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Abstract

Did Greeks and non-Greeks banquet together in the first half of the first millennium BCE, and if so, how does this mode of cultural contact explain the evidence of cultural exchange between Greece and the Near East? Following suggestions in scholarship that Greeks shared a banqueting culture with West Semitic peoples, and that Greeks sometimes banqueted with non-Greeks, this dissertation presents evidence that Greeks banqueted with non-Greeks, explains why they should have done so in terms of earlier practices and anthropological theory, and argues that multicultural banquets were the primary mode of peaceful cultural contact in the thought-world of Greeks in the eighth and seventh centuries BCE.

Chapter 1 addresses the evidence for multicultural banqueting before the first millennium, and finds that it was a feature of diplomacy in the Late Bronze Age (1700-1100). Objects and texts are examined and used as evidence that members of various populations learned foreign banqueting customs. I argue that the multicultural banqueting in the Iron Age (1100-750) and Archaic period (750-490) is a revival of Late Bronze Age diplomatic practices. Chapter 2 addresses evidence for reclined banqueting in the Iron Age, arguing that it is a result of multicultural banqueting among various groups. It is interpreted as a feature of diplomacy and as an instantiation of the anthropological theory of Mary Helms (1988) that elites seek out external symbols of status in order to be recognized as elite by foreigners and to differentiate themselves at home. Chapter 3 focuses on the Iliad and finds that multicultural banquets are philologically distinguished from banquets among
Greeks, and that the banquet is essential in cultural contact where hostility is possible.

Chapter 4 focuses on the *Odyssey* and demonstrates that banqueting mediates contact between Greeks and non-Greeks in the Archaic imagination.

I hope hereby to construct a stable mode of contact that explains the evidence of cultural exchange between Greek and West Semitic populations, such as the alphabet, the burning of incense in ritual, and adaptations of gods and cults. The multicultural banquet becomes an interpretive model for developments in Archaic Greek literature, culture, and society.
Preface

This dissertation is the original, unpublished, independent work of the author, Kevin Solez.
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Introduction

Defining Terms

Multiculturalism and Culture

The concept ‘multiculturalism’ has sustained recent assaults on its reputation, along with the related adjective ‘multicultural.’ In 2010, German Chancellor Angela Merkel stated that multiculturalism as a domestic policy was a failure in Germany,¹ and the Right-wing writer Mark Steyn has adapted the terms to invective; people he calls “multiculti” dominate North American Centre-Left politics and society.² In the field of ancient history the concept has been repudiated by major figures in the study of ancient law, Raymond Westbrook and Edward Cohen, who dismiss multiculturalism’s relevance to the Amarna Period from a profoundly American, almost inside-the-beltway perspective, in favour of the term ‘polycultural.’ ‘Polycultural’ has not, however, attained currency. Their insistence that multiculturalism is primarily relevant to “the tolerance of minority cultures by a dominant culture” (Cohen and Westbrook 2000, 10) misrepresents the goals of multicultural policies in modern states. ‘Multicultural’ is the unmarked adjective for the coexistence of individuals from more than one culture in a single state, city, institution, or event. It is the coexistence of Greek-speakers and non-Greek-speakers at commensal events that is the subject of this dissertation, and to refer to such events as multicultural banquets or multicultural feasts is, in fact, the clearest way to express my subject in English. Rejecting the m-word in favour of


² Mark Steyn, “I’m with the ‘intolerant’ Quebecers” Maclean’s Online, 25.3.2010.
‘polycultural’ because of the former’s modern political associations artificially reduces the semantic range of ‘multicultural’ to the referents which the authors find objectionable from their perspective, belonging to a culture that has rejected the modern political policies associated with multiculturalism. They also seemed to have missed the point of the modern policies; in addressing the failure of multiculturalism in Germany, Merkel is not saying that Germany’s dominant culture failed to tolerate minority cultures. She is saying that the dominant culture failed to grant full membership in the society to minority cultures. The goal was to allow “different cultures [to] coexist on equal terms” (Cohen and Westbrook 2000, 10) but that goal was not achieved. ‘Multicultural’ clearly denotes the coexistence of a plurality of cultures or peoples, and my research proves that speakers of Greek in the Archaic Period (750-490) had opportunities to witness royal banqueting practices among West Semitic populations (Phoenician, Syrian, Samarian, Israelite, Judahite, etc.), and when they thought of intercultural communication for any purpose, the primary social context of this interaction is a banquet. Such events are best described as multicultural banquets.

Anthropologically, from both etic and emic perspectives, multicultural banqueting played a role in the development of Greek society in the Archaic period. The research questions addressed here are formulated from an etic perspective related to contemporary scholarly concerns around cultural contact, cultural exchange, and pluralism. Chapters 1 and 2 examine the ancient Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age (1700-1100), Iron Age (1100-750), and Archaic period (750-490), addressing the evidence for multicultural banqueting from an etic perspective. Chapters 3 and 4 pivot the analytical eye towards the internal workings of Archaic Greek culture as expressed in their mythological traditions, and analyze multicultural banquets from the emic perspective of Homeric epic.
In using the term multicultural, the root word must be addressed. ‘Culture’ is the result of efforts of a definable, if necessarily penetrable, group of people to manipulate and comprehend the world. I follow Herder in defining culture as “all creative, human enterprises [including] art, industry, commerce, science, political institutions and literature, as well as ideas, beliefs, customs, and myths” (Spencer 2007, 83). If politics are the dynamics of power in a society, political culture is the mental parameters under which the political players labour, the semiotic networks engaged by their words and actions, and the common products of these efforts, like speeches, photo-ops, etc. Since these mental parameters and products are idiosyncratic indices of the time and place of their production, ‘culture’ expands to denote a particular population at a particular time bound by ties of language and society. Since intelligibility is central to cultural participation, language is paramount in determining the boundaries between one culture and another. While there certainly can be multiple cultures within a group of peoples who share a mother tongue, the reverse is not true; there can be no single culture among those who cannot verbally communicate, who speak different mother tongues, and have achieved no bilingualism through which they might culturally engage another group. If Greeks were able to organize social events with non-Greeks, we must assume that on every occasion at least one member of one of these groups had achieved limited competence in the language of the other. Without this, there can be no intercultural exchange of practices or ideas.

**Banquet**

In this dissertation ‘banquet’ is used for a special meal, not the basic act of food or drink consumption, but an event that is marked as special in some way, such as its
ceremonial quality, the participants being of the highest rank in society, elaborate religious rituals accompanying the proceedings, or the meal occurring on a special occasion. It is thus a synonym of ‘feast,’ and ‘banqueting’ a synonym of ‘feasting.’ I adopt the definition of feasts presented by Michael Dietler and Brian Hayden, which are “events essentially constituted by the communal consumption of food and/or drink [distinct] from both everyday domestic meals and from the simple exchange of food without communal consumption” (Dietler and Hayden 2001, 3). Communities, large and small, can be constituted in a variety of ways, ranging from the entire community to some subset of members within it.

**Development**

This study opens up a field for analysis based on social practices that are in evidence primarily in works of the Archaic Greek imagination: texts and images. The evidence is of an idealized nature because these texts and images purport to tell of long ago, legendary heroes and/or the gods. In Homeric texts and the Epic Cycle, I observe that several meetings between Achaeans and non-Achaeans occur in a banqueting context. Besides confrontation in battle, banqueting is the primary mode of cultural contact in *Iliad*; banqueting stands unchallenged as the primary mode of cultural contact in *Odyssey*. Corinthian vase painting of the early sixth century presents male and female banqueters reclining on couches, a practice that indicates Greek knowledge of Samarian, Phoenician, Assyrian, or possibly Lydian royal banqueting practice of the first half of the first millennium BCE.
I argue that Greek-speakers, abroad or on Mediterranean islands, in the eighth or early seventh century witnessed one or more of these Near Eastern royal banquets. Through an effect identified by Mary Helms (1988, 262-4), and productively applied to the ancient Mediterranean by several scholars (Gunter 2009, 12), these Greek-speakers replicated aspects of the Near Eastern practice in their home communities in pursuit of symbolic capital; by acquiring aspects of an external system of status marking (Near Eastern royal banqueting) they wished to increase their prestige at home by further differentiating their habits from those of their countrymen. In my application of Helms’ theory, I build on conclusions drawn by Alain Duplouy, that from the tenth to the fifth centuries BCE, Greeks used goods of Near Eastern origin to express and contest their membership in elite social groups (2006, 166, 178), and that part of the symbolic capital of these objects was that they were evidence of the international relationships necessary for their acquisition (2006, 177). In this formulation, travel and international relationships accrue a symbolic capital of their own (Duplouy 2006, 172). It is implicit in Duplouy’s conclusions that it was not only membership in the elite groups of their home communities that people desired, but also recognition as being elite by foreigners, creating what Jonathan Hall calls the “supraregional and transethnic elite” (2009, 613). Applying Helms’ theory to the data of Iron Age and Archaic Mediterranean, I build on Duplouy’s work with the argument that it was not only Near Eastern goods and the contacts they presuppose that were attractive to aggrandizing Greek elites, but many forms of foreign knowledge, practices, and lifestyles. It was not primarily for the acquisition of Near Eastern goods that Greek-speakers sought relationships with non-Greeks, but for the acquisition of esoteric knowledge that could be used to attain or reaffirm elite status both at home and internationally. This process thus gave rise to the
Greek *symposion*, and the *symposion* bears some marks of its Near Eastern relations in its imaginings of foreign lands and fetishization of foreign performers.

In opening this field I do not wish to overstate what the evidence indicates; it is evidence for the apparatus of ideals through which some ancient Greeks viewed their world. Before the Classical period, we do not have a reliable account of what a Greek banquet or a multicultural banquet should have been like. Evidence of the ideals and of the imagination of Archaic Greeks can go a long way towards understanding the sociocultural developments of their times. By a number of logical connections I prove that banqueting with “the other” was a common means of conducting diplomacy, managing relations, and negotiating a variety of matters including trade in historical Archaic Greece. What my literary evidence demonstrates, however, is that Archaic Greeks imagined that the banquet was an appropriate context in which to encounter and negotiate with non-Greeks. The iconographical evidence demonstrates that this must have been the case on at least a few occasions. This idealized view of cultural contact at the banquet is a key to understanding the sociocultural developments of Archaic Greece. Intercultural exchange (particularly in the fields of poetry and religion), imported goods, and knowledge of lands inhabited by non-Greeks increased dramatically from the eighth to the sixth century. That the Greeks of the eighth and seventh centuries (sc. the authors and audience of “Homer”) wished to represent cultural contact, which was ever more frequent in their lives, occurring at banquets in their traditional literature, must bear some relationship to the increasing levels of foreign contact in Archaic Greek communities. At the least we can say that this historical reality generated a great interest in the modes and processes of cultural contact, and Greek poets and thinkers responded by establishing an ideal of peaceful contact at a sacrificial banquet. When
relations were not peaceful, we get presentations of banquets gone horribly wrong, marred by violence, death, and cannibalism. My evidence therefore coalesces in an argument about the thought-world (Hobden 2013, 69; Skinner 2012, 17; Vlassopoulos 2007, 236) of Greek-speakers in the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries BCE, as the profound developments in state formation, religious practices, trade, literature, and social practices that mark the Archaic period took place. This research partly explains the thought-world and worldview related to these developments.

