the bust, and in Kos,
impiousness was called down upon anyone offering an interpretation concerning the
priests of Demeter which violated what was written in the sacred laws on the notice
boards.194 The rule of the Iobakchoi in Athens in the second century CE insisted on
quietness at the sacrificial festival (stibas) of hymns, libations and sacrifices, and
panegyric (sermon), making it unlawful for anyone to sing, or applaud, deliver a speech
without permission or in any way disturb the good order of the festival. Fighting,
insulting one another, or taking someone else’s seat at the banquet was subject to a fine of
twenty-five drachmae or eviction from the banquet if he did not pay the fine. This was
enforced by the thyrsus-carrier, who placed Dionysus’ thyrsus beside the disorderly
member, who was summarily evicted by the bouncers (literally ‘horses’) 195 The
Dionysiac Thiasos of Physkos, Greece, fined their maenads and cowherds four drachmae
if they ‘incited’ another maenad or cowherd.196 An eranos in Athens in the second
century CE declared, “if anyone of those should be seen where fighting or disturbances
occur let him be thrown out of the club, being fined the double.” 197 In Andania, the cult
required both male and female officers, while pouring an offering of blood and wine over
the fire, to swear an oath promising that they would allow no unseemly or contrary acts to
disturb the solemn observation of the mysteries. They had twenty rod-bearers at their
command who were instructed to flog those who were disobedient or behaved
indecently.198

**Public Display**

Association banquets served as a venue for displaying status and honour to the
outside world as well. Many associations celebrated their banquets outdoors or in

---

193 *PLond* VII 2193; *PLond* 2710, II. 13-17 (69-58 BCE).
194 *IDelos* 1523 (II BCE); *IKosHerzog* 8 (Kos, III BCE).
195 *IG* II 1368.
196 *IG* IX/1 670.
197 *IG* II 1369.
198 *IG* V/1 1390; see also Moshe Weinfeld, *Organizational Pattern of the Qumran Sect*, referencing abuse
of members in the Manual of Discipline: 1QS 7:3-4 (on anger against one’s comrade); 1QS 7:4-5 (on
cursing one’s neighbour); 1QS 7:5 (on slandering a neighbour), 35-36.
public sanctuaries where everyone could see who was invited and who was excluded.\textsuperscript{199} For instance, the regular banquets of the flute players held in the temple of Jupiter, were notoriously lavish, prompting Varro to complain that the innumerable dinners of the \textit{collegia} were sending the prices in the market through the roof.\textsuperscript{200} Katherine Dunbabin has recently highlighted the importance of the visibility of the indoor banquet setting.

Even in domestic settings, the layout of Roman triclinia in the early and mid-Empire often contained an element of the spectacular: not only the view outwards from the triclinium for the diners themselves, but also the view into the triclinium from outside was taken into account, and the diners might be arrayed as if before a backdrop.\textsuperscript{201}

While many simple associations were little able to produce dining spectacles, the ideal was to invoke an impression of hedonism and luxury, even in modest commercial establishments. For example, a wealthy \textit{collegia} such as the carpenters, or \textit{fabri tignuarii} in the Building of the \textit{Triclinia} at Ostia (c. 120 CE) possessed a central court with arcaded porticoes, flanked by side \textit{triclinia}.\textsuperscript{202} Beautiful mosaics decorated the floors of these \textit{triclinia}, and the courtyard or peristyle leading to the \textit{triclinium} was often columned, with busts and statues of influential association members appropriately displayed. A collegial building outside Pompeii, called the \textit{Agro Murecine} is an example of banquet visibility. The couches are faced with marble and a fountain of water arose from the middle of each circular table, with more fountains arranged around the edge of the couches. There were mythological and Dionysiac paintings on the walls.\textsuperscript{203} \textsuperscript{(96)} The modesty and simplicity of the (plausibly suggested) baker’s \textit{collegia} in Pompeii, contrasts with its spectacular painting of luxury, leisure, sex and hedonism called ‘The Chaste Lovers.’\textsuperscript{204} Paintings such as these sometimes represented elite banquets, with elegant bronzed young men, naked

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{199} Ramsay MacMullen, \textit{Roman Social Relations} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974) 68.
\item \textsuperscript{200} Dunbabin, \textit{Roman Banquet}, 73.
\item \textsuperscript{201} Dunbabin, \textit{Roman Banquet}, 88;
\item \textsuperscript{202} Dunbabin, \textit{Roman Banquet}, 97.
\item \textsuperscript{203} Dunbabin, \textit{Roman Banquet}, 96.
\item \textsuperscript{204} Dunbabin, \textit{Roman Banquet}, 100, colour Plate I. This painting is discussed in detail also in Roller, \textit{Dining Posture}, 62.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
to the waist, reclining beside diaphanously-covered women with expensive silverware placed on the elegant three-legged table.\textsuperscript{205} Mosaics in Pompeii, Etruscan tomb-paintings and Hellenistic kylikeia evidence the practice of displaying table silver, especially drinking silver, on a special stand for public visibility.\textsuperscript{206} Associations, along with elites and municipal institutions, used the physical manifestations of the banquet display to further their own social prestige in the competition for membership, patrons and political power in their world.

**Public Banquets**

Associations sought to increase their prestige in the city banquets as well. This honour-seeking benefited the association as a group, as well as the individual members. Associations were included in the select public banquets, where wealthy benefactors would present distributions (sportulae) and banquets according to a strict hierarchy, which reinforced existing social distinctions. In his table showing the amounts of sportulae received by the most frequent recipients, van Nijf shows that the collegia outranked the plebeians.\textsuperscript{207} “The effect of all this was that collegia were presented as respectable organisations, as first-level status groups for ambitious members of the plebs that were seen as an integral part of local social hierarchies.”\textsuperscript{208} Some cult groups such as the Molpoi of Miletus or the hymnoidoi (hymn-singers) of Ephesus or Pergamum gained considerable social importance by their involvement in civic banquets and the imperial cult. These groups sang the liturgy and sacred hymns to the gods, and were comprised of their city’s most successful businessmen. They were probably engaged in a process of individual and group upward social mobility. Through participation in the civic banquet, they hoped to gain rank, status and participation in the civic institutions, which were dominated by the elite.\textsuperscript{209} Other professional groups, such as the performing artists (theatrikoi and technitai), in Carian Stratonikeia, were invited to participate in the public

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{205} Dunbabin, *Roman Banquet*, 56.
\item \textsuperscript{206} Dunbabin, *Roman Banquet*, 86-87.
\item \textsuperscript{207} Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 154.
\item \textsuperscript{208} Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 155.
\item \textsuperscript{209} Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 166-68.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
banquets and distributions. In Priene, athletes and their entourage, including physicians, masseurs and trainers, were listed as attending local public banquets.\textsuperscript{210}

Occasionally, associations would be honoured by a private benefactor for contribution to a festival that s/he had organized, as seen in the inscription dedicated to Epaminondas of Akraiphia (Boeotia) who breakfasted “the booth-holders or the people who helped to set up the festival”.\textsuperscript{211} Groups such as the physicians and teachers appear in two inscriptions from the city of Dionysopolis and one from Sparta, as attendees at the public banquets. In Sparta, the list of banquet participants included their official function, probably indicating that they were representatives of their collegia.\textsuperscript{212} The collegia tria (fabri, centonarii and dendrophori) were amongst the most frequent beneficiaries of public banquets and distributions. Membership in these associations was primarily composed of the wealthier members of their professions, members who had social aspirations and economic aspirations. Their private epigraphy often referenced their membership in their association, indicating this membership as an emblem of social status.\textsuperscript{213} Participation in the public banquets, through their membership in their collegia, elevated their personal status, as well as the status of their collegia. There is some evidence that the professional collegia took a visible part in public processions, acquired theatre seats for similar self-display, and took part in the upkeep of the theatre.\textsuperscript{214}

**Funerary Monuments**

The quest for honour did not end at death, but continued beyond the grave. A great many grave stele, loculus covers, funerary altars, kline monuments and vaults

\textsuperscript{210} Van Nijf, \textit{Civic World}, 185.
\textsuperscript{211} Van Nijf, \textit{Civic World}, 186, referencing IG 7.2712 II.
\textsuperscript{212} Van Nijf, \textit{Civic World}, 175.
\textsuperscript{213} Van Nijf, \textit{Civic World}, 180.
\textsuperscript{214} MacMullen, \textit{Roman Social Relations}, 76 and 177. n.66. See the inscriptions for the procession of the goddess Bendis IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1283 (ca 260 BCE); 1284 (259/58? BCE); 1255 (337/36 BCE); 1256 (329/28 BCE); 1361 (2\textsuperscript{nd} half of IV BCE; 1324, early III BCE). See the honours given to Marcus Minatius by the Poseidoniasts in the II BCE in Delos in \textit{IDelos} 1520. See Roueche, “Performers,” for seats bought in Aphrodisias by the associations of tanners (90); gardeners (97); gold-workers (98); butchers (112); Jews (119). For the upkeep of the theatre at Hierapolis, see Francesco D’Andria, \textit{Hierapolis: An Archaeological Guide} (Istanbul, Turkey: Ege Yaynian & Francesco D’Andria, 2003) 149. Van Nijf, in \textit{Civic World}, includes a table in Appendix 4, which itemizes seats held in local theatres by a wide variety of Roman collegia, such as linen-weavers, shell-fish dealers, stone-cutters, bronze smiths, leather workers, goldsmiths, shippers, horse traders and porters.
from classical and archaic Greece, Etruria and the Roman Empire evidence variations on the scheme called *Totenmahl*.