**Archaic**

The evidence for this study is limited by the end of the late Archaic in 492 BCE with the beginning of the Persian Wars. It focuses on literary and archaeological evidence securely dated between the beginning of the eighth and the beginning of the fifth centuries BCE. I encompass these data with the terms ‘Archaic’ and ‘Archaic period’ by which I mean generally the period between the Greek adaptation of the Phoenician alphabet with a terminus ante quem of 735 BCE and the beginning of the Persian Wars, often stated in this text to be 750-490 BCE. The target relevance of all my arguments is the literature and society of Greek-speakers and Greek states in Archaic period, but, to understand the background to historical events and to establish historical patterns, I investigate evidence for multicultural banqueting in the Iron Age (IA, 1100-750 BCE) and the Late Bronze Age (LBA, 1700-1100 BCE). ‘Archaic Greece’ technically refers to the earliest period of Greek literature (735-492), and while this time period is still in the Iron Age in Mediterranean archaeology, it is to literature and the sociocultural history around its production that this
dissertation is addressed. I investigate modes of contact in order to explain how West Semitic ideas, poetics, and lifestyles were adapted by Greek-speakers in the Archaic period, with attendant effects on literature and sociocultural development.

**Greek Society**

All studies of ‘Archaic Greece’ involve the combination of diverse data that originates in different areas of the Greek-speaking world. Drawing conclusions from it about a singular entity, here ‘Greek society,’ renders that entity somewhat artificial since there is no singular Greek society in the Archaic period; there is only the diverse group of Greek-speaking communities spread from Tell Sukas, Naukratis, and Cyrene in the South and East, along the Anatolian coast from Cilicia to Ionia, throughout the Balkan peninsula, in southern Italy, and on the Mediterranean islands of Pithekoussai, Sicily, Crete, and Cyprus. It is quite a diverse group, but unified by a shared language. Therefore, my analysis of a large data set derived from many different Archaic Greek communities draws conclusions about that unity. I am making an argument about the totality of Greek-speakers in the Archaic Mediterranean and I call this collectivity ‘Greek Society.’ This target relevance is constituted from an *etic* perspective since Greek-speakers did not develop a Panhellenic consciousness until the sixth century (Hall 2002, 130-4; cf. Ross 2005, an argument for Panhellenic consciousness in the *Iliad*), a very important development from an *emic* perspective. In the eighth and seventh centuries there is little evidence that Greeks conceived of the body of Greek-speakers in the Mediterranean as a unity. This does not preclude a scholarly study of the unity of Greek-speakers in the eighth and seventh centuries. It is a
unity constituted by external analytical criteria, i.e. the Greek language, and not by any detectable notion of ethnicity or identity endemic to any one Greek population, or to them all collectively. Like all research questions, this one is constituted from an *etic* perspective to answer questions of interest to modern scholars; it makes no claim in the first place that the ancient Greeks were interested in this question. Identity in the Archaic Mediterranean is complex, and Greek-speakers were as likely to see themselves as participants in some shared community with native Phoenician- or Aramaean-speakers, a community based on elite or royal status, as they were to see themselves as bound in a community with other Greek-speakers. From our modern perspective, culture must be bound with language, but the Ancient Greeks did not see it that way. The Archaic Greeks show a distinct lack of concern for linguistic difference; problems of language difference are almost never discussed before Herodotus, and hardly at all in his expansive text (examples addressed by Munson 2005). This disjunction between what we know must have been the case—expanding contact with non-Greek-speaking groups—and the almost total lack of concern for mutual intelligibility in Archaic Greek texts will continue to puzzle scholars attuned to this question for a long time to come (Ross 2005; Bachvarova 2008; cf. little attention to the Archaic period in Mullen and James 2012, or in Adams, Janse, and Swain 2002).

**History of Scholarship on Modes of Cultural Contact**

In the academic discipline known as Classics or philology, as old as Western science, medicine, or history, the idea that “The Greeks,” or Greek-speaking peoples, were in cultural contact with “Others,” or non-Greek-speaking peoples is not controversial. No one, from the
beginning of the discipline until today, has ever denied that Greek peoples in the Archaic period had dealings with those who spoke different languages, worshipped different gods, and had different ways of life. The controversy arises when scholars try to demonstrate who exactly had these contacts, how such contacts were carried out, and what were their effects. The most influential theory about cultural contact in the Archaic period today is that of Walter Burkert (1992 [1984]), who envisions itinerant specialists or skilled workers moving from their home communities in the Near East to take on part-time or permanent work in areas dominated by Greek-speakers. It is these individuals and those they come in contact with who are the conduits of various Near Eastern cultural characteristics that we find in abundance in our earliest evidence of literate, historical Greek civilization. Burkert’s theory goes some distance in answering the question of who was involved in these contacts, i.e. who were the conduits of culture. The approach I have developed in this dissertation addresses the question of how such contacts took place, i.e. what social, economic, or political practices negotiated the contact between Greek-speakers and non-Greek-speakers in the Mediterranean in the crucial time period between 1000-500 BCE, between the destruction of Late Bronze Age civilization in the Balkan peninsula and the Persian Wars.

The subject of how Greek-speakers and non-Greek-speakers came into contact and interacted can be approached from a number of perspectives that amount to macroanalysis. Analyzing such contact under the aegis of religion (Demetriou 2012), economics (Horden and Purcell 2000), or colonization is useful and produces the general results to which macroanalysis is prone. I have chosen to begin with the microanalysis of a particular social practice which was identified by ancient Greeks as one that facilitated contact between them and non-Greeks, without, in the first place, associating this social practice with any broad
historical development in the Mediterranean, such as religious pilgrimages, travel, trade, or colonial enterprise. I hope therefore to avoid prejudicing my results or presenting multicultural interaction as being primarily associated with religion, trade, colonization, or mobility. Intercultural contact in human history is everywhere, and I do not wish to misrepresent the phenomenon by choosing an overarching cause a priori. In doing so, my theory does not compete directly with Burkert’s. I think that, in the wake of Burkert’s work, theories of how are more valuable than theories of who. My theory directly competes with those who see intermarriage as the prime driver of cultural exchange, such as Margalit Finkelberg (2005), Barry Powell (2002) and Martin West (1997), and these theories will be addressed in the appropriate place in the history of scholarship.

The history of scholarship on this question of how Greeks and non-Greeks came into contact and negotiated that contact begins in the Enlightenment, with the philosophies of history written by Voltaire (1829 [1765]) and Herder (2002 [1774])—Herder’s being explicitly a response to Voltaire’s. The examination of these questions does not begin there, and this dissertation has thematic similarities with the work of Herodotus, with Thucydides’ *Archaeology*, and even with the Homeric poems. Cultural contact was of interest to many ancient Greek writers in all genres. Ancient literature bears witness to a Greek culture in continuous engagement with others in the Mediterranean, real and imaginary (Skinner 2012, 14-5; Gruen 2011, 5). Thus, cultural contact was a concern of the first historians, and Greco-Roman historians never abandoned the interest in ethnography, other cultures, and how the Greeks and Romans interacted with them; indeed, the literary genre of history developed out of the preexisting genre of ethnography (Skinner 2012, 4). Part of the argument of this dissertation is that Homer offers views about how Greeks (Achaeans) interacted with non-
Greeks (Trojans, etc.), that Homer constitutes evidence for how Archaic Greeks imagined interacting with non-Greeks, and so an analysis of the Homeric perspective on the question is postponed until Chapter 3. Following Bernal in the only way one can (see Hartog 2001), I agree that ancient ideas of history and cultures (Bernal’s “Ancient Model”) have been suppressed under the weight of a racist Enlightenment and imperialist certitude; however, the disciplines to which this dissertation is a contribution (philology, history, anthropology) were reoriented or invented in the nineteenth century (De Angelis 1998, 539) on the basis of intellectual developments of the Enlightenment and Romantic periods (such as nationalism), and nothing earlier is cited as a scholarly authority. It is possible to research and assess the scholarly account of cultural contact from antiquity to the present (beginning with the rise of philosophy in Ionia), but that is a dissertation in itself. The disciplines of philology, history, and anthropology addressed by this dissertation developed in the Enlightenment through the nineteenth century, and this modern history of scholarship is my concern here.

Beginning with the Enlightenment, I proceed through the nineteenth century with the aid of twentieth-century intellectual historians such as Ian MacGregor Morris (2008), François Hartog (2001), and Martin Bernal (1987). The topic of cultural contact has been popular since the 1980s, and many scholars offered their opinions and analysis. Our sources for the question therefore increase rapidly after the middle of the twentieth century. We begin with Voltaire and Herder in the late eighteenth century, and proceed through the perspectives of George Grote and Victor Bérard, which bring us to the fin de siècle. In the twentieth century we acknowledge two traditions. The first is less influential, stemming from Bérard, insisting on an interdisciplinarity between Classics and Near Eastern Studies, represented in the 1960s by Cyrus Gordon. The second follows in the Athenocentric
tradition of Grote, dominant in Anglo-American scholarship, and represented in the 1950s by T.J. Dunbabin. We then have the explosion of interest in the subject in the 1980s following the publications of Walter Burkert (1992 [1984]) and Martin Bernal (1987), and the subject is approached from the fields of linguistics, philology, anthropology, and archaeology as represented by the work of Oswyn Murray (1990, 1994), Margalit Finkelberg (2005), Barry Powell (2002), François Hartog (2001), Bruce Louden (1999, 2006, 2011), Erich Kistler (1998), Albert Nijboer (2013) and Tamar Hodos (2006, 2009). Rather than addressing the contemporary scholars individually, I discuss the main lines of argument coexisting in today’s scholarship.

Voltaire’s *Philosophy of History* offered an account of human history that constructed unbridgeable distances between the various “species” of humanity. The Whites, his people, were utterly different from the other races. It is possible that members of the different species mate, but the result is akin to that of a horse and an ass—a “spurious” mulatto who, like a mule, is not fertile (1829, 6-10). With these vast distinctions in mind, Voltaire viewed commonality in the beliefs and practices among ancient peoples as the result of independent developments; humans around the world have similar practices because of the similarity of their natures, not because the one learned from the other (1829, 28-9). The radical isolation he constructs for the peoples of antiquity is tempered by two goals. In the first place he wishes to deny any authority or originality to the Jewish people, so influential on Europe’s Christianity, and thus, in this special case, he presents the Jews as profoundly influenced by the other people of the Near East, such that they had no name, no thought, no beliefs or arts before they were granted them by the Chaldeans and the Egyptians; moreover, they could have taught nothing to the Greeks (1829, 297-300).
Secondly, Voltaire’s rationalism does not permit him to ignore the fact of the Greek adaptation of the Phoenician alphabet. In this case, since the boundaries between these peoples have been irrevocably bridged by literacy, his strategy is to portray the Phoenicians as mere merchants, who, once met by the Greeks, were outdone by them in every regard. The Greeks received but little from the Phoenicians before they became the instructor of the Near East, teaching the Egyptians sculpture, and bestowing excellent arts on their neighbours (1829, 143). This capacity for high art is not something that they learned from another civilization but is the result of the special quality of their physical bodies; the Greeks possessed remarkable organs prone to art.

With Voltaire we find the beginning of a hermeneutical position vis-à-vis cultural similarity. It is still common today to hear objections to arguments about cultural exchange (sc. the “diffusion” of the 20th century) based on the idea that it is really the similarity of the human mind that causes confluence of cultural traits and practices. Voltaire’s view permits ancient populations to be presented, if one so desires, as pure and unadulterated by admixture, since all commonality can be attributed to a common human nature. Opposed to this view are the ideas of pluralism, multiculturalism, and hybridity that have gained in popularity since the 1960s. The notion of genetic and cultural purity in human populations is now a merely ideological position, since global studies of human genomics bear witness to major events of population mixing (Hellenthal et al. 2014),3 anthropometry is not aware of absolutely isolated populations, and archaeology has evidence for long-distance exchange.
beginning in the Palaeolithic period. Expressed simply, the borders of one human community are the borders of another, and in the borderlands first, contact provides outside stimulus to new ideas and practices, which may become popular in the centre of one of the cultures in contact. On the other hand, through mechanisms of elite exchange, the centres of populations may be in contact in the absence of contact on the peripheries. Beyond the necessity of physical presence in the same place of different cultural groups due to proximity or elite relations, we can observe that monolingualism is a minority trait among humans; it is much more common to speak two or three languages. I share the view expressed by The New Yorker’s Adam Gopnik in a review of Eric Cline’s 2014 book *1177 B.C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed*, that "[t]he globalized world—that is, one where cosmopolitan permeability of peoples is the rule, rather than the special exception—seems the old and hardy fact about human existence, while the idea of the walled-off, unique nation, with its singular spirit, is the newcomer". The idea that ancient cultures were separate and pure, utterly unmixed in a parochial golden age is indeed a neophyte idea, developed by Voltaire and his like in the Enlightenment, and elaborated in the colonial era (De Angelis 1998, 544). In the minds of scholars from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, conditioned by their times, this idea replaced the Ancient Model which saw the ancient Greeks self-consciously link their civilization to Egypt (Cecrops, Danaus, Aegyptos), Phoenicia (Cadmus, Europa), and Lydia (Dionysus) because these recognizably richer and sometimes older civilizations lent prestige to Greek origins in the minds of Greeks (Gruen 2011, 5). Such admixture had to be expunged from ancient Greece by modern Europeans for exactly the opposite reason—the civilizations of Africa and the East were not unequivocally prestigious in modern Europe.
There is thus a great dissonance between Voltaire’s positions and what has been demonstrated by the physical and human sciences in the last two hundred and fifty years. One cannot characterize all Enlightenment thinking on these subjects as allied with Voltaire, and in Herder’s response to Voltaire’s *Philosophy of History* (Forster 2002, 272, n.1), entitled *This, too, a Philosophy of History* (Herder 2002 [1774]), he presents views that intuited many subsequent developments in the physical and human sciences; indeed, his thought is regarded as foundational to the study of history, anthropology (especially cultural anthropology), and natural history (Zammito, Menges, Menze 2010, 662, 664). Herder regarded humanity and human achievement as pluralistic (Spencer 2007, 82-3); Europe and the White European were not the measure and paradigm of human culture and development (Spencer 2007, 85). Herder asked: “Is not the good dispersed all over the earth? […] Why should the western extremity of our Northern Hemisphere alone be the home of civilization” (Herder 1997, 41, 47). Specifically related to cultural contact, Herder regarded all human history as a process of later cultures building on the achievements of earlier ones. There is no radical division between human populations in Herder’s thought, but each civilization learns from its older neighbors, combines this learning with innovation and its own genius, hence causing the historical developments evident in the remains of antiquity. A characteristic passage relevant to the civilizations studied here is as follows (Herder 2002, 286-9, italics removed):

The [Greek] form of government—was it not necessary that it had swung its course down from Oriental patriarchal despotism through Egyptian land guilds and Phoenician semi-aristocracies before there could occur the beautiful idea of a republic in the Greek sense, “obedience paired with freedom, and wrapped about with the name of fatherland”? […] Its name “Greek freedom”! Ethics had to have
become gentler from Oriental father-sense and Egyptian daylabourer-sense through Phoenician travel-cleverness—and behold!, the new beautiful bloom unfolded. […Greece was] a true intermediate land in culture in which from two ends everything flowed together which they so easily and nobly altered! The beautiful bride was served by two boys on the right and the left, all she did was to idealize beautifully—precisely the mixture of Phoenician and Egyptian manners of thought, each of which took away from the other its national aspect and its jagged stubborn idiosyncrasy, formed the head for the ideal, for freedom. […] That Greece received seeds of culture, language, arts, and sciences from somewhere else is, it seems to me, undeniable, and it can be clearly shown in several cases: sculpture, architecture, mythology, literature. But that the Greeks as good as did not receive all this, that they equipped it with a quite new nature, that in each kind the “beautiful” in the real sense of the word is quite certainly their work—this, I believe, becomes just as certain from a little continuation of these ideas. Nothing Oriental, Phoenician, or Egyptian retained its nature any longer; it became Greek, and in many respects the Greeks were almost too much originals who clothed or re-clothed everything in accordance with their own nature. From the greatest invention and the most important story down to word and sign—Everything is full of this; it is similarly the case from step to step with all nations— whoever still wants to build a system or quarrel about a name, let him quarrel!

We can see from Herder’s enthusiastic intuitions about cultural connectivity in the progress of history that a pluralism valuing human diversity arose in the Enlightenment, but it was decidedly not this perspective that was adopted by the Classical scholarship immediately subsequent. Those working on cultural contact and exchange in antiquity thus have an intellectual terminus post quem for their subject in Herder’s philosophy, as do all who consider themselves cultural historians (Herder 2002, xxv). ⁴ Let us contrast the positions of Voltaire on these same Greeks, Egyptians, and Phoenicians (Voltaire 1829, 140-141):

⁴ I thank Marcel Detienne for pointing out to me some years ago that my own enthusiastic intuitions about ancient cultural contact went back to Herder.
The Athenians, scattered over a barren and unfruitful country, inform us, that an Egyptian, named Cecrops, exiled from his own country, gave them their first institutions. This appears rather surprising, as the Egyptians were not navigators. But, it is possible, that the Phoenicians, who had intercourse with all nations, may have brought this Cecrops into Attica. It is very certain, that the Greeks did not adopt the Egyptian letters; for there is not the least resemblance between them. The Phoenicians brought them their first alphabet which, then, consisted of only sixteen characters; which are, evidently, the same. To these, the Phoenicians, subsequently, added eight other letters; which the Greeks likewise adopted. An alphabet may be considered as an incontestable monument, of the country from which a nation has acquired its first learning. It appears still further probable, that the Phoenicians worked the silver mines of Attica; as, they unquestionably did those of Spain. Merchants were the first preceptors of those very Greeks, from whom, so many nations subsequently derived instruction. This people, as barbarous as they were in the days of Ogyges, appeared born with organs more adapted to the cultivation of the fine arts, than all other people. They displayed in their nature, the most refined cunning and acuteness; their language is a proof of it; for, even before they knew how to write, their language was distinguished for a union of the most harmonious consonants and vowels; previously, unknown to all the people of Asia.

Voltaire is compelled by the evidence of the alphabet to admit cultural contact between the Greek and Phoenicians, but not between Greeks and Egyptians, and such contact as exists is of a distinctly mercantile or economic nature. Beyond the alphabet, these Greeks received nothing from the Phoenicians, especially since their language (along with their artistic organs) was already qualitatively superior to all those of Asia. While Voltaire is willing to admit cultural contact in some places, it is regularly minimized in considerations of Greece and maximized in considerations of Israel (1829, 297-300). Whatever nods to cultural contact there are rest on a foundation of isolation among ancient peoples and the notion that “nature being every where the same, it is rational and reasonable to suppose, that, in general,
mankind have adopted the same truths, and the same errors, relative to those things which most forcibly assail the senses, and strike the imagination” (1829, 28).

A scholarly orientation that only grudgingly admitted a Greek civilization on the receiving end of peaceful and constructive cultural exchange was inherited from Enlightenment writers like Voltaire and dominated the scholarship of the nineteenth century. Although Herder’s pluralist rejoinder was known, it was ignored in favour of monist isolationist theories that were in harmony with the senses of national identity prevailing in Europe at the time: the British, French, and Germans claimed to be the rightful inheritors of the greatness of Greece (De Angelis 1998, 539; van Dommelen 1997, 306), but a Greece unpolluted by any foreign component, be that Asian, African (Bernal 1987), or central Mediterranean (De Angelis 1998, 542). The Europeans saw themselves as the height of civilization (De Angelis 1998, 541) standing in opposition to eastern barbarism and despotism, and to the primitive tribes being discovered all over the globe (De Angelis 1998, 544). The only Greece they could accept was one that likewise stood in opposition to all that Modern Europe opposed—the Jew, the Arab, the Negro, and the Savage. The fictive kinship with ancient Greece that Modern Europe constructed for itself has distorted presentations of ancient history and caused widespread misunderstandings of ancient society from the Enlightenment until today (De Angelis 1998, 541). The debates around Greece’s inclusion in the Eurozone, the position of Classics in today’s university, and the history of Western democracy are all distorted by the imaginary ancient Greece constructed by Europe’s colonial powers and elaborated by the Americans. This imaginary ancient Greece, the one that is fifth-century Athens writ large, expanded in time and space to encompass the area of the nation state of modern Greece from Homer to late antiquity, but not Cyprus, Ionia, or
Cyrene. It still dominates today despite much progress towards a demystified Greece in the work of individual scholars. Ancient societies deserve to be treated as foreign to the modern student and as only fragmentarily known, not as one’s own ancestors, in whom we construct aetiologies to fortify our current sociopolitical perspectives (Morris 2008, 264-5).