The basic motif of the *Totenmahl* consists of a single male figure, wearing tunic and mantle or with his upper torso bare, reclining on a couch with a drinking vessel in his hand and a small table in front laden with food. A woman often sits either in a separate chair or on the foot of the couch; a servant brings drink."\(^{215}\)

Included are often heroic attributes such as a snake and a horse’s head. Considerable variations on the theme can be found, such as the addition of further figures, both male and female reclining, the inclusion of more women seated as well as children, and augmentation of the furniture, background or attributes. Scholars have not agreed on the interpretation of the *Totenmahl*, although recent commentators are more willing to concede that different interpretations may have applied in different eras and locales. Many argue that the reclining banqueters are either depicted as enjoying the pleasures of the banquet as the highest point of their lifetimes, or representing the pleasures of the otherworldly banquet in which they are now participating.

---

after death, and annually thereafter. On the third day after death, the deceased was carried out on a *kline* to the grave, where three different kinds of funerary sacrifices were performed. The first two involved gifts befitting the position in life. The third was a funerary banquet, *perideipnon*, celebrated at the tomb. On the third and the ninth day, food was brought again, and on the thirtieth day, mourning was ended by a communal feast. Most of the funeral banquets would have taken place outdoors, but wealthier families occasionally incorporated a small *triclinium* into the grave.

Evidence of many grave *triclinia* has been discovered around the Greco-Roman world. They were generally small, built to hold no more than a dozen people, sometimes roofed, sometimes open.

Banquets occurred annually during the city’s day of honouring the dead, *nekysia*, as well as specified other occasions, such as the anniversary of the death, or birthday of the deceased. The living consumed sacrificial meat, fish and wine (but not eggs, or the root of beans from seeds or anything else that is foul-smelling) according to the Bacchants of Dionysos Bromios in II BCE Smyrna. The dead were offered a barley broth called *choai*, which was mixed with milk, honey, wine and blood from the sacrificed animals, and poured down to the body through a special spout in the grave.

There are many references of the dead man being host at the meal given at his grave.

---


217 For further information, see the following articles in *Burial, Society and Context in the Roman World*, ed. John Pearce, Martin Millett and Manuela Struck (Exeter, Gr. Britain: The Short Run Press, 2000): for feasting at the grave, see, for instance: Rosalind Niblett, “Funerary rites in Verulamium during the early Roman period,” 99; for evidence of cooking materials in the grave in Gallo-Roman cemeteries, see Marie Tuffreau-Libre, “Pottery assemblages in Gallo-Roman cemeteries;” 52-60; and C. Schucany, “An elite funerary enclosure in the centre of the villa of Biberist-Spitahof (Switzerland) – a case study,” 120-21.

218 *Smyrna* 728.

219 Burkert, *Greek Religions*,192-4. See also Dunbabin, *Roman Banquet*, 127; *LSCG* 77; the Regulations of the Labydai, a 400 BCE *phratry*.

220 Nock, “The Cult of Heroes,” 157 gives many references to this belief in note 57.
Dunbabin rightly observes that common to all three interpretations is the idea that the banquet is the ideal metaphor for happy existence.\textsuperscript{221} I would suggest, however, that Dunbabin is ignoring the ritual significance of the banquet in the Greco-Roman world. As we have seen, banquets are celebrated as part of a sequential ritual: first the procession, then the sacrifice, and then the banquet. As Mario Torelli has shown, from the 510 BCE Tomb 1999, where the Dionysiac message of salvation occurs, the Etruscans always placed the painted banqueting scene on the back wall of their burial vaults.\textsuperscript{222} The tomb space was considered to be a liminal zone, a transitional space where the deceased was both still in this world and about to begin the journey into the Underworld.\textsuperscript{223} The procession is painted on the side walls, but pride of place on the back wall of the tomb, which was considered to be the entrance to the Underworld, is given to the banquet. This placement of the banquet on the back

\textsuperscript{221} Dunbabin, \textit{Roman Banquet}, 132.


\textsuperscript{223} Torelli, “Funera Tusca,” 153.
The wall seems to indicate that the banquet is the transitional ritual enacted between life and death, which most involves the deceased in expressing piety to the gods. As was discussed in chapter two, great honour was linked to expressions of piety.

Similarly, on Greek and Roman monuments, reliefs and sarcophagi, the representation of the dead as celebrating the banquet commemorates this transitional ritual and can be seen as a final act of piety to the gods. The gods will recognize this action performed by family and/or the association, on behalf of their loved one, and deal kindly with the dead, as they continue their journey beyond the grave. The gods may also, if they so deem the piety suitable, deal kindly with the family/association which placed this representation on/in the tomb, and grant them further honours in their lifetime. The inscription of an Attican thiasos of the late III BCE states this concept of piety clearly:

and if any of them should die...or a son or a...or a father or whoever is his closest relative in the association, and they shall attend the cortege – both the
members and all the friends...so that everyone might know that we show piety (ἐυσεβεῖον) to the gods and to our friends. To those who do these things, (may) many blessings (καγαθά) come upon them, their descendants and their ancestors.224

Associations often assisted in the purchase of a funerary plot and occasionally in the organization of the ritual funeral banquet.225 An inscription from Piraeus suggests that this was done so that “even though they have died they might remain noble.”226 Matthew Roller points out that in Greek and Roman banqueting tomb reliefs, freedpersons, much more frequently than the elite, were using the banquet iconography. They were demonstrating their “adherence to and integration into essentially Roman values and practices”.227 Several inscriptions from Tebtunis and the Fayum indicate great concern that funerary rituals be observed correctly, in order that due honour be given to the deceased.228 An association of slaves in I CE Tebtunis promised that “all of the members shall be shaved and shall hold a banquet for one day, each member contributing immediately one drachma and two loaves and in the case of other bereavements, they shall hold a banquet for one day.”229

In Hierapolis, there are several inscriptions recording provisions for funeral banquets to honour the dead. Markus Aurelius Aigillos donated to the collegia of the

---

224 IG II² 1275; Mythology concerning the afterlife developed and changed over the centuries, with Homeric myths empowering the god Hades. Later, Chthonic gods such as Zeus of the dead, chthonic Hyakinthos, chthonic Erechtheus and chthonic Iodama were worshipped at the chthonic offering sites next to the altar and temple of the living god/dess. The mystery cults at Eleusis and the rites of Mithras, Dionysus and Isis also encouraged a belief in an afterlife. For those not belonging to a mystery cult or not believing in an afterlife, fear of the gods governed their actions. Piety as a constant insurance was essential, as the gods were eternally present, and were quite capable of intervening to uphold oaths and punish ‘impious’ acts. Many also participated in cults honouring the dead who participated and interacted with their living descendents in an extended family of both living and dead. Burkert, Greek Religion, 201-3; Fox, Pagans and Christians, 96-98.

225 IG II² 1327; see also IGRR IV 796; IG VII 687, 688; CIL 14.2112. Some societies had their own burial plots: IG 12, 1.937; SIG 1116; CIG 9179; CIL 54483; 10.5647 – from MacMullen, Roman Social Relations: 179, n.77.

226 IG II² 1327; see also IG II² 1277 (Athens; 278 BCE).

227 Roller, Dining Posture, 38.

228 As early as 218 BCE, women relatives of the deceased complained that the thiasos in the Fayum did not reimburse them for the funeral fee (P. Enteuxeis 21). In 158 BCE in Tebtunis, a thiasos worshipping the local Souchos gods and the crocodile, contributed money for a member’s burial and his House of Embalmment, and if he died away from the village, sent 10 members to observe the rites at his place of death. Fines were recorded if members refused their responsibilities. This thiasos also recorded its intention to drink beer with the father of the young deceased and “comfort his heart” (P. Cairo dem. 30606).

229 PMich V 243; see also the slave association PMich V244 of the same time period.
purple-dyers so that, with the accrued interest of 144 denarii, they will draw names by lot to determine who will hold the funeral banquet at his tomb every year.\footnote{IHierapP 23; see also Ascough, \textit{Paul’s Macedonian Associations}, 25-28; see Kloppenborg, “Collegia and Thiasoi,” 21-23 for funerary associations.} On the cover of a marble sarcophagus (picture attached) there is an inscription dating from the second to the third century CE recording the donation by Marcus Aurelius Ammianos Menadrianos to the guild of flax workers and dealers the sum of two hundred fifty denarii for the annual crowning of the tomb of himself, his wife and his descendants, and for the distribution of money to the guild members.\footnote{See attached photo by Rachel McRae, 2005. Similar inscriptions requiring associations to lay annual wreaths can be found in \textit{CIJ} 777 (Jewish Epitaph and Guild of Purple-dyers and Carpet Weavers, also at Hierapolis; II CE.); \textit{CBP}-455 (Jewish Epigraph with Bequest for the Workers’ Association of City Gate, Phrygia, III CE. For burial by association, see \textit{IG} VII 687, 688 (Tanagra, Boetia, 175 BCE); \textit{IGRR} IV 796 (Apameia, Bithynia).} Note that if the flax workers are negligent in their performance of the funerary banquet with its honourable gesture of the crowning of the tomb, the money shall be taken from them, and twice the sum shall be paid to another association, the Friends of Weapons.
children will be buried within. No one else can be buried, and anyone acting in breach of these instructions will have to pay the Holy Ficus 1500 denarii. I leave the elders of the flax workers, a guild, 250 denarii as a basis for the crowning of the tomb, so that everyone may receive denarius, which will be handed on the tenth day before the end of the eighth month. If the bequest for the crowning is not handed on the appointed day, twice the sum shall be paid to the Friends of Weapons.