As the eighteenth gave way to the nineteenth century, the primary proponent of this imaginary Athenocentric ancient Greece was George Grote (Morris 2008, 256, 266), author of *A History of Greece*, composed in the 1820s and 30s. He was decidedly in line with Voltaire, seeing ancient Greece as isolated from the less prestigious civilizations of the eastern Mediterranean. Where connections had to be made, as with the Phoenicians, Grote took care to construct a dichotomy with his Greeks on one side and the Phoenicians (with the Jews) on the other as dishonest traders, inferior in war, with only itinerant contact with the Greeks (1904, 2: 41-3). Picking up the ancient observation that inland and coastal states have different effects on the character of their populations, Grote wrote of the “occasional preference for extraneous customs” in coastal states (1904, 2: 153), but, in the full accounting of this idea, the extraneous customs Grote identifies are those of other Greek states, not anything from the non-Greek world. The coastal Greek, from Miletus or Phocaea, with his maritime outlook, had “a mind more open to the varieties of Grecian energy and to the refining influences of Grecian civilization” (1904, 2: 154). In Grote's formulation, coastal Greeks were more open to the ennobling greatness of Greece than those who lived inland. This is not inherently objectionable, but it is also a truism, and conspicuously absent from the formulation is the idea that the coastal maritime Greek community was also more open to influences from non-Greeks, as is in evidence at the Piraeus (Phoenicians) or on Lesbos (Lydians).
Grote’s Greeks are allowed to be influenced by Greeks, but all other influences are regarded with that same disdain evident in Voltaire, who saw cultural commonality as the result of common human nature, and Greece’s special culture as a derivative of their unique physiology. For Grote it is geography that gave the Greeks their unique nature: fiercely independent city states always prepared to fend off invasion and “that unborrowed intellectual development for which they stand so conspicuous” were the result of their rough, mountainous, surroundings—the “multitude of insulating boundaries” that characterized Grote’s ancient Greece (1904, 2: 155).

Grote’s influence on the academic discipline of ancient Greek history cannot be overestimated. He established parameters of study that still define the discipline today (Morris 2008, 255). With respect to the mode of cultural contact Grote proposed, whatever contact was allowed was decidedly mercantile. Here Grote and Voltaire argue the same line: the Phoenicians were interested only in trade, honest or dishonest gain, quite like the (modern or Medieval) Jews; their presence in Greek lands was temporary; although they bestowed one very important technology on the illiterate Greeks, the Greeks learned nothing else from them. Insofar as there is a mode of contact discernible in this formulation, it is trade; trade and the profit motive drive cultural contact in the ancient Mediterranean. In this Grote and Voltaire agree, and Herder is of this mind also, calling these Phoenicians “the first trading state, based entirely on trade” (2002, 284). Although Herder allowed a cultural contact that was far more consequential than the others, his notion that Egypt and Phoenicia had “together formed Greece and hence the world beyond it” (2002, 285-6) nevertheless supposes a mode of contact based on the movements of the “deceptive, profit-crazed
Phoenicians” (2002, 286). The movement of men is determined by trade, and thus the presence of foreign goods is the corollary of cultural contact.

The ideas that trade drives cultural contact and that foreign goods are primarily evidence for trade are still popular today. Trade as the key mechanism of cultural contact and exchange is the result of a macroanalysis where one attempts to find the impetus for all the travel and contact in evidence in ancient literature and material culture. It is partly dependent on colonial European ideas regarding why people go abroad and the purpose of new settlements (Finley 1976, 174). This theory says very little about how cultural contact took place. The fact that there was trade (exchange of goods) raises several questions. Were these trading ventures prearranged among two or more parties? Were the traders sent somewhere specific once previous arrangements were made with outsiders? Were the traders hosted in foreign kingdoms, or did they go to preexisting emporia to sell their wares? My first response to the notion of trade as mode of contact is to try to answer the question, what are the correquisites of trade? When people come together to trade, what else do they do together which might have permitted the cultural exchange in evidence, such as of the alphabet or religious practices like the burning of incense? Here is the basic fact of my objections to trade as mechanism of cultural contact. While it explains (poorly) the small number of foreign artifacts found in Greek contexts in the eighth century, it does not explain the exchange of the more consequential cultural artefacts like the alphabet, the habit of burning incense in religious ritual, or the habit of reclining at a drinking party that happened in the same foundational period of Archaic Greece. How does the notion of trade account for such things? From a macroeconomic perspective, we know people in the eastern Mediterranean exchanged increasing amounts of goods in the Iron Age and Archaic period.
How did they do this? What other things besides trade did these people do together that resulted in these far more consequential exchanges of religious ideas and social practices? Another question follows closely on this one. Are we sure that a trading motive was the primary one that caused cultural contact? Foreign goods are evidence of some form of cultural contact, but they do not demonstrate that trade was the motivation for the contact. What other reasons could people have had to establish such contacts? Especially for the eighth century BCE, the number of foreign objects found in Greek contexts is not great enough to presume that they were the result of trade missions (Strøm 2001, 371; Shanks 1999, 198; Finkelberg 2005, 62; Powell 2002, 46; West 1997, 624). How besides trade might objects move? From these questions the reader can understand that my view of exchange in the Iron Age and Archaic Mediterranean is firmly rooted in the substantivist school of economic exchanges, that sees these exchanges as socially embedded (Duplouy 2006, 171-2; Bauer and Agbe-Davis 2010, 34-7), and does not follow the formalist school that focuses on markets and trade systems (Duplouy 2006, 172; Bauer and Agbe-Davis 2010, 37-8; Wallerstein 1974).

Many of the questions above have been raised by scholars throughout the twentieth century, and despite a new consensus emerging that the foreign goods in eighth-century Greek contexts are likely the result of gift exchange between elites (Hodos 2009, 232) or religious dedications, the idea that trade drives cultural contact is still prominent in scholarship today. There seems to be in these theories an a priori assumption that if men did not wish to trade, they would stay home. The notion of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1984), and moreover the necessity of diplomacy should instruct us that the possible motivations for an elite individual to make contact with his or her foreign peer are very many, and material
goods are likely not the most valuable thing that could be obtained by such a venture. Although there is ample evidence that goods were traded between Greeks, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Syrians, Cilicians, Lycians, and Lydians on an increasing scale from the tenth to the sixth century BCE, there is no reason to think that trade is the primary reason cultures are in contact with one another until the scale of the trade become much greater, such as in the late seventh and sixth centuries BCE, but by then, long-standing contacts have already been established. Considering the period when the first *poleis* were coming into being along with the first colonies, and Greek-speakers were beginning to write down their tradition and occasional literature, there are many reasons besides the exchange of goods that might motivate Greeks to seek contact with non-Greeks. The persistence of trading as a dominant model of cultural contact (along with Burkert’s itinerant specialists) is one of the most salient Enlightenment features of today’s understanding of cultural contact and exchange. Of course, it is also how Herodotus imagined Greeks first interacting with Phoenicians (1.1.2).

In the cultural ferment that was *fin-de-siècle* Europe, the question of Greek contact with non-Greeks was approached from the fresh perspective of Victor Bérard, professor of ancient geography at l’École des Hautes Études. In contrast to Grote he followed the line of thought established by Herder. He presented the Greeks, from the Late Bronze Age to the Archaic period, as being in some sense subjugated to the Egyptians and Phoenicians. In a passage that could have been written yesterday, he outlines his polemic against isolationist scholars (1902, 5):

_Même quand il est des ressemblances que l'on ne peut nier, on préfère encore n'y voir que des rencontres fortuites et les effets de cette cause, si commode à invoquer, que l'on nomme hasard. Les relations entre Grecs et Sémites, surtout, seront toujours aperçues à travers certains préjugés qui_
d'avance inclineront les esprits aux affirmations contradictoires. Longtemps encore il se trouvera de vaillants coeurs pour défendre le patrimoine sacré des ancêtres indo-européens et pour repousser toute invasion des influences sémitiques loin de ce domaine grec, citadelle et temple de la culture occidentale.... La seule linguistique n'arriverait pas, je crois, à désarmer ces préjugés.

Using linguistics to combat these prejudiced views, Bérard firmly situates the early Greeks in a world dominated by others. They were a lesser power in the Mediterranean and were therefore in the position of client, vassal, or tributary to greater and older civilizations. Trade determined the movements of the Phoenicians, but the movements of the Greeks were predetermined by the Phoenicians, who subsumed Greek maritime activity under their aegis, just as the Hebrew Bible sees Israelites and Judahites involved in maritime expeditions with the Phoenicians to their colony in Tarshish and elsewhere (1 Kings 10:22, of Hiram and Solomon; 1 Kings 22:49-50, 2 Chronicles 20:35-7, of ninth century Judahite kings). Cultural contact was inevitable in this circumstance, and the modes of contact Bérard imagines are those of sailors of different cultures serving together on merchant ships, with the Phoenicians in the lead (1902, 7, 15). The Greeks must therefore obey, converse with, and learn from their Phoenician leaders. Finding inspiration in the succession of maritime empires Europe had witnessed, he compares the situation of Phoenicians in the Mediterranean to the British in his contemporary world, observing that these “thalassocrats” always make use of the foreigners they dominate (1902, 15). Beyond this model, which is usually called by Bérard clientèle (1902, 5), the ruling thalassocrats are constantly exploiting the human resources of those they dominate, taking women and men as slaves, or hiring them as servants (1902, 367). Bérard spends significant time explaining the various uses foreign women might be put to, as slaves for every purpose, as companions on maritime
ventures, and as concubines and nurses at home. His examination of these possibilities prefigures the popularity at the end of the twentieth century of multicultural marriage as a mode of cultural contact. When imagining cultural contact, there is none as intense and sustained as that which occurs in the multicultural household. This intensity is one of the things that makes this model attractive. One can easily imagine in such a situation multilingual children with cultural competence in the cultures of both mother and father. Such households can amply account for the more complex evidence of cultural exchange (alphabet, religious practices) in evidence in Archaic Greece, and this is the mode of contact and exchange favoured by Margalit Finkelberg (situated in the LBA) and Barry Powell (situated in the IA). Like all theories of cultural exchange that produce the profound effects in evidence in Archaic Greece, it is necessary that these marriages occur in the highest echelons of society.

Bérard makes a number of linguistic arguments about connections between Greek and West Semitic (e.g. 1902, 229) that are repeated in a line of scholarly inquiry that spans the twentieth century and tends to be unpopular in Anglo-American and French classical scholarship, but is better respected in Germany and Italy. Cyrus Gordon (1967), Michael Astour (1967), Saul Levin (1995, 2002), John Pairman Brown (1995-), and, with insufficient linguistic rigour, Martin Bernal (1987-) have attempted to bridge the well-patrolled disciplinary boundaries between Classics and Near Eastern Studies; unsuccessful in creating a common interpretive ground, their arguments are more respected by Semitists than they are by Classicists. Martin West attempted to redeem several of these arguments in *The East Face of Helicon*, often backing off from a conclusion once he had presented all the seductive evidence. The most prolific exponent of this tradition today is Bruce Louden, who, in a
series of monographs about Homer (Louden 1999, 2006, 2011), presents evidence for a thoroughgoing Semitic (Ugaritic, Hebrew) complexion of hundreds of narrative episodes. Each of the works in this tradition are remarkably full of detail that varies on the scale of cogency from very significant and capable of demonstrating a close and ongoing relationship between Greek-speakers and the speakers of one or more West Semitic languages to almost irrelevant general similarities that one might also find between the Greeks and native Siberians or Melanesians. It is not worthwhile here to go over what is not useful in these works, but in the next section of this introduction about motivations for this project, I present some of the arguments in this tradition that have stood the test of time, even as they are sometimes ignored and forgotten. They will speak directly to the modes of contact imagined in this tradition.

This line of scholarship, practiced for the most part outside of the universities that dominate classical studies in the Anglo-American world (Harvard, Berkeley, Stanford, Princeton, Yale, Michigan, Texas, Cambridge, Oxford), and often outside the field of Classics, is barely cited in works treating Archaic literature in the dominant Oralist tradition with its hallowed centre at Harvard and at the Centre for Hellenic Studies in Washington, D.C. It is more popular in Homeric scholarship that has an Analyst character, as in the work of Martin West, Barry Powell, and Alberto Bernabé. West’s attempt at the end of the twentieth century to modernize this tradition may be part of the profound unpopularity of his work on Homer in North America. It bears witness to the deplorable condition of Homeric scholarship that books published in the U.S. tend to print excerpts from T.W. Allen’s OCT Iliad (1931), preferring it to West’s Teubner Iliad (1998) published a half-century later. Internationally, three or four traditions of Homeric scholarship continue to churn out books
and articles, happily refusing to cite the relevant works in the other traditions. This is a problem no individual can resolve. For my work, I insist on Homeric poems fully theorized in their orality and literacy, with anthropological models addressing speech acts, oral formulae and tradition, performance contexts, and the transition to the written word, which did not however completely fix the text of Homer before the Classical period (Nagy 2010). Recognizing that the Homeric poems are full of narrative and religious detail that was certainly adapted from Semitic populations during the long history of their formation does not justify the analysis of the passages containing these details as not original, not Greek, not Homeric, or having some other negative quality that might cause an Analyst to excise them. A positive, acquisitive stance towards the populations of the Near East was a characteristic of Greek civilization, insofar as one can conceive of it as a singular entity, until the Persian Wars and the invention of the barbarian (Hall 1989). As Gruen states, there was a “powerful ancient penchant (largely unnoticed in modern works) of buying into other cultures to augment one’s own” (Gruen 2011, 5). With this outlook among many Archaic Greek elites, and evidently among some in the illiterate Iron Age (1100-750 BCE), why should the poets whom they patronized not seek out new poetic content whose variety would be pleasing to these audiences? Elite approval of Semitic ideas may already have been evident in the milieux in which they worked; that is, our oral poets of ninth- and eighth-century Greece may well have encountered Phoenicians, Hebrews, or Syrians as honoured guests of their patrons, and may have entertained these wealthy foreigners. In such contexts, some would likely have met individuals skilled in West Semitic oral traditional songs and sayings. Establishing that those with equal or unequal skill in different poetic traditions, Greek and West Semitic, encountered one another is not very difficult—this dissertation presents ample
evidence—but here we come up against the significant interpretive hurdle of multilingualism. A portion of the next section on justifications for the current study will address multilingualism, of great interest to us, and all but ignored in Archaic Greek literature.

In 1957, T.J. Dunbabin, working very much in the Athenocentric tradition of Grote, posthumously published the important essay *Greeks and Their Eastern Neighbours*, which renewed interest in Greek and Near Eastern cultural contact in the fields of Classics and ancient history. The dominant mode of contact in his study came to be one of the most popular in the twentieth century, and that is the Greek settlement in eastern lands (sc. Al Mina) or the multicultural emporium, with the correlative Greek maritime activity in the area, all driven by mercantilism (1957, 25, 27). More interested in “peaceful relations” (1957, 16) than in hostilities, the parameters of what Dunbabin understands to be East-West relations are a spectrum between war and trade (1957, 28). Here is perpetuated the idea that since physical goods are some of the evidence for cultural contact, the exchange of goods must have motivated the contact. Thus, the Greeks established settlements in the area in hopes of more trade, and while this is oversimplified in my view, the idea of Greek settlers in the Near East (1957, 30) led to welcome greater complexity in explanations of cultural contact and exchange for the following 50 years as scholars began to imagine multicultural communities, and the mixed marriages within them as a mode of contact. Dunbabin, following Grote’s version of an imaginary ancient Greece in service to the modern European worldview, had an imperialist mentality that identified the Greeks with the contemporary British, the Near East with the East in opposition to his West, and native peoples of the western Mediterranean with the primitive peoples discovered during imperialist enterprise
(De Angelis 1998, 542-3). Finding “self” in ancient Greece, this worldview finds “others” everywhere else, and it requires an obvious motive that good civilized Greeks should want intercourse with these strangers; that motive is trade. However, Dunbabin’s willingness to accept permanent Greek settlements in areas dominated by Phoenician- and Aramaic-speaking peoples added complexity and sophistication to subsequent accounts of cultural contact between Greeks and non-Greeks. I find no fault with his statement, revolutionary at the time, that “the very fact that on these coasts [the Levant] the Greeks met people, in many ways more civilized than themselves, from whom they were able to learn the arts of peace, gives their eastern expansion a unique importance in the history of the transmission of civilization” (1957, 34).

In the wake of Dunbabin’s work various lines of argumentation about cultural contact emerge, which have dominated the discussion up to the present. As I have stated, trade remains an explanatory principle in many theories, specifically trade in finished goods and raw materials, particularly metals (Herodotus 1.1.2; Tandy 1997, passim; Sherratt and Sherratt 1993, 366). Related to this is Burkert’s theory of itinerant professionals (healers, singers, metalworkers) native to areas within Near Eastern cultural spheres who practise their trade in areas dominated by Greeks (Burkert 1992, 22; Raaflaub 2004a, 197-8). This mode of cultural contact remains essentially economic, relating to the supply and demand of valued services. Following Dunbabin, many more scholars were willing to address the evidence for settlements with mixed Greek- and non-Greek-speaking populations (Phoenician, Aramaean, Hebrew, Lydian, Phrygian), which sometimes included the phenomenon of intermarriage and therefore multicultural families (Coldstream 1993, 100; West 1997, 624; Powell 2002, 46, Finkelberg 2005, passim). In addition, many more sites
with evidence of multicultural populations have been found, especially on Mediterranean islands. One of the more compelling theories used today involves Greeks serving as mercenaries in Phoenician armies, or Greeks and Phoenicians serving as mercenaries together in Egyptian, Neo-Assyrian or Babylonian armies (Burkert 1992, 25; Woodard 2010, 42-44). In this theory we hear the echoes of Bérard, with the men of weaker Greek states mobilized in service of the stronger Phoenicians or Egyptians.

Archaeology has supplied impressive evidence of cultural contact and cultural mixing since the middle of the twentieth century, particularly on the islands of Cyprus, Crete, Sicily, and Pithekoussai. It is decidedly archaeology that leads and dominates the discussion of intercultural contact in the ancient Mediterranean, and not ancient history or philology. An important corrective to historical accounts, provided first by archaeologists and followed by some in the other disciplines, is that commercial encounters alone are not sufficient to explain the cultural exchange in evidence (Strøm 2001, 371; Shanks 1999, 198; Finkelberg 2005, 62; Powell 2002, 46; West 1997, 624). The explanatory value of trade is limited by two facts: 1) the number of foreign goods datable to the eighth century and before is too small to be indicative of commerce; and 2) the evidence of cultural exchange in religion, poetry, and technology is too profound to be explained by small-scale commercial contacts. Something else must be going on. An important development has been the acknowledgement that the type, quantity, and deposition of foreign goods in Greek contexts from the tenth to eighth centuries is consistent with the idea of elite gift exchange between Greeks and non-Greeks (Hodos 2009, 232).

In addition to trade, itinerant specialists, multicultural communities and mixed marriages, some scholars in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century have attempted
to explain the cultural connections that bind the Greeks, Lydians, Phoenicians, Syrians, and others using the notion of a Mediterranean Koine or an East Mediterranean Koine (Riva 2005, 203; Demand 2011, xi-xv; Powell 2002, 42; Marinatos and Wyatt 2011, 407). I agree that the cultural contact from the Late Bronze Age to the end of the Archaic Period resulted in such a state of connectedness and shared references; I agree that the peoples of the Mediterranean were collectively, over time, Mediterraneanized through contact with one another (Purcell 1990; Horden and Purcell 2000; Raaflaub 2000; Malkin 2003; Malkin 2011; Morris 2003); they created a common language of symbols, images and rituals. We must never lose sight of the role of cause and effect in this theory. A Mediterranean Koine is the result of a number of processes of cultural exchange occurring over hundreds of years. It is not the cause of those processes. What practices and motives caused the cultural exchange is my focus, and the idea of a Koine has no explanatory value in this research. The evidence of cultural exchange is the fabric of this Koine; it is made of the shared practices and ideas of ancient Mediterranean (and sometimes Mesopotamian) peoples. It offers no insight into how the Koine arose. This present study of multicultural banqueting is an attempt to situate cultural exchange in the context of real social practices observable in ancient data; if I can prove that Greeks, Phoenicians, Israelis, and Anatolians took opportunities to banquet with one another, then the multicultural banquet will stand as a powerful interpretive tool in explaining how the Mediterranean Koine arose.

Today, there are many models for understanding the cultural contact and exchange between Greeks and others. They have recently been summarized in Kostas Vlassopoulos’ excellent if anachronistically named book *Greeks and Barbarians* (2013, 131-145). The “practices of interlinking” among Greeks and non-Greeks Vlassopoulos identifies here are
guest-friendship, i.e. the practice of initiating and maintaining contact with foreign (both Greek and non-Greek) peers by means of hospitality and gifts (Herman 1987), intermarriage, diplomacy, travel, exchange (trade), itinerant labour, cult, and commensality. He both provides a neat summary of the scholarly trends I have been tracing and, in his discussion of commensality, anticipates the current study. The examples he gives of Greek contact with non-Greeks at commensal events are all from the Classical period, and he does not analyze the evidence for multicultural commensality in the Archaic period. The research presented in the chapters of this dissertation should provide welcome evidence and perspective to the scholars currently engaged in the debates around cultural contact and exchange, and I am hopeful that my work will be a useful complement and contribution to the newest research in these areas.