Roller identifies a sort of shorthand appearing on the urns and altars, which he calls a convivial iconography or rhetoric. The reclining posture (even without a couch) plus a cup in the left hand and a crown or garland in the right hand was enough to convey
the appearance of the deceased as a socially integrated, essentially “belonging” Roman.232

Funerary monuments allow us an important glimpse into the role of women at banquets, and perhaps into a transitional time during the first two centuries CE, when it was permissible for women, too, to seek honour. In contrast to inscriptions, which indicate women at cult banquets as priestesses and occasionally, as patrons at professional association banquets, and to vase paintings, which show the symposium and banquet of male elites with diaphanously veiled *hetairae* as female companions, Etruscan and Roman tomb paintings and reliefs evidence respectable women reclining honourably upon a *kline*.233 In the earliest Etruscan tomb paintings, husbands and wives are depicted as reclining together, both clothed (Tomba della Caccia e Presca) and partially clothed, and evidencing some affection for each other.234 In smaller Roman funerary urns, altars and reliefs, variants such as fully-clothed husband and wife recline together, (Flavian altar from Rome of Q; and Hierapolis Museum sarcophagus from Laodicea, III CE), women recline alone (Lorania Cypare in the Louvre) complete with drinking and eating paraphernalia and slaves (funerary urn of M. Domitius Primigenius).235

---

233 For *hetairae*, see for instance, Small, “Eat, Drink,” 92, n.45. Note that women were not portrayed as reclining in Greek banquets.
An unusual loculus slab is that from the necropolis of the Isola Sacra at Ostia where a portrait-like relief shows the half-nude man accompanied by two women, one half-nude sitting and one clothed reclining on the couch. We can only speculate as to why only one woman (perhaps married?) achieved the honour of the reclining position.

Images of free-born children are extremely scarce and each depicts them in a sitting position. On a funerary monument dating to the first or early second century,

---

now in the Palazzo Barberini in Rome, is the image of a freeborn son sitting next to his father.\textsuperscript{237} On a late first-century urn in New York, another boy, possibly dressed in the \textit{toga praetexta} of the freeborn child, sits on the couch of the reclining woman.\textsuperscript{238} A second-century loculus cover now in Geneva shows a long-haired, long-tuniced child sitting on his mother’s couch.\textsuperscript{239} This supports the traditional view that children dining with adults were accustomed to sit, and only began reclining when the males assumed the \textit{toga virilis} and the women achieved marriage.\textsuperscript{240} Honour was accorded only when ‘adulthood’ had been achieved.

**Summary**

The Mediterranean world was a competitive world, in which every man sought to establish his social identity through the pursuit of honour, by way of status, benefaction, actions, and adherence to honoured groups. Mediterranean peoples saw the associations and their banquets as an acceptable source of social identity. Association banquets gave visibility to members’ acceptance into the group. They offered a great variety of public honours to those who became officials in the association. Wealthy patrons received visible honours in exchange for their benefaction to the association. In the public milieu, association members sought honour at public banquets and processions because of their association status. Competition for honour at banquets and meetings was a problem for associations, as can be seen by regulations which legislated against the formation of competitive factions and disorderly behaviour. The search for honour continued beyond the grave as association members and their families continued to ennable the dead through banqueting monuments and annual funeral banquets. They gained further honour by this last expression of piety to the gods. In Etruscan and Roman monuments, there is evidence that married women are also permitted to gain honour through the reclining position at the banquet.

\textsuperscript{237} Roller, \textit{Dining Posture}, 166-7.
\textsuperscript{238} Roller, \textit{Dining Posture}, 165.
\textsuperscript{239} Roller, \textit{Dining Posture}, 167.
\textsuperscript{240} Roller, \textit{Dining Posture}, 158.
It is not enough to deliver a general social-cultural explanation which merely points out the high social and cultural value of community meals....The social value of community meals is undisputed. However, if that is supposed to be the whole explanation for the origin of the Lord’s Supper, then one would have to assume a cultural automatism.

Chapter Four
The Corinthian Lord’s Supper

With our knowledge of the Greco-Roman banqueting customs broadened by the addition of information from inscriptions of association banquets and archaeological findings such as triclinia, mosaics and vase paintings, we now examine the Corinthian meal ritual. We do this, however, acknowledging, as discussed in chapter one, that there were great varieties both in association meals, and in early Jesus-group meals. Therefore, we approach the description of the Corinthian meal with some caution, exercising, with Horrell, ‘disciplined imagination’.  

Analogies from associations and artifacts can assist us in understanding the Corinthian meal in 1 Corinthians 11:17-33. First, recognizing that “early Jesus groups were reflexive social experiments, engaged in and responsive to the challenges and opportunities presented by the social histories and diversities of cultures in the Greco-Roman world,” we suggest that the Corinthians are subsuming the honour/shame value system into their banquet, and it is this code which Paul so deplores.  

This value system, furthermore, is causing the tensions and divisions within the Corinthian group, rather than the wealthy/poor split which scholars have previously theorized. In 1

241 Horrell, “Domestic Space,” 366
Corinthians 11:17-33, we see Paul using the Lord’s Supper ritual to radically change the basis of the Corinthians’ social identity. He redirects the foundation of this identity away from the traditional honour and shame system, to a new foundation reflecting the values of Christ.

In adhering to the honour/shame value system, the Corinthians are much like the voluntary associations that we have examined in chapters two and three. Because these customs are so similar to voluntary associations, other analogies to the associations are also possible. We argue that they shed some light on the actual banqueting practices of the Corinthians, concerning the timing, location, provisions and funding, and ritual order of their banquet.

Honour and Shame in the Corinthian Banquet

George May stresses that “Paul was not correcting a failure on the part of the Corinthians to conduct a ritual or ceremony properly but a failure to demonstrate the gospel in their gatherings by their behaviour.”²⁴³ Paul writes,

When you come together it is not for the better but for the worse. For, to begin with, when you come together as a church, I hear that there are divisions among you....For when the time comes to eat, each of you goes ahead with your own supper, and one goes hungry and another becomes drunk. What! Do you not have homes to eat and drink in? Or do you show contempt for the church of God and humiliate those who have nothing? What should I say to you? Should I commend you? In this matter I do not commend you! (1 Cor.11:17-22).

Very few scholars comment on Paul’s question at the end: “Should I commend you? In this matter, I do not commend you!” Yet, this is quite important, for Paul is intimating that the Corinthian group really are expecting to be commended. We suggest that the reason for this expectation is their belief that their behaviour is honourable within the honour/shame code which undergirds all social relationships and social identities in the ancient Mediterranean world. They also believe they are following Paul’s expectations that they honour each other, for Paul too belongs to this

world based upon honour/shame. Several times Paul exhibits a tension in his teachings between subscribing to and deploring the honour/shame system, as shall be discussed below.

As we have examined in detail in the last two chapters, the associations reflected the honour/shame system in their regular banquets, in their attendance at public banquets, sacrifices and processions, and in their funerary monuments. Honour was both ascribed and acquired. Members of the top three status groups, the elite, possessed ascribed honour, both by birth and by wealth. Honour was acquired through holding office in civic or private groups and through beneficence. Association members, (and this may include members of Christian associations), were denied the opportunity of birth, wealth and, for the most part, civic office, because of lack of wealth and citizenship. They therefore gained honour through their position in professional, cult and ethnic associations, as was discussed in chapter three.244 Honour was also sought publicly, through public banquets, processions, theatre seats and funerary monuments. The associations participated significantly, along with civic institutions, in acknowledging beneficence with publicly awarded honours. At the banquet, the honoured were seated upon the more comfortable, well-positioned couches and were served first, with higher quality or double portions of food and wine, which reflected the honour of their office. The priest/esses of the cults of Sarapis in Priene, Zeus and Poseidon in Thebes, Anatolia, Poseidon Heliconios in Priene, and Poseidonios in Halicarnasus were honoured with special portions of sacrificial meat.245 Many associations honoured their officials, priests, or benefactors with crowns of various substances (gold, ivy, floral, olive, ribbons) and perfumes as they occupied the honoured couch at the banquet.246 Their statue or bust was oiled and decorated in a ceremony at the same banquet.

Opportunities for achieving honour are available in the Corinthian group as well. Much of Paul’s letter addresses “a common theme relating to inequality of community

244 Arnaoutoglou, “Between Koinon and Idion,” 75; Ascough, Paul’s Macedonian Associations, 25; Wilken, Burial Society, 35-40; Clarke, Serve the Community, 68; Schmitt-Pantel, “Collective Activities”, 200-1; Abbott, The Common People of Ancient Rome, 221-225
245 See Appendix B.
246 See Appendix B.
Members pursue status through their roles as prophets, speakers-in-tongues, teachers, and others. In 1 Corinthians 12:28-30, in tension with his usual teachings of equality and mutual servitute, Paul too participates in legitimating the ranking system, as he enumerates the official positions in the community: in the top rank is Paul, who is the founder. Apollos and Cephas are also in the top rank as leaders and apostles. They receive wages from the group (1 Cor.3:8), acquire a group following and build upon the foundation laid by Paul (1 Cor.3:10). Prophets are named second, for they build up the community and acquire more honour than those who speak in tongues (1 Cor.14:5). Teachers are third; fourth are those who effected “deeds of power; fifth, those who contribute their gifts of healing; and then appear those who offer “forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues” (1 Cor.12:28). In 2 Corinthians 8:17, Titus is praised for accepting the job of money-collector, “that as he had already made a beginning, so he should also complete this generous undertaking among you” (2 Cor.8:6). Paul is clearly describing and endorsing a hierarchical listing of group leadership. Each of these leadership positions has been given a title, similar to other association titles, such as epimiletes, gymnasiarch.