Motivations of the Present Study

Multicultural Banqueting

Research on the evidence that Greeks and non-Greeks banqueted together in the Early Archaic period is a new development since the 1990s arising from the study of Archaic Greek social practices, funerary archaeology, and the comparison of Greek and Near Eastern cultures. I will trace the major developments in this new area of research to explain how the current study develops and makes a significant contribution to it. In his essay “Sympotic History,” Oswyn Murray wrote (1990, 6):

[At a date which remains to be clarified, but which I believe to have been as early as the eighth century, the Greeks changed from the normal practice of sitting at table to the far more distinctive
practice of reclining on couches. This attitude, probably Near Eastern in origin, was passed on to the Etruscans, and once again serves as a ‘tracer’ for Greek influence in the barbarian world.

It occurred to me soon after my encounter with Murray’s essay that there was a special quality to this particular artefact of exchange between Greece and the Near East: the reclined banqueting posture is not only an object of exchange, it is an index of the context of contact that might facilitate such exchanges; i.e. banqueting habits were likely transmitted at a banquet. Once we can place Greeks and non-Greeks at a banquet together, what might not be exchanged?

A few years later, Murray suggested that social practices in Israel around the time of David and Solomon “would explain much in the evolution of Greek conviviality from the Homeric feast into the archaic symposion” (1994, 54). These suggestions were followed closely by the contributions of Erich Kistler and Hartmut Matthäus. In 1998, in a study devoted to the development of elite culture in Archaic Athens, Kistler performed an extensive comparison of Archaic Greek and West Semitic (Ugaritic, Hebrew) poetic culture and banqueting practices, finding that the themes of metasymphotic poetry were common to both traditions (128-141). He concludes that Greek elites were acculturated to the ways of life of the Canaanite-Phoenician elites (141), and that this was part of the enormous increase in cultural contact in the eighth century BCE (131). In the year after Kistler’s study was published, Hartmut Matthäus presented all the archaeological evidence for reclined banqueting imagery from the eighth-sixth centuries BCE between Syria-Palestine and Etruria, and he argues that the Greeks must have adopted the practice from Phoenicians, most likely on the island of Crete (in the environs of Knossos), in the early eighth century BCE, based on the little-known and very fragmentary votive shields from the Idaean cave of
Zeus (1999-2000, 59). So far, we have reclined banqueting and similarities in poetic and banqueting culture analyzed as if they were yet more points of contact between Greece and the Semitic world.

At the turn of the millennium, along with the ever intensifying interest in the Greek symposium, perspectives have begun to change. Acknowledging the recent research, Ian Morris states that “the aristocratic symposium, the performance context for much archaic poetry, had its own orientalising revolution after 700” (2000, 182). It is in discussing the values of these aristocrats that the breakthrough comes. Morris writes (2000, 185):

For elitists, a good community would embrace aristocrats from all over Greece, and even from beyond Greece. But this was rarely more than an oppositional dream: the “Greek aristocracy” was an immanent elite, an imagined community evoked in the interstices of the polis world—at interstate games, in the arrival of a xenos, or behind the closed doors of the symposium.

Here we see what distinguishes the development of reclined banqueting from other Greek adaptations from the Semitic world. This particular adaptation has an indexical relationship with the context of contact that facilitated it; that is, the adaptation depends on Greeks witnessing West Semitic banqueting practices, likely as participants in those banquets. In ancient Greece and elsewhere, there were social institutions that were open to certain foreigners, even if this was rarely more than an ideal of the aristocracy, as Morris warns.

Most recently, Albert Nijboer analyzes what is known as “warrior feasting equipment” deposited in graves, and suggests how the Greeks could have gained a knowledge of Phoenician banqueting customs, writing that “during the Iron Age, meetings associated with a warrior ideology created an upper-class fabric that assisted the diffusion of cultural phenomena such as syncretism, the transmission of the alphabet, the use of
quantified exchange for international trade based on Levantine units of weight and the
concept of city-states” (2013, 98), and that such meetings involved banqueting (2013, 119).
Since this dissertation follows close on the heels of Nijboer’s suggestions, his conclusions
deserve presentation here (2013, 119-20):

With the spread of the Orientalising phenomenon during the Iron Age and the subsequent formations
of city-states, Greece and Italy adopted goods and imagery from their Phoenician peers ‘not only
because the possession of such things enhanced their status but also because the adopted iconography
gave expression to their own beliefs’ (Carter 1997, 112). This created a network of communication
and a frame of reference for shared tokens. Feasting, storytelling and veneration of ancestors provided
a consistent setting ‘having been rehearsed over centuries, thus providing a notion of continuity with
the past’ (Sherratt 2004, 211). Phoenician merchants, being of high social status (Aubet 2001, 107,
114-19), transmitted Oriental goods, iconography and concepts, some of which were adopted and
imitated in Greece and Italy. Initially, diffusion probably took place at guest feasts, a ritual meal that
was the established response to the arrival of visitors (Finley 1977, 125).

These recent developments motivated the present study. If the Archaic Greeks
frequently attended banquets with West Semites, either on Mediterranean islands or in the
Levant, we have a secure context for many of the the objects of exchange between these
populations, as Nijboer suggests above. Nijboer draws his conclusions primarily from
warrior feasting equipment found in funerary contexts, and in this dissertation I focus on the
iconographical and literary evidence for multicultural banqueting, and discuss the evidence
for such banquets going back to the Late Bronze Age. The multicultural banquet as a
repeated social context of contact constitutes a revolution in understanding Greek relations
with non-Greeks. With this possibility emerging in the modern scholarship, it is now
necessary to marshall all the evidence for this newly identified phenomenon, the
multicultural banquet, to see whether it is possible to prove the existence of a social institution open to foreign presence in Greece or in a West Semitic population. I here present the most cogent evidence that some banquets had participants from more than one identifiable culture in areas where Greek-speakers were active from the Late Bronze Age until the end of the Archaic period. No previous scholarship has focussed on the iconographical and literary evidence of reclined banqueting as evidence of multicultural banquets, choosing instead to see it as yet another cultural artefact adapted by the Greeks from the Near East. Likewise, no previous scholarship has analyzed multicultural banquets in Homer as representative of idealized social practices in the eighth and seventh centuries, and idealized relations with “the other”. I situate this evidence in a theoretical framework that combines the throughgoing connection of feasting with diplomacy, seen prominently in the Amarna Period, with an anthropological theory of elite exchange proposed by Mary Helms (1988, 262-4), that the principle driving contact and exchange is the pursuit of symbolic capital by elite groups, who are seeking esoteric knowledge as external systems of status-marking and adapting it in order to further differentiate themselves from others in their home communities. Building on the work of Duplouy, who shows that the symbolic capital associated with foreign goods is partly due to the international relations they presuppose (2006, 177), we see that the acquisition of goods, as well as knowledge and lifestyles, is related to a desire to be recognized as elite, or as a peer, by foreigners. This possible motivation for the harmonization of banqueting practices in the Mediterranean has been suggested but not argued by some scholars focussing on earlier periods (Steel 2004, 282; Joffe 1998, 307). Connecting the pursuit of symbolic capital with the necessities of diplomacy satisfies a desideratum in historical theory identified by Jerry Bentley, who says
that historians have found it difficult “to evaluate the meaning of cultural borrowings […] or the dynamics that help to explain cultural exchanges” (2011, 344). My target relevance is Archaic Greece, and my results speak to Archaic history, society, and literature. In the study of Archaic Greek literature, my results are primarily relevant in two areas. Firstly, in whatever amount a scholar thinks that Archaic Greek literature adapted West Semitic poetic and religious material, and no one would argue that there is none, the multicultural banquet offers a cogent context for this kind of exchange and therefore provides an interpretive model for the adaptation of poetic material across linguistic boundaries. The banquet facilitates at least a low level of bilingualism among some participants. Secondly, I offer new interpretations of banqueting in Homer, with reference to the language of epic banqueting, its narrative role, and its significance in the society of heroes.

We find that the evidence for multicultural banqueting in the Archaic period has precedents in the Late Bronze Age, and so renewals of contact between Greece and the Near East in the Iron Age and Archaic period resuscitate Bronze Age practices of feasting as diplomacy (Chapter 1). The development of reclined banqueting from the Levant to Greece, Etruria and Sicily can be accounted for by the theory of Mary Helms (1988, 262-4), and building on the conclusions of Alain Duplouy (2006, 177), where emergent elites sought out others of their status to acquire the means to further distinguish themselves—to become, symbolically, more elite (Chapter 2). We find that, from an *emic* perspective, Homeric diction distinguishes multicultural banquets from banquets among Greeks, and that the banquet is essential in multicultural contact where hostility is possible (Chapter 3). Furthermore, the Archaic Greeks themselves were profoundly concerned with multicultural banquets, how they could be successful and socially consequential, and how they could be
dangerously unsuccessful. I demonstrate that it is feasting, first and foremost, that mediates contact between Greeks and non-Greeks in the Archaic imagination, just as, as others have recognized, it is in terms of banqueting that the Greeks make cultural distinctions (Chapter 4).
Chapter 1: Multicultural banqueting in the Mediterranean
from the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age

Introduction

As I described in the introductory chapter, Chapter 2 will assemble and analyze the evidence for reclined banqueting in the areas where it first appears – the Levant, Cyprus, Crete, Assyria, Corinth, Etruria, and Sicily – and offer an interpretation of these representations as a result of prior instances of multicultural banqueting between various groups. Since the focus of this project is multicultural banqueting in general and not reclined banqueting in particular, Chapter 1 addresses the evidence for multicultural banqueting in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age and attempts to situate it in a historical context in reference to economic, political, and other social developments. I find that multicultural banqueting was a feature of diplomacy in the Great Kings system of the Amarna period, a system with which the Bronze Age Greeks were peripherally involved. Also, banqueting and banqueting services feature in the relations between Mycenaeans and Minoans; to some extent we can conclude, along with Wright 2004, that the Mycenaeans became acculturated to Minoan styles of banqueting and banqueting equipment, even as they came to politically dominate the latter.

This study is about Archaic Greek society and thought, and its point of articulation is that there is scholarly consensus that Greeks must have adapted the reclined posture for their drinking parties from West Semitic models sometime in the Late Geometric / Early Archaic period (Murray 1990, 6), and there are both a number of scholars who suggest that Greeks
and West Semitic peoples had opportunities to banquet together (Nijboer 2013; Hodos 2009; López-Ruiz 2010), and some who observe that the Archaic Greek symposion had as part of its ideology in some circles the notion that elite Greeks would host non-Greeks at their festivities and be hosted in return (Morris 2000, 185). It is sometimes said that the symposion was closed from the perspective of the non-elites within the Greek city (Carey 2009, Matthäus 1999-2000), but it was a site for contestation of elite status among those who wished to acquire it, and thus participation was not limited to an elite defined in terms other than the participation in the symposion (Duplouy 2006, 146). Connected to its role in discursively constructing elite status and terms of distinction within the Greek city, the festivities were to a certain degree open to elites from other, including non-Greek, cities, and importantly, they featured hetairai, performers and slaves from other Greek and non-Greek cities. The putative presence of foreign luxuries and interstate connections implied enhanced the prestige of the symposion (Morris 2000).

The multicultural reality of the early Greek banqueting practices that came to be known as symposia and what the reclined posture indicates about Greeks and non-Greeks banqueting together have serious implications for the ways we envisage the exchange of cultural information between Greeks and West Semitic peoples and between Greeks and all non-Greeks who had an aristocracy that might be engaged in networks of guest-friendship, gift-exchange, and alliances. In addition, once we accept that there were multicultural banquets as demonstrated by the phenomenon of reclining, whether these banquets were reclined, seated, or otherwise is not important when considering the multicultural banquet as a context for cultural exchange. That is, the reclining posture is evidence of Greeks participating in a West Semitic-style banquet sometime before the first evidence for reclined
banqueting appears in the Greek-speaking world, and this raises the question of whether there is other evidence that Greeks and non-Greeks banqueted together that does not involve reclining, or the reclined banquet. Erich Kistler has addressed part of this question in his analysis of Homeric banqueting ideology, where he clearly demonstrates with literary evidence that in the non-reclined context of Homeric banqueting, influence from the West Semitic world is unmistakeable (Kistler 1998, 127-41). Kistler does not discuss the implications for multicultural banqueting, but I consider the evidence he adduces to be as suggestive of face-to-face encounters between Greeks and West Semites as the evidence of reclining, and it is therefore as important for considerations of the contexts in which Greeks and West Semitic peoples exchanged information about poetry, music, ritual, technology, and politics, and also clearly indicates that these contexts need not include reclining. I will directly address Kistler’s arguments about the Homeric banquet in Chapter 4. Kistler has argued for direct, face-to-face multicultural banqueting in a subsequent article which traces the distribution of certain specialized banqueting equipment among Mediterranean elites (Kistler 2009), and his work, along with Albert Nijboer’s and Hartmut Matthäus’, have encouraged me to review and analyze all the data for reclined banqueting from the perspective that it is strong evidence for multicultural banqueting.

When we accept that the cultural import of the multicultural banquet extends further back in time beyond the confines of the seventh century, as Erich Kistler has shown for Homeric banqueting and as Hartmut Matthäus has shown for the advent of reclined banqueting—extended into the mid-eighth century at the latest by metalwork depicting reclined banqueting and klínai from Greek contexts in Cyprus and Crete—it is necessary to ask the question whether events where Greeks banqueted with non-Greeks were phenomena
that emerged during the Iron Age or whether the Iron Age evidence represents a continuity or renaissance of practices already apparent in the Late Bronze Age.

The subject of this first chapter is the Late Bronze Age evidence that Greek-speakers took opportunities to banquet with others. When considering the LBA evidence, I have looked at the entire Greek-speaking world and its connections to the wider Mediterranean and Mesopotamia, with special focus on the same regions where I hypothesize that Greeks and West Semitic peoples took opportunities to banquet together in the Iron Age: Syro-Phoenicia, Cyprus, Crete, Sicily and southern Italy. In my review of the LBA evidence two facts emerged that are relevant for the history of multicultural banqueting: 1) The Mycenaean adapted Minoan banqueting habits, altering them in an idiosyncratic way, and this new Mycenaean mode became dominant on Crete once the Mycenaeans conquered the island ca. 1450 BCE; 2) banquets where representatives of one of the Great Kings of the Amarna letters would be hosted by one of their brother Kings, usually for long periods, was a feature of the distinctive diplomacy of the Amarna period. Not so different from some diplomatic strategies today, in LBA East Mediterranean, Egypt, and Mesopotamia, multicultural banquets were an important context of direct contact between the political power centres.

Minoan-Mycenaean Multicultural Banqueting in the LBA

At the beginning of the LBA there emerges a somewhat standardized elite Mycenaean drinking service [Fig. 1], which constitutes a change from MBA drinking habits,
characterized by a mix of imported vessels, imitations of imports, and indigenous vessels, which included the replacement of some indigenous ceramic and metal vessels with vessels of gold, silver, and bronze imported from Crete (Wright 2004, 140). This followed a marked increase in the amount of feasting equipment found in certain high-status burials at the end of MBA (Wright 2004, 146). While this increased interest in feasting and its representation and symbolism is related to competition for status and prestige among the elites of different Mycenaean centres (Wright 2004, 156), it is likely that the terms of this competition, in the form of “the acquisition of bronze, silver, and gold vessels by aggrandizing Mycenaean elites during the beginning years of the Late Bronze Age resulted from their participation in such festivals while on Crete” (Wright 2004, 167 cf. 154; cf. Dickinson 1977, 54). Wright gathers a good deal of evidence to support his theory that prior to the foundation of Mycenaean palatial society in LH III A, mainland Greeks participated in Minoan court culture in the form of feasts and that this multicultural, multilingual banqueting experience caused them to adapt certain elements of the Minoan banquet to their own, largely competitive and exclusive, practices of feasting and drinking on the mainland. As pointed out by other authors in the special issue of Hesperia, the Mycenaean feast never replicated the feasting practices of Crete (Borgna 2004b, 261) but selectively adapted some of their components as a result of direct experience of these practices. That is, this archaeologically observable relationship between Mycenaean, Cretan, and Cycladic societies is, as Wright concludes (2004, 172):

> the result of sustained and intense human social interaction carried out at every level from the personal to the political. Feasting is one of the most ubiquitous and socially productive of these interactions, highly personal and open to infinite cultural variation in the selection of comestibles, their
manipulation by preparation and presentation, and customs of their consumption. Feasting can thus be argued to be an appropriate vehicle for many other human activities, especially those that involve production and exchange, all of which depend on human relationships, trust, and sharing.

Here, Wright acknowledges not only that Mycenaean-Minoan multicultural banqueting influenced Mycenaean banqueting practices and status negotiation, but also that such banquets likely served as contexts and motivators of other exchanges and of the development of bonds between these two groups. This is very similar to my hypothesis about the results and opportunities provided by Greek banqueting with West Semitic peoples in the Geometric period, and is an example of how a phenomenon that is in evidence in the Geometric period played a central role in the emergence of Greek elite culture in the LBA.

The LBA Mycenaean Drinking Service, Mycenaean Pictorial Kraters, and their Significance for the Question of Multicultural Banqueting

The similarities of the evidence for multicultural banqueting in the LBA to that in the Geometric period are yet more extensive because of the international popularity beyond the Aegean of the aforementioned new elite Mycenaean drinking service that emerges at the beginning of the LBA. This drinking service becomes popular at the coastal Syrian city of Ugarit, in certain cities of Cyprus, on the east coast of Sicily, and in a very interesting development is imitated by local pottery in certain cities on Crete, representing a cultural feedback of the material culture of banqueting determined by the changing relative prestige of Mainland and Cretan society, whereby after the Mycenaecs incorporated local imitations...
of Cretan wares and Cretan metal vessels into their LBA banqueting service, this hybrid service became prestigious enough for the Cretans to imitate its forms and composition in local ceramic fabric. Importantly, in doing so, the Cretans might not have been imitating the Mycenaean, but could also have been influenced by Cypriot and Ugaritic deployment of Mycenaean banqueting services.

Mycenaean pottery was imported to Cyprus and Ugarit in larger quantities than to any other location in the East Mediterranean (Yon 2006, 145; Steel 2004, 289). The quantities were so large to Ugarit that they allowed the propagation of the theory in recent scholarship that there was a settlement of Mycenaean traders there (Kilian 1990, 459), which has been successfully refuted by Kochavi who argues according to Ugaritic documents that while foreign merchants resided at Ugarit, the majority have Semitic names and are never mentioned as coming from anywhere in the Mediterranean west of Cyprus (1992, 13). It is clear that there was Ugaritic interest in Mycenaean banqueting equipment since “the whole range of Mycenaean painted pottery and tableware” were found there (Kilian 1990, 459). Non-container types are prevalent (Sherratt 1999, 170-171) indicating that the pottery itself was of interest to the Ugaritians (Kochavi 1992, 10), but the pottery alone does not indicate the circumstances of Ugaritic incorporation of Mycenaean forms into their repertories. However, interest in this banqueting equipment does presuppose its recognition as significant in elite systems of ritualized wine-drinking (Sherratt 1999, 185-186). LH III A2 – LH III B Mycenaean pictorial kraters in particular, which were much more common on Cyprus and in the Levant than they were in Mainland Greece, fit into East Mediterranean elite symbolism with their depictions of chariots and bulls (Sherratt 1999, 188-189). It is important to note that Mycenaean pottery at Ugarit is usually associated with Cypriot pottery
(Kochavi 1992, 10), so our evidence does not suggest contact between Mycenae and Ugarit without Cypriot involvement, which can be envisaged in a number of ways, including joint Mycenaean and Cypriot trading ventures similar to the Levantine-Cypriot trading ventures in evidence in the Ulu Burun and Cape Gelidonya wrecks (Kochavi 1992, 12). Sherratt sees Cypriot traders as middle-men capable of communicating to producers in the Argolid what would be of interest to consumers at Ugarit, thereby facilitating its production and delivery (1999, 187). In sum, people at Ugarit do not imitate Mycenaean drinking behaviour or the elite Mycenaean banqueting service, but rather incorporate some imported Mycenaean wares into their own banqueting services. I will return to the question of the circumstances of how the Ugaritians adopted these Mycenaean forms after a consideration of the situation on Cyprus, which, as mentioned above, is essential to understanding contact between Ugarit and the Greek mainland.