This tension within Paul’s thinking concerning the honour/shame system is seen in several places within 1 Corinthians and again in Romans, wherein Paul acknowledges and honours the benefactors of the various ecclesia. Chloe (1 Cor.1:11), Stephanas (1 Cor.16:15), Prisca and Aquila (1 Cor.16:19; Rom.16:3) host an ecclesia in their houses, while Phoebe (Rom. 16:1) is an acknowledged deacon and benefactor in the ecclesia in Cenchrae. Yet in his previous letter to the Thessalonians, Paul warns them to behave properly toward outsiders and be dependent on no one (μηδενος) (1 Thess 4:12). In 2 Cor.8:1-15, Paul attempts to shame them into contributing to the Jerusalem-collection, citing it as an honorary religious obligation. Interestingly, unlike the associations who use fines, floggings and expulsion to punish aberrant behaviour, and while deploring the honour/shame

---

248 Bradley H. McLean comments in “The Agrippinilla Inscription,” 259 that “it is instructive to observe that various Christian groups also experimented with their own titles such as apostles, prophets, teachers, miracle workers, healers, administrators, deacons and overseer.” (cf. 1 Cor 12.27-31; Eph.2.19-21; Phil. 1.1).
249 Ascough, “Religious Duty,” 584-599.
code, Paul attempts to shame the Corinthian community into better treatment of the disadvantaged at the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor 11:22).

In verses 17 to 19 Paul discusses the factions (σξίσματα) among the people, which the NSRV translates, “there have to be factions among you, for only so will it become clear who among you are genuine (οἱ δόκιμοι).” It is unclear whether Paul is using the word δόκιμοι (dokimoi) to describe those with doctrinal attitudes or socio-cultural attitudes.250 Most scholars interpret Paul’s tone as one of resignation, or mock disbelief (rhetorical dissimulatio), admitting shock at such a monstrous violation of the unity which he has taught them.251 Thiselton agrees with Fee that this sentence is “one of the true puzzles of the letter.”252 Synder admits surprise at Paul’s words, and suggests that Paul is noticing differences between house communities, or perhaps a hardening of social distinctions within each house community.253 Campbell offers an important way forward by translating this verse: “So that if you please the elite may stand out from the rest.”254 He suggests that the second καὶ goes with δόκιμοι and serves to bring out the incongruity of the situation. The word δόκιμοι is the Corinthians’ word rather than Paul’s, and that this is the way the upper-class Corinthian members describe themselves as a method of attaining distinction. A study of association inscriptions offers a somewhat similar usage of the same word. The associations use the word δοκιμάζω and its cognates a great deal, with the sense of “approved by the people,” and we suggest that this is the

252 Thiselton, The First Epistle, 848.
inference which Paul wants his communities to make: “for only so will it become clear who among you are approved by your association.” The verb form δοκιμάζω is used in a number of inscriptions to indicate “approved by a vote,” or “resolved,” as in the 300 BCE regulations of a Piraean eranos:

“Ἀγαθή τῇ Τύχῃ. Δέδοξας τοῖς ἐρανισταῖς ἐπαινέσαι Ἀλκμαίωνα.” (“For good fortune, it is resolved by the association members to commend Alkmaion”).

It is also used in its noun form in the regulations of a theiasos of Piraeus in 325 BCE:

ἄν δοκεῖ τῶν κοινῶν (whatever “seems appropriate to the association”), in its adjectival form describing an appropriate amount of wine in Epicteta’s cult-foundation inscription: ὃνον ξενικέον ἱκανων δόκιμον (“wine in sufficient quantity”), and in a decree concerning the festival of Artemis in Ephesus, where ἄνδρος δοκιμωτάτου is “a man very well thought of.”

In the regulations of the Andanian mysteries of 96 BCE, it is the animals which are marked as approved by the ten officers: δοκιμασθέντων σωμάτων ἐπιβαλέσων ἰεραί.

We also saw factions developing in several cult associations, on Kos, Miletus and Piraeus, where regulations were enshrined to protect the priest/esses from other groups which were supporting a competing priestess. In the Guild of Zeus Hypsistos, regulations were enforced to prevent the president being challenged by a competing group.

Paul is recognizing that approval from the members is the usual method of acquiring honour in order to hold a leadership position. He knows that their faith commitment – their piety – must be supported by a group which will acknowledge their honourable status as leaders within the community. The giving of time, money and hospitality to fellow members must be noticeable to their patron, Paul, and to a group of members who would support and honour the generous member. An excessive example of

---

255 IG II² 1291. See this use of the verb in IG II² 1368 (Athens, 175-7 CE); IG II² 1327 (Piraeus); IG II² 1252 + 999 (Athens, 300 BCE); IG II² 1297 (Athens, 237 BCE); IG II² 1273 (Piraeus, 281 BCE); IG II² 1201 (Piraeus, 222 BCE); IG II² 1361 (Piraeus, 350 BCE); IDelos 1521 (166 BCE); IDelos 1519 (153 BCE); IG XII/3, 330 (Thera, 210 BCE); SY 0867.

256 IG II² 1275.

257 IG XII/3, 330 (Thera, 210 BCE).

258 SY 0867.

259 IG V/1 1390 (Andania, 96 BCE).

260 Milet VI 22 (Miletus, 276 BCE); SIG³ 1012 (Kos, II/I BCE); IG II² 1328 (Piraeus; 183/2 BCE).

261 PLond VII 2193; PLond 2710, II. 13-17 (69-58 BCE).
this is seen in the story of Ananias and Sapphira, who lie about their contributions in order to gain honour with their community (Acts 5:1-11).

This seeking of honour, even for faith commitment, causes the inevitable divisions or splits. Snyder surmises that these factions are developing within each house-community. That Paul is aware of these proclivities and doubts their effectiveness is indubitable, for he comments in 2 Cor.10:12 (and again in 1 Cor.10:18): “But when they measure themselves by one another, and compare themselves with one another, they do not show good sense.” Paul understands that factions develop because of the cultural context of the honour code.

Despite these tensions within his thinking, Paul deplores the agonistic social relationships of the honour/shame system, which functions within the associations and the political structures of his time. This prompts him to state categorically in his letter to the Corinthians, “In this matter, I do not commend you!” (1 Cor.11:22). Paul is teaching them mutual upbuilding and mutual servanthood, and power in weakness, and encouraging strong fictive kinship groups.

Yet, the social relationships within the Corinthian community facilitate and encourage competition amongst the group(s) to belong to the best patron and the best house-community. In fact, “the structured social relationships in a church such as at Corinth, with its fictive kinship, probably facilitated opportunities for patronage, clientelism, employment and social and political mobility.”

Linton and Dunn speculate that there are as many as six communities of Jesus-groups in Corinth, each of which meet in the suitably large home of a member, for frequent, regular meetings, and meet less frequently (weekly? monthly?) as gatherings of ‘the whole church’. Divisions seem to be occurring amongst these groups, for at the beginning of the letter, Paul is angered that there is dispute among the individual groups: “for it has been reported to me by Chloe’s people that there are quarrels among you” (1

---


263 Paul’s teachings to the Corinthians on mutual servanthood are found in 1 Cor.9:19-27; 10:31-33; mutual upbuilding in love in 1 Cor.8:1-3; 10:16-17; 12:12-13:13; 14:26; 16:14; and power in weakness (humility) in 1 Cor.1:19-31; 2:10-16,18-20.


Cor.1:11). These groups are engaging in boundary-setting behaviour at the expense of their fellow groups in Corinth. While Paul is preaching co-operation amongst individuals and groups, his small communities are encouraging competition through competition and patronage. Put simply, like the Iobacchoi who engraved on their stela, “now we are the best of all Bakchic societies,” the individual house-communities proclaim, “I belong to Apollos,” or “I belong to Paul,” (1 Cor.1:12; 3:4) meaning “our ecclesia is the best ecclesia in the city of Corinth and our leader beats your leader!”

At the banquet of the Lord’s Supper, the behaviour is similar. Competition instead of fictive kinship is rampant. The competition is based upon the honour system, which prioritizes leaders and patrons. The traditional hierarchical positioning of the Greco-Roman banquet of both elites and associations is practiced, with the honoured people seated upon more comfortable, well-positioned couches and served first, with higher quality proportions, which reflected their honoured position in the community. Some of the honoured would indeed be wealthy, for they have been patrons or benefactors of this association, and are accorded all the honours which the association can bring to bear, such as excellent food and prioritized seating. It is likely that patrons such as Stephanas, Gaius, Chloe, Phoebe, Prisca and Aquila would occupy the couches of honour.

Others who should also be accorded honours were Apollos and Cephas, as apostles and leaders, Titus, the money-collector, and the prophets, teachers, and healers of the community. It would be these people who would be “devouring” their food, and drinking to excess. Not all are wealthy, for in this community, “not many of you were wise according to worldly standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth” (1 Cor.1:26). Certainly, there may be one or two who are wise, powerful, wealthy and of noble birth, but probably not enough to fill nine places on the couches of the primary triclinium. The other leaders could be of very low rank, for they are chosen by their gifts of healing or glossolalia, rather than their status.

In contrast to the scholarly consensus, we argue that the disadvantaged group is composed of those who have no standing in the community. They lack wealth, power and status, as well as gifts and graces valuable to the community. They hold no leadership position in the group, such as healer, teacher or prophet, and are thus shamed.

\(^{266}\) IG II\(^2\) 1368.
(καταίσχυνετε). They are positioned farther from the honoured guests, and served later, with a limited quality and quantity of food and drink. It may well be that the low-status members consider this treatment acceptable, for they receive some honour from admittance to the group and banquet. They may well have upward-moving intentions to improve their social identity within the group by seeking leadership or developing charismatic skills in the next year. However, in the community which Paul is building, Paul is overturning the values of the honour/shame code. It is God who is now supreme patron and source of all beneficence. 267 Paul says earlier in the letter: “For us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and through whom we exist” (1 Cor.8:6). Honour no longer comes from the acknowledgement of good deeds or benefaction by one’s equals, where there is a perceived scarcity of honour for each to acquire. 268 Honour comes from God, who represents abundance: “for the earth and its fullness are the Lord’s” (1 Cor.11:26). Good deeds or benefaction no longer need to be claimed for due honour. It is enough that God knows. As Ascough notes, Paul’s counter-cultural view of the honour system is “‘treasure in heaven’ rather than ‘honour on earth.’” 269 In this community, the new code embedded in the banquet reflects Jesus’ ethics of service, sacrifice and substitutionary atonement: “do not seek your own advantage, but that of the other” (1 Cor. 10:24). The ritual of the Lord’s Supper calls the participants to behaviour which is based upon values such as equality, rather than hierarchy; mutual servitude, rather than competition; and humility, rather than the upward mobility enshrined in the power structures of the Greco-Roman world.

The Corinthians’ social identity as individuals and as a group will derive from identification with a group which turns away from the pivotal values of the Mediterranean world. The new social identity changes the search for status into recognition of God’s leadership, guidance and power. 270 Ascribed honour now comes with possession of the Holy Spirit. Achieved honour comes from a life devoted to

268 I am grateful to my colleague, Barb Adle, for the term ‘perceived scarcity’ from her unpublished paper, “Scarcity and Violence,” 2007.
269 Ascough, “Benefaction Gone Wrong,” 104.
servitude and compassion for others. Gender is no longer the determiner of social approval. Judgment of honour comes through “the body and blood of the Lord.” Indeed, judgment of this new form of honour is already apparent to the group: “for all who eat and drink without discerning the body, eat and drink judgment against themselves. For this reason many of you are weak and ill, and some have died (1 Cor.11:27-30). Paul is creating a new social identity, the Christian identity.

**Traditional Customs in the Corinthian Banquet**

The traditional value system of honour and shame is functioning in the Corinthian banquet in a manner very similar to its role in the association banquets. We therefore argue that there are other customs in the Corinthian banquet which may find analogies within the traditions of the voluntary associations. We now extend the comparison into four distinctive banqueting patterns of the associations, which may shed further light on the actual practices of the Corinthians. First, the regulations of the associations contain many references to the scheduling of the banquets, which indicates that this was of importance to the membership. Second, archaeological and artistic evidence of banquet locations is abundant. Third, inscriptions document several methods of funding and provisioning the banquet. Fourth and finally, we provide arguments for Paul’s adaptation of meaningful, traditional association ritual codes containing cognitive and physical banqueting memory, to embody new rituals reflecting the Christian values of the Lord’s Supper.

**Banquet Schedules and Attendance**

Many associations had regularly scheduled banquets once a month, with further banquets occurring on special event days such as patrons’ and gods’ birthdays, and meals of honour for specially honoured officials. The schedule for the banquets was often included within the regulations of the association. These meals were special occasions for all the members to join together in a celebration. They were organized so that all members, whatever their status or work-commitments, could be in attendance for the whole meal.
Inscriptions and monuments provide us with some evidence concerning those attending association meals. There are many association banquet inscriptions which indicate that adult males attended the banquets and reclined upon couches. Inscriptions indicate that women were able to attend certain association meals. Monument and mosaics provide evidence of first century, respectable, married, Roman, sub-elite women attending public meals, both with their husbands, and alone. These artifacts reveal women in either reclining or sitting positions. Several funerary monuments and artworks evidence children at the banquet in either standing or sitting positions. Unfortunately, inscriptions provide us with no details concerning the reclining of slaves or food service to guests. However, servants and slaves are highly visible on the funerary monuments and in mosaics, giving us evidence that the subelite were served as they reclined. Philo’s Therapeutae of Alexandria shared the duties among their members, and this represents a distinct possibility for the Corinthian group.

The Corinthian meal that Paul discusses bears strong resemblances to these meals. Paul describes the Corinthians coming together as an ecclesia to celebrate a ritual banquet called the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor.11:18). Paul is using the present tense of the verb συνέρχεσθε here, indicating that this “coming together” is an on-going pattern. This is similar to the associations’ meals, which also had a regular pattern of members coming together to eat a meal.

The resemblance to association meals may continue, for the Corinthian banquet may have begun at a set time, as indicated by the words, “for when the time comes to eat...” (1 Cor.11:20). As we have seen, it was not the custom in associations for members to arrive throughout the meal and throughout the evening. While this is presently proposed by scholars to make sense of the words: “each of you goes ahead with your own supper” (1 Cor.11:22), we argue that, like the associations, it was probably the custom for the meal to be scheduled to allow all members to be in attendance at the beginning of the meal. Paul’s Jesus-group was not the only association whose members were comprised of

271 IG XI/4 1227; see also IG II² 2347 (Salamine, second half IV BCE); Taylor Davies, “The So-Called Therapeutae,” 15; Ascough, Paul’s Macedonian Associations, 55-58.
272 Dunbabin, Roman Banquets, 119; Roller, Dining Posture, 155. We have an example of a monument from Amiturnum, Italy with six people reclining and six sitting: see Appendix A.
273 Roller, Dining Posture, 178.
different ranks and genders, for household, ethnic and cult associations also contained mixed memberships.

**Location**

Many facilities offered several or even numerous dining rooms for their members with additional facilities for cooking, washing and reclining. There was some variety, but most *triclinia* in the first century were equipped with three couches for nine diners. The *triclinia* were often placed in a row next to the shrine, or along both sides of the courtyard. Many *triclinia* were covered with wooden roofs, but as many again were open to the sky. A hierarchy of *triclinia* was established, with those within and next to the honoured guests receiving more honour and food than those farther away. Paul may have disapproved of the Corinthians continuing this practice of placing the dishonoured farthest from the dining room of the guests of honour.

As was discussed in chapter two, there is significant evidence that many of the dining rooms were shared by more than one association, such as Sarapeion B in Delos, which was used by five associations. Evidence exists in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods that members could belong to more than one association. For example, members of Paul’s communities, such as Prisca and Aquila, would very likely have belonged to a professional association of handworkers, perhaps tentmakers “and hence familiar with the structure and dynamics of professional collegia.” It is possible that, because members belonged to more than one association, the Corinthian Jesus-group were able to borrow or share dining rooms with another association. These would not be large public facilities, but instead, private association dining rooms. It was so customary to share that the Corinthians would perceive only advantage to their group in cooperation of this sort. However, Paul’s perception was quite different, bolstering his fear that it was not really the Lord’s supper they were eating.

In 1 Corinthians 14:23-25 Paul worries that, outsiders or unbelievers may overhear the glossalalists and think that the Corinthians are out of their minds. The unbeliever or outsider is to be reproved and called to account by all, and then join with

---

274 See Appendix A.
the others in bowing down and worshipping God. In order for outsiders to overhear and then participate in the meeting of the Jesus-group, the location of the meal must be semi-public. Rental accommodations similar to the columned portion of the temple of Neptune, and corner cafes (popinae) satisfy this requirement. These venues also offer sizable dining rooms and accessible kitchens. Banqueting out-of-doors in one of the groves or vineyards sacred to a cult was extremely popular with the vast majority of associations. These too may have been popular with the Jesus-group members and therefore the location of the Corinthian banquet.

Provisioning and Funding

The food served at the ritual may not have been as elaborate as examples in the commensality literature convey. As we have seen, many associations had extremely simple meals. The collegium of Diana and Antinous specified only good wine, bread worth two asses, four sardines and sausages. Sacrificial meat, bread and fruit may have been all that was served to the cult of Mēn. Cakes and honey, cheese, and sweet wine accompanying the sacrificial meat are often the only food mentioned in the inscriptions. This may explain why, in Paul’s group, some go hungry (1 Cor.11:21), and why Paul asks the question concerning possession of homes in which to eat and drink (1 Cor.11:22). While the banquet is festive, it does not replace meals served at home. The only evidence for banqueters bringing their own food comes from the slave associations in Egypt. In the vast majority of association banquets, the food was either supplied by their patron, or purchased with funds from their treasury. This also held true for public banquets of the time. The distribution of sportulae, or gifts of extra money and food and wine, to the honoured guests, does, however, make it possible to infer that the honoured guests were eating their own food, which they received in little baskets. In some cases, there is emphasis upon extra portions of wine, such as in the collegium of Aesclepius and Hygia, which offered considerably larger portions of wine to the president.