The indigenous ceramic fineware of Cyprus, Base Ring and White Slip, constituted the drinking services of the island until the fourteenth century BCE (LC II A-B), when Mycenaean forms begin to be incorporated (Steel 2004, 292). The Mycenaean pictorial krater, in particular, became a high-status component of drinking services [Fig. 2], along with Mycenaean metal vessels. Intended for display and with an imagery associated with elite lifestyles, it became a necessary component of wealthy burials in coastal cities, while use-wear analysis indicates that the kraters were used for many years before deposition (Steel 2004, 293). Deposits identified as the remnants of elite feasting in the administrative building X at Kalavassos - Agios Dimitrios, a few kilometres inland of the south-central coast of the island, and in a well associated with a sanctuary at Kouklia (near Palaepaphos) contain significant amounts of Mycenaean fineware, especially cups and bowls (Steel 2004,
Importantly, the deployment of Mycenaean ceramics by the Cypriot elite did not emulate the use of these items by Mycenaean elites, but seems to have followed the pattern of use at Ugarit (Steel 2004, 294). Therefore, the use of Mycenaean ceramics associated with drinking in Cyprus is indicative of Cypriot familiarity with Ugaritic drinking practices more than with Mycenaean drinking practices. There is some iconographic, architectural, and literary evidence of multicultural banquets between Mycenaeans and Cypriots and Mycenaeans and Ugaritians that I will address below, but the evidence from Mycenaean ceramics does not go further than indicating that the elites in some Cypriot cities were familiar with Ugaritic elite drinking practice, and therefore had some opportunity to observe it.

The influence of the LBA Mycenaean banqueting service on Crete has been outlined above. The Cretan emulation of the LBA Mycenaean banqueting service (originally composed of indigenous mainland wares in combination with local imitations of Cretan wares and imported Cretan metal vessels) occurs in the context of the Cretan Monopausal period, LM III A, whereby Knossos under Mycenaean control held sway over the island. On the mainland in LH III B, at the height of Mycenaean palatial society, there was an attempt by central authorities to control feasts even in private funerary practice (Borgna 2004b, 267), and in this period on Crete there is a marked decrease in wine consumption (Borgna 2004b, 268) which is also likely related to Mycenaean dominance on the island and their attempt to control the symbols of elite status. The Mycenaean style of warrior grave appears in LM II at Knossos, and in LM III A at Phaistos, Archanes, Rethymnon, and Chania (Borgna 2004b, 268), with the typical presence of metal weapons and metal vessels, and with a number of vessels significantly lower than was traditional in elite Cretan graves (Borgna 2004b, 264).
Concurrent with the climax of Mycenaean power on Crete in LM III B are the feasting deposits at Phaistos, which demonstrate a departure from traditional communal feasts to exclusive, competitive feasts which were “celebrated as occasions of conspicuous consumption and served to promote the ideological strategies of dominant groups” (Borgna 2004b, 248), as was typical in mainland Greece. As the Mycenaean style graves appear on Crete, a parallel development is the appearance of an entirely ceramic and elaborately decorated banqueting service in some LM III graves that differs from earlier Cretan assemblages and is consistent with assemblages found in some settlements at the time (Borgna 2004b, 268). Many of the shapes of this new set were influenced by Mycenaean ceramics, such as kylikes and kraters, but, like the Cypriot evidence, do not indicate emulation of the entire Mycenaean banqueting service or Mycenaean drinking practice and we should see this development in LM III Crete as a possible emulation of Cypriot or Ugaritic banqueting in possible opposition to the Mycenaean model, or at least as an alternative elite system of symbolism from which these less Mycenaeanized Cretans were not excluded.

Before turning to the dynamics of the Mycenaean banqueting service in the central Mediterranean, mention should be made of the theory employed in Louise Steel’s 2004 article about Cypriot banqueting in the Late Bronze Age that is relevant for our discussion of elite symbolic systems and emulation, and for all considerations of multicultural banqueting. Steel, following Mary Helms, highlights “the role of imported exotic commodities and esoteric knowledge in the construction of political and ideological power” (Steel 2004, 282) and sees the incorporation or emulation of foreign cuisine and banqueting equipment as a “transferral of esoteric knowledge of exotic drinking customs and the novel use of external
referents in the expression of identity and status” (Steel 2004, 288). I think that the appeal to external referents to assert one’s identity and status is one of the prime engines of all trade and cultural contact in the Mediterranean from the Late Bronze Age through the Archaic period, and this phenomenon is relevant for the consideration of the fortunes of the Mycenaean banqueting service in the Levant, Cyprus, Crete, and Sicily and southern Italy. In theoretical terms, I am working in the postcolonial tradition that sees all cultures involved in exchanges as agents pursuing their interests. It is not a matter of cultural diffusion, an impersonal process whereby memes travel the globe unconcerned for their human carriers. It is not a matter of acculturation, where individuals gain competence in another culture because of the latter’s dominance. What Helms’ theory addresses are the strategies of being or becoming elite employed by individuals, and the acquisition of symbolic capital through the adaptation of foreign systems of status-marking and esoteric knowledge is one such strategy.

The earliest Aegean pottery to appear in Sicily and southern Italy in significant quantities is of LH I-II date, in Vivara in the Gulf of Naples, near Salerno, in the Lipari Islands and at Monte Grande in Sicily (Bettelli 2011, 110; Vagnetti 2010, 893-4; Vagnetti and Betelli 2005; Vagnetti 2003; Sherratt 1999, 192). The earliest import of Aegean pottery over all in the central Mediterranean appears at Monte Grande on the central southern coast of Sicily and is composed of Matt-Painted and Burnished Ware from Attica-Aegina of MH date in association with Canaanite jars (Bettelli 2011, 112). Importation is followed by local manufacture of Mycenaean-style and Mycenaean-influenced ceramics in LH III A-B, especially in the plain of Sybaris (Bettelli 2011, 111; Vagnetti 2010, 894; Kilian 1990, 456). Both importation of Mycenaean ceramics on Sicily and local manufacture of Mycenaean
forms in southern Italy and Sardinia reach their climax in LH III B-C, during and after the crisis in mainland Palatial society in LH III B (Bettelli 2011, 110). In the plain of Sybaris, while LH I-II cups are the first imports, these are soon afterwards made locally and only storage vessels are imported, with a return to importing drinking and storage vessels in LH III C (Bettelli 2011, 112). In Sicily, from the earliest imports until LH III C, Mycenaean drinking and storage forms are present alongside Cypriot imports and local production of Mycenaean-style ceramics is not significant (Bettelli 2011, 111-2; Vagnetti 2010, 894-5).

After LH III C, a major shift in trade and contact between the central and East Mediterranean occurs, with Sicily and southern Italy limited to Tyrrhenian connections in the Early Iron Age and the rise in importance of Etruria and Sardinia as centres of wealth, power, and long distance exchange (De Angelis 2010, 23).

Three important facts emerge from the picture sketched above which are significant for questions of multicultural banqueting. Firstly, there seems to have been greater enthusiasm for the Mycenaean drinking service in the central Mediterranean than in the Levant, Cyprus, and Crete. In southern Italy and Sardinia a large industry emerged making truly Mycenaean, Mycenaean-imitation, and Mycenaean-local hybrid ceramics, and in Sicily and the Aeolian islands, Mycenaean imports were not limited to an elite, but were found “in almost every hut” in the Lipari islands, for example (Kilian 1990, 461). This enthusiasm has prompted Susan Sherratt to hypothesize that the beginning of Mycenaean imports to the area in LH I-II involved “a process of the introduction of a ‘civilised’ wine-drinking ritual to that region—part, in this case, of a strategy of actively propagating lifestyle ideology in the interests of furthering long-term exchange in that direction” (1999, 194). Secondly, the relationship of the locals to the Mycenaean drinking service varies in different areas of the
central Mediterranean; in the plain of Sybaris LH I-II imports give way to local manufacture of the same shapes; in Sardinia imports continue alongside local manufacture; in Sicily Mycenaean ceramics are imported throughout the LBA and there is little local manufacture of them (Bettelli 2011, 111-2). Thirdly, the trade in Mycenaean ceramics outlasts Mycenaean Palatial society (Jung 2010, 180; Vagnetti 2010, 895), and it seems that Mycenaean trading ventures to the central Mediterranean increased during LH III C, prompting both the increase in imports in Sicily and the increase in local manufacture in Sardinia and southern Italy. It follows from this that the reaction of some Mycenaeans to the instability in the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean was to intensify their attention on the central Mediterranean. Many other markets for the Mycenaean drinking service were burnt, girded for war, or otherwise unreachable, and so Mycenaeans arrived on the shores of Sicily in larger numbers with greater cargo, and this may have encouraged more local production throughout the Tyrrenian. This intensification in LH III C, however, represented a last gasp, since the areas involved in trade with the Mycenaeans most intensively, Sicily and the Aeolian islands, experienced a diminution of their centrality in the region and of their importance in international trade in concert with the transition from LH III C to the Early Iron Age and the depression seen in the Aegean economy and population size. On the other hand, fortunes were on the rise in areas where the Mycenaean drinking service was just as popular but that had succeeded in incorporating it into their local pottery production, for example Sardinia. One small symbol of their newfound prominence in the region may have been the continuity in their symbolic expressions involving drinking practices during the same period as Sicily had lost one source of its symbolism – the imported Mycenaean drinking service.
Iconography of the Banquet in the East Mediterranean and Mesopotamia

Another set of evidence that bears witness to the cultural exchange of aspects of elite banqueting and therefore may be the result of multicultural banqueting is the iconography of banqueting in LBA mainland Greece, Crete, Anatolia, the Levant, Egypt, and Mesopotamia. I follow Wright in treating representations of banqueting as elements of banqueting itself (2004, 137), especially since banqueting iconography is often found on vessels associated with the consumption of food and drink, on architectural decoration and furniture that could conceivably be used for banqueting. On the other hand, Egyptian stelai, Hittite rock reliefs, and seal stones are not necessarily directly associated with feasting events, but rather convey information about the status and wealth of the divine, elite or royal person depicted. On the stone reliefs of the gates at Alaca Höyük [Fig. 14], the placement of images of the king seated holding a cup and of a seated god drinking can be interpreted along the lines of Irene Winter’s interpretation of Neo-Assyrian wall reliefs (1981), as communicating to the viewer that one is coming into the presence of the king and the city’s god(s) as one enters the walls, even though the home of the king or temple of the god might be quite far away. The banqueting depicted on Egyptian stelai and paintings can be connected either with the feeding of the dead in the afterlife or making offerings to deities, also conceived in terms of feeding (Dentzer 1982, 26). Simply put, the representations of banqueting in all Mediterranean and Mesopotamian societies serve variable functions and have multiple meanings, but they can never be separated from each society’s attitudes and beliefs about food, drink, and banqueting in other contexts which may or may not be engaged in any
single representation. In all the regions mentioned above, eating and drinking are most often depicted as activities carried out by an individual or by pairs of individuals, with a number of notable exceptions, while there may be a number of servants preparing food, serving