277 MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*, 77, 86 and 198, n.73; Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, 88. The poorest associations such as the millers, apple-sellers, gardeners, and well-diggers at Pompeii, met in popinae. The builders of Ravenna rented the temple of Neptune for their banquets.
278 As described by Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 107; MacMullen, *Social Relations*, 68; Syll 1024=LSCG 96; IG 5/1 1390; MacMullen, *Paganism*, 35. This is evidenced also, in inscriptions of the cult in Mykonos, the Andanian mysteries and the Arval Brethren of Rome.
279 IG II 1366.
(quinquennalis), the pater collegi and the curators.\textsuperscript{280} If the Corinthians are following this first century custom, this may explain why Paul accuses some of the guests of drunkenness (1 Cor.11:22). These baskets did not comprise food brought from home, but extra food, wine or money that was supplied by the patron or association to supplement the portions provided to the regular members.\textsuperscript{281}

**Ritual Order**

Agreeing with the conclusions of McGowan, Bradshaw and Rouwhorst, that each Jesus-group created its own distinct ritual, I contend that “borrowing, rearranging and resignifying” of the oral tradition concerning Jesus’ last meal with his followers describes Paul’s intentions in instituting the Lord’s supper ritual for the Corinthians.\textsuperscript{282} De Jonge suggests that “the Lord’s Supper originated as a Christian variant of the Hellenistic community meal.”\textsuperscript{283} This Christian variant was received, as Paul swears, directly from the Lord: “for I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you” (1 Cor.11:23). This would be consistent with Paul’s words in Gal. 1:12 that he “did not receive it [the gospel] from a human source, nor was I taught it; but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ”, and in Gal. 15-17 that “when God, who had set me apart before I was born and called me through his grace, was

\textsuperscript{280} CIL VI 10234.
\textsuperscript{281} See Fisher, “Greek Associations, Symposia and Clubs,” 1169: the eranos associations had evolved into money-lending institutions by the first century, with little connection with banquets. Therefore, the eranos meal which Lampe identified in Aelius Aristides is questionable on this count, and perhaps represents an example of literary fiction. Lampe, “Dinner Party,” 4-5. See Aelius Aristides, *Orationes* 45.27-28 trans. by Charles A. Behr, *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).
\textsuperscript{282} Cameron and Miller, *Redescribing Christian Origins*, pp. 503-505, take the working hypothesis that “early Jesus groups were reflexive social experiments, engaged in and responsive to the challenges and opportunities presented by the social histories and diversities of cultures in the Greco-Roman world.” They question our understanding of the origin of Christianity as tied to a single ‘trajectory,” trying to chart a “‘tradition history’ by tracing the history of the transmission of traditions, incrementally, back to Jesus or his first followers.” Instead, they challenge us to recognize a diversity of Jesus groups in the first century, with diversity in their myth-making and in their social formations. Burton Mack, in *The Christian Myth: Origins, Logic, and Legacy* (New York and London: Continuum, 2003) 103-5 and 203-216, describes these groups as composed of people who were experimental in that they engaged in social experimentation, reacting against an age-old pattern of life which was no longer working, and challenged by the upheaval which the pax romana forced upon their social structures and cultural traditions. They were also reflexive in that they were concerned with a sense of collective identity, seeking to position themselves “within and over against the larger social and cultural worlds by rendering critical judgments about their cultures of context and their relationships to them, and by seeking liaison with other groups and social institutions. This resulted in the critique, borrowing, rearrangement, and resignification of various practices and ideas from that larger world context” (211).
\textsuperscript{283} De Jonge, “The Early History of the Last Supper,” 235.
pleased to reveal his Son to me, so that I might proclaim him among the Gentiles, I did not confer with any human beings.” Paul may have been aware of the oral tradition of Jesus’ last meal with his disciples, with a general idea of Jesus’ motions and meanings. But, in a vision from the risen Christ, he ‘saw’ exactly how it was done, hearing the words and observing Jesus’ actions.

Meals are made up of a series of meaningful codes, which trigger memory and therefore familiarity, for the participants. Memories are “very much formed as an interaction between the past and the present.”[^284] To successfully change a ritual, it is wise to recode, but not radically change all features. Paul may have superimposed his ritual upon the accustomed banquets of the associations, in order to situate the meal within the sacred traditions with which the majority of his Corinthians were familiar. Discussions of the piety which the association banquet exemplified in chapter two, and the importance of the banquet in funerary settings in chapter three have given us a better understanding of the role of the banquet as important religious ritual. It was with considerable knowledge of this ritual understanding of the banquet that Paul instituted the new Lord’s Supper ritual.

However, for a ceremony to work and be persuasive for its participants, “those participants must not be simply cognitively competent to execute the performance, they must be habituated to those performances. This habituation is to be found ... in the bodily substrate of the performance.”[^285] The Corinthians may have habituated many of their bodily responses from their pre-conversion banquets into the ritual. With this letter comes Paul’s realization that they are celebrating the Lord’s banquet “in an unworthy manner,” for bodily memories of the past “hold a curious place in our identities, one that simultaneously stabilizes those identities in continuity and threatens to disrupt them.”[^286] Yet, these bodily memories were inconsistent with his new teachings, for they were rooted in the honour/shame system. Thus, while Paul was superimposing new words and new meanings into the ritual, they were only partially

assimilated, with the unhappy result that Paul was appalled at what had happened to the Lord’s Supper ritual that he had taught them.

An important cautionary note is sounded here, and can be illustrated by this quotation from Henk de Jonge:

The pattern at issue conforms to that of the normal Hellenistic communal supper, which consisted of a meal (syssition, that is, a common meal) and an ensuing symposium. Such suppers were held periodically in all sorts of clubs, societies, associations, religious guilds, and other groups, in which members wanted to give shape to their ideal of unity, community, equality, and brotherhood (koinonia). De Jonge makes the assumption that the order of meal and later symposium, common to the elite commensality literature, is also common to “all sorts of clubs, societies, associations, religious guilds and other group.” We have been unable to prove this assumption. Only one inscription available to us precisely gives the order in which an association banquet proceeds, and interestingly, it is an inscription of a funerary banquet. The inscription concerning Epicteta’s foundation of a family funerary cult in Thera in 210 BCE contains these regulations for the banquet procedures:

- the one who officiates the first day will offer to the Muses a victim and offerings consisting of cakes made with 5 choinix of wheat and a dry cheese (costing?) a stater. In addition, he will provide crowns for the gods and all the other necessary things for all the sacrifices. And from these things he will prescribe for the gods the parts of the victim that are sacred, and a cake.
- The one who officiates the second day will offer to the heroes Phoinix and Epicteta a victim and offerings, consisting of cakes made with 5 choinix of wheat and a dry cheese (costing?) a stater....

Only cakes, cheese and meat are offered to the gods and heroes at the beginning. The wine is referred to in a previous column:

---

288 IG XII/3, 330.
It has been resolved to accept the proposal of (Epicteta), and to hold the meeting after the first payment and, after the meal, to pour all of the first cup, as a libation in the honor of Muses, Phoinix, Epictete, Cratesilochos and Andragor.

Paul’s order does replicate this order, but the evidence of one inscription is not enough to allow us to draw the conclusion that Paul was following a well-known association order of ritual banqueting. We may cautiously recognize that he is following one example of banqueting order of ritual, which occurred in a funerary context. This notwithstanding, the ritual which is written down in its initial form in this letter separates Christian meals from Greco-Roman meals. It is this ritual which is institutionalized in church rituals in the fourth century.

It is unclear whether Paul’s ideal for behaviour and ritual of the Lord’s Supper took root in Corinth, or spread to other communities in Greece or Asia Minor. This ritual is not mentioned in his letters to any other of his communities, and may have been specifically applied to the special needs of the divided Corinthians. Nevertheless, there may be allusions to ritual meals in his letter to the Thessalonians. There may also be allusions to a banqueting ritual in his letter to the Galatians, for he worries that they are “observing special days and months and seasons and years. I am afraid that my work for you may have been wasted” (Gal. 4:10-11). The special days, months, seasons and years may refer to the celebration of Greco-Roman banquets honouring founders and patrons according to the honour/shame code and participation in non-Christian association celebrations. McGowan states, “There really is no good and clear case, prior to the third century, of the use of the words of institution in the manner so often assumed to have happened even prior to the literary formation of the Gospels.” However, as a reflexive social experiment, it surely can be judged to have gained a reasonable measure of success, for the ritual of the Lord’s Supper eventually resurfaces in the third century and is still in use in the twenty-first century.

---


Summary

Acknowledging that the Corinthian Jesus-group, like other groups in their Greco-Roman world, were social experiments, responding to the social and historical context of their times, we described how the cultural value system of honour and shame undergirds their ritual banquet. Divisions within their group occur because members honour those in leadership roles, such as patrons, apostles, and teachers, and defend and support their own chosen candidates for leadership. Although tensions are apparent in his value system, Paul attempts to counter this honour/shame value system by proposing the ritual of the Lord’s Supper. This ritual promotes the Christian value system, establishing social identity through mutual service, mutual love and humility. The Corinthians’ use of honour and shame in their banquets is very much like that operational in the banquets of the voluntary associations. We therefore argued that analogies to other aspects of the associations’ meals are also possible, and may shed some light on the practices of the Corinthians’ meal. Associations considered their meals to be important acts of piety to the gods, and therefore celebrated their meals at regular intervals, and at scheduled times at which all members could be present. Locations for the meal were often in public places, such as rental accommodations, corner cafes and outdoors in vineyards or sacred groves. Small associations often shared the triclinia adjacent to their shrines with other associations. Analogously, the Corinthians may have shared the dining-rooms or sacred grove of another small association, rented rooms built to accommodate association banquets, or held their banquet out of doors in the vineyard of a member of the group. Associations funded their banquets primarily through membership dues or through patron benefaction, with the menus varying considerably depending upon the resources of the group. Sportulae, or small baskets with additional amounts of wine, food, and money were occasionally awarded the honoured guests. Similarly, the Corinthians likely owed the provision of the food to the generosity of their patron(s) or to a collection of money from the members. Additional food in small baskets may have been provided by the patron, upon occasion, to the honoured guests. The menu may have been quite simple. Association regulations rarely include the ritual ordering of the banquet. Only the funerary banquet endowed by Epicteta regulates an order which is analogous to the deipnon and symposium of the elite banquets.
Rituals retain relevance when they are based upon meaningful codes which trigger both cognitive and physical memory. It is our argument that, receiving a vision from the risen Christ with the institution words of the Lord’s Supper, Paul combines these with the familiar association banquet traditions to create the new Christian banquet.
Chapter Five
Conclusion

The evidence in 1 Corinthians 11:17-33 and in the Gospel accounts of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John is not sufficient to come to a clear understanding of the meal that the Corinthians were celebrating. There is no clear evidence that the ritual meal, the Lord’s Supper, can be traced back to the historical Jesus, and no clear evidence that it was based upon existing Jewish meals. Similarly, we lack evidence to prove that the ritual meal originated with Paul’s community, or any other first century community. Later church liturgies reflect a variety of forms, making it similarly impossible to trace the ritual backwards through the various Jesus groups. Scholars now suggest that each community developed its own ritual, based upon rituals, prayers and banquets of their immediate context. We therefore look at the ritual meal as distinct to Paul’s community, as a response to specific cultural meal memories and to specific cultural conditions.

Currently, there is a general understanding that the Corinthian meal was based upon the Greco-Roman banquet, which could have been held in a variety of venues, possibly a rented hall, or the upstairs rooms of a tradesperson. Some scholars still hold to the idea that it was held in the triclinium and atrium of the villa of a wealthy member. It is generally agreed that everyone reclined, with the wealthy elite wining and dining on their own food baskets first, exhibiting lack of Christian charity to the poorer, working members who arrived later and found the food supply greatly diminished. The divisions within the Corinthian community, which Paul deplored, come as a result of this wealthy/poor split. Behaviour exhibited at the meal ritual is based upon economic and status divisions of the Greco-Roman world.

We have examined the ritual meals of the voluntary associations and other archaeological artifacts with regard to their scheduling, locations, provisions and funding and ritual order. Because the examples are similar, even though they come from a wide range of locations across the Mediterranean world, and from a wide time spectrum, we posit that they offer excellent analogies for the Corinthian meal and can provide us with further contextual data. We therefore suggest that the Corinthians celebrate their Lord’s Supper together, at a time convenient for all to enjoy the complete meal. They celebrate the ritual as a pious and visible act to God. They recline on couches, which could be
located in the borrowed *triclinia* of another association which had sufficient space for food preparation and for all to dine. They may also have reclined outdoors in the sacred grove or vineyard of a fellow member, for this was by far the most ubiquitous venue in this warm Mediterranean clime. Alternately, they may have rented a private dining facility with many *triclinia*, or even have dined in private rooms of a corner cafe. The food, which may not have been sumptuous, was probably provided by a patron or host, or supplied from the donated funds of the treasury for the purpose. Special *sportulae*, or food and wine boxes, may have been given to certain honoured guests as a mark of respect and honour. It is highly doubtful that they celebrated a potluck meal, or *eranos*, as this was not the custom of the first century.

Some scholars of Greco-Roman banquets now posit that the Lord’s Supper ritual follows the traditional order of the elite dinner, with the dinner begun with the breaking of bread, and the second part, the *symposium*, proceeding after libations to the gods. Association banquets give little evidence of this order – in fact, there is only one example in the inscriptions available to us, which verifies that this order was used by a funerary association. It is possible, however, that Paul embeds the Lord’s Supper ritual within the general context of the Greco-Roman banquet, preferring to adapt, rather than completely change, a long-established Hellenic cultic ritual. In this letter, he recognizes that the Corinthians have retained more of the old Greco-Roman banquet than desirable, and he is at pains to explain again the meaning and context within which the special Lord’s Supper of this new Jesus group must take.

The associations provide us with much information on how the honour/shame code, which was embedded in all facets of the Mediterranean world, underlay all ritual behaviour, such as banqueting behaviour. Honour was sought through membership and office in a group, and was rewarded at the monthly banquet. The importance of the banquet as a location for awarding honour can be traced even to funerary monuments, where, I posit, banqueting behaviour is depicted on monuments as a lasting memorial by the subelite of honourable piety to the gods. Those who receive the honour of reclining on the foremost couch, therefore, are the honoured officials of the community – those who serve in offices such as healers, prophets, tongue-sayers, and treasurers, (who need not be the wealthiest of the group) and those who are the
patrons and benefactors. As befits their honoured status within the group, they are served first with special portions of food and wine. Those who occupy the least important couches are those with little status within the group because they lack personal gifts, official status or wealth.

While the dishonoured, who know no other value system, may intend to improve their low status within the group in the future, Paul deplores this use of the honour/shame code within the banquet celebrating the ritual of the Lord’s Supper. Paul is overturning this value system, encouraging equality, humility and mutuality instead of hierarchy, aggrandizement and competition. Although unable to completely dispense with the honour system, as evidenced by his support of patronage and method of office-seeking, Paul changes the value system of the Lord’s Supper to recognize God as the Divine Patron, ascribed honour as the gift of the Holy Spirit, acquired honour as a life devoted to servitude and love for others, and judgment of honour comes from the body and blood of Jesus Christ, whose memory is forever enshrined in the Lord’s Supper banquet ritual. Paul overturns the old behaviours required to achieve social identity and institutes new behaviours which describe a very different social identity.
## Appendix A: Association Dining Rooms: Triclinia, Biclinia and Stibadia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># Triclinia</th>
<th>#Couches</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeus Ephesiios</td>
<td>VII BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomlinson, &quot;Perachora&quot; 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepieion at Corinth</td>
<td>IV BCE-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7. = 33 guests</td>
<td>permanent; from a large poros block; red/yellow stucco; headrest; stone tables; evidence of cooking</td>
<td>John Fotopoulos, Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) :61; Bookidis, &quot;Ritual Dining,&quot; 90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date BCE</td>
<td>Room(s)</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic Oregeones of Hero Egretes</td>
<td>IV-1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Covered shelter; oven, tables; red/yellow stucco</td>
<td>IG II² 2499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining hall of Iobakchoi, Athens</td>
<td>175 CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>betw. Pynx and Areopagus; inscription found</td>
<td>IG II² 1368.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo Hylates, Kourion, Cyprus</td>
<td>II CE</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>Long, narrow triclinia with staircases to access couches; ledger runs</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 50.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around edge; columns to divide them from centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapeion A, Delos</td>
<td>220 BCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;all the seats and eating couches were installed in the dining hall;&quot; koinon est'd by merchants</td>
<td>IG XI/4, 1299; B. Hudson McLean, &quot;The Place of Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos,&quot; in <em>Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World</em> (eds. John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson, 1996) 205.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikos of Naxians, Delos</td>
<td>573 BCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merchants, shippers, inn-keepers; mosaic pavement</td>
<td>Tsakos, <em>Delos-Mykonos</em> 14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Hermes, Delos</td>
<td></td>
<td>several</td>
<td>Large; fine mosaic floors; probably multi-use</td>
<td>Tsakos, <em>Delos-Mykonos</em> 70.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Fourni, Delos</td>
<td></td>
<td>several</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsakos, <em>Delos-Mykonos</em> 70.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidon &amp; Amphitrite, Tinos</td>
<td>IV BCE</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>Strabo (I BCE) writes of great banqueting halls; early IV BCE cult to Poseidon the healer established first dining room.</td>
<td>Plaque in Tinos Archaeological Museum of Strabo's <em>Geography I</em>, 487; pictured below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace House 1, Ephesus</td>
<td></td>
<td>one large</td>
<td>archaeologists speculate this was an association meeting place; marble panels; mosaics; painted walls;</td>
<td>Peter Scherrer, ed. 2000 <em>Ephesus: The New Guide</em>. (Selcuk, Turkey Osterreichisches Archaeologisches Institut and Efes Muzesi Selcuk, 2000) 100-102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dura Europos, Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>small thiasos</td>
<td>MacMullen, <em>Paganism</em>, 37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufetula, North Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>built by craftsmen; triclinium entered from courtyard</td>
<td>Peter Richardson, &quot;Building a ‘Synodos.. and a Place of Their Own’,&quot; in <em>Community Formation in the Early Church and in the Church Today</em>, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002) 49.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Building with benches&quot;, Hadrumetum, North Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 per side 6 small tricinia; one large in central space; mosaics on side of couches and on floor; ledge at front for food and drink</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>:99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Isis, Pompey, Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>large hall opening onto courtyard</td>
<td>Malcom Drew Donalson, <em>The Cult of Isis in the Roman Empire: Isis Invicta</em>, (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003) 93; Richardson, &quot;A Place of Their Own,&quot; 47..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Imperiale, Pompey, Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>barrel-vaulted banqueting hall; ladies' dining room are posited as ass'n dining rooms;</td>
<td>Richardson, <em>A Place of Their Own</em>, 47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa dei Misteri, Pompey, Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>several</td>
<td>Dionysiac fresco; possibly an association dining room</td>
<td>Richardson, <em>A Place of Their Own</em>, 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large villa at Agro Murecine of</td>
<td>mid 1 CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 triclinia on one side of the peristyle, two on the other; marble faced</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 97.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealthy bankers or trading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>couches, elaborate water effects; wax banking tablets in wicker baskets,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association (possibly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which suggest bankers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schola of Trajan, Ostia, Italy</td>
<td>1 CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>long raised pool down centre, at end of which was the triclinium</td>
<td>Richardson, <em>A Place of Their Own</em>: 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of the Triclinia; owned</td>
<td>120 CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40-50 people</td>
<td>Russell Meiggs, <em>Roman Ostia</em>. Oxford:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by collegium of Fabri tignuarii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>carpenters' association; masonry couches; ledge for food.</td>
<td>Clarendon, 1960,324; Dunbabin, *Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia, Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banquet*, 97.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue at Ostia, Italy</td>
<td>1 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>adapted an earlier house with a kitchen; benches for meetings and worship;</td>
<td>Richardson, <em>A Place of Their Own</em>: 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustales building at Misenum,</td>
<td>1 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>belonged to Augustales; donated by Q. Baebius Natalis; identified by</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inscription on entrance to triclinium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schola of the Praecones,</td>
<td>3 CE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>black and white mosaics, showing two processions of four men carrying</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 100..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standards and caducei, the emblems of the heralds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Relief at Museo Nazionale, Este, Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3; 13 people</td>
<td>13 formally dressed recliners, served by 2 servants; on one side are working tools of a smith (anvil, bellows, tongs); on other side are the tools of a wool-worker or wife (spindle, distaff, shear and wool-basket; no inscription</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 74-75.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block from Sentium, Umbria</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3; 12 people</td>
<td>12 recliners around a circular table laden with drinking vessel; no inscription</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 75.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funerary Relief, Amiternum, Italy</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 people</td>
<td>six people are sitting; six reclining</td>
<td>Dunbabin, <em>Roman Banquet</em>, 79-85.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanctuary of Obadas, Petra</strong></td>
<td>I CE</td>
<td>13 (cf. Strabo)</td>
<td>inscribed with 132 signatures, thought to be association members</td>
<td>M.C.A. MacDonald, &quot;Languages, Scripts, and the Uses of Writing among the Nabataeans,&quot; in <em>Petra Rediscovered: Lost City of the Nabataeans</em>, ed. Glenn Markoe (New York: The Cincinnati Art Museum, 2003) 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 other inscribed thiasoi triclinia, Petra</strong></td>
<td>I CE</td>
<td>13 (see above)</td>
<td>inscribed with signatures possibly of members</td>
<td>MacDonald, &quot;Languages,&quot; 40.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>as many as 35 other small thiasoi triclinia, Petra</strong></td>
<td>I CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>according to conclusions from the archaeological context</td>
<td>Laïla Nehmé, “The Petra Survey Project,” in <em>Petra Rediscovered: Lost City of the Nabataeans</em>, ed. Glenn Markoe (New York: The Cincinnati Art Museum, 2003) 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Bel, Palmyra</td>
<td>I-III CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>inscription for a banquet-hall of the marzeah</td>
<td>PAT 1358 in John L. McLaughlin, <em>The Marzeah in the Prophetic Literature</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Belastor and Baal</td>
<td>I - III CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tesserae banquet hall for the marzeah</td>
<td>(Leiden: Brill, 2001) 56-7.</td>
<td>PAT 0991 in McLaughlin, <em>The Marzeah, 51</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Honours Awarded to Benefactors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Endowing Association</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bronze statue</td>
<td>Sarapeion A</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>III BCE</td>
<td>honoured Demetrios for service to the gods.</td>
<td>IG XI/4, 1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bronze statue in courtyard</td>
<td>Poseidoniastai of Berytos</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>see below</td>
<td>ID 1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painted or bronze bust in sanctuary</td>
<td>Poseidoniastai of Berytos</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>honoured Marcus Minatus for funding completion of oikos &amp; payment of common account, donating 7000 dr., preparing sacrifice and public dinner. Also honoured by day be celebrated each year, and special guests invited. Crowned monthly.</td>
<td>ID 1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painted or bronze bust</td>
<td>Synodos of Greeks from Egypt</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>honoured a benefactor for setting an example of dutiful discharging of sacred responsibilities and generosity for others. Crowned at each banquet and a party each year</td>
<td>ID1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painted or bronze bust in Sanctuary of Heracles and one other place</td>
<td>Tyrian merchants and shippers</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>153-2 BCE</td>
<td>honoured Patron, son of Dorotheos, who supplied many needs, is generous to each member, led an embassy to Athens to get land for a sanct. of Heracles, and entertained the thiasos for two days.</td>
<td>ID 1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold crown</td>
<td>Orgeones of Amynos, Asklepios &amp; Dexion</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>300 BCE</td>
<td>crowned Kalliades &amp; Lysimachidas for excellence and honesty</td>
<td>IG II² 1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold crown</td>
<td>Synodos of Greeks from Egypt</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>ID 1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold crown</td>
<td>Tyrian merchants and shippers</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>153-2 BCE</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>ID1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold crown</td>
<td>Poseidoniastai</td>
<td>Delos,</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>ID 1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold crowns</td>
<td>Koinon of Dionysiastai</td>
<td>Rhodes, Greece</td>
<td>shared in the crowning with other associations: Soteriastai, Zeniastai of Zeus; Panathenistai, Ataburiastai of Zeus (olive wreath), Agathodaemoniastai of the Philoneioi, Dionysiastai of the Chairemoneioi (olive wreath), and koinon of Apollo the General.</td>
<td>IG XII/1,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold crowns</td>
<td>Synagogue</td>
<td>Phokaia, Ionia</td>
<td>III CE crowned Tation, benefactress to a synagogue for constructing the oikos and wall enclosing the atrium</td>
<td>IKyme 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ivy crown</td>
<td>Priesthood of Dionysos Phileos</td>
<td>Priene, Anatolia</td>
<td>II BCE during month of Lenaion and Anthestherion</td>
<td>I Priene 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floral crown with red fillets</td>
<td>Thiasos</td>
<td>Thera, Greece</td>
<td>Imperial honoured Asclepiades who served as priest with honour and dignity</td>
<td>Foucault 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floral crown with red fillets</td>
<td>Thiasos of Cybele and Apollo</td>
<td>Thera, Greece</td>
<td>Imperial for Stratonike, daughter of Menekrates, priestess</td>
<td>Foucault 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crown</td>
<td>Dionysiac Ass. of Ameinichos</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II CE crowns Theano and Titus, daughter and son of Sopatros, to be announced every two years.</td>
<td>ID 1522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crowns</td>
<td>Thiasos</td>
<td>Salamine</td>
<td>IV BCE crowns awarded to many members (both genders) for meritorious service and fairness.</td>
<td>IG² 2347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female crowning</td>
<td>Sarapiastai</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>III BCE female president.</td>
<td>IG II² 1292, ID 1522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female crowning</td>
<td>Dionysiac Ass. of Ameinichos</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II CE Theano, daughter of Sopatros - announced every two years.</td>
<td>ID 1522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold wreath</td>
<td>Priesthood of Poseidon Heliconios</td>
<td>Priene, Anatolia</td>
<td>benefit of buying priesthood for life.</td>
<td>I Priene 201-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreath &amp; woollen fillet</td>
<td>Thiasotai of the Mother of the Gods</td>
<td>Pireus, Greece</td>
<td>III BCE</td>
<td>honoured Soterichos, treasurer for kindness and enthusiasm; and Kephalion as zealous priest.</td>
<td>IG II² 1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreaths</td>
<td>Sarapiastai</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>III BCE</td>
<td>honoured Zopuros, treasurer and Theophanes, secretary Olympichos, and the female president superintendent for accuracy, and providing (monetarily) for the Sarapistai.</td>
<td>IG II² 1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreaths</td>
<td>Eranos</td>
<td>Pireus, Greece</td>
<td>III BCE</td>
<td>honoured Alkmaion, treasurer and Dionysius, secretary for virtue and ambition towards the koinon</td>
<td>IG II² 1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreath &amp; woollen fillet</td>
<td>Thiasos with members of both genders</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>237 BCE</td>
<td>honoured archeranistes Sophron for erecting a stela</td>
<td>IG II² 1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreaths</td>
<td>Thiasotai</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>278 BCE</td>
<td>honoured their supervisors and secretary for accuracy, adorning the statue of the goddess and constructing the altar; crowns proclaimed at each of the sacrifices.</td>
<td>IG II² 1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreaths</td>
<td>Thiasos</td>
<td>Pireus, Greece</td>
<td>222 BCE</td>
<td>honoured their supervisors for repairing the kitchen and donating money</td>
<td>IG II² 1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive wreaths</td>
<td>Soteriastai</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>37 BCE</td>
<td>yearly honoured Diodoros, archeranistes and treasurer for zealous service and hosting the synodos</td>
<td>IG II² 1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption from fees and public service</td>
<td>Tyrian merchants and shippers</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>152 BCE</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>ID 1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption from fees and public service</td>
<td>Poseidoniasiat of Berytos</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>ID1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption from fees and public service</td>
<td>Synodos of Greeks from Egypt</td>
<td>Delos, Greece</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>ID 1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions of Sacrificial Meat</td>
<td>Cult or Place</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult of Sarapis</td>
<td>Priene, Anatolia</td>
<td>200 BCE</td>
<td>Priest receives fourth of everything and other gifts</td>
<td>IPriene 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult of Zeus and Poseidon</td>
<td>Thebes nr Miletus, Anatolia</td>
<td>III BCE</td>
<td>Priest for life; immunity from public service; also all tax on sale of alum</td>
<td>IPriene 364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priesthood of Poseidon Heliconios</td>
<td>Priene, Anatolia</td>
<td>II BCE</td>
<td>Benefit of buying the priesthood for life</td>
<td>IPriene 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment of Poseidonios</td>
<td>Halicarnasus</td>
<td>III BCE</td>
<td>Benefit to priest</td>
<td>SIG 1044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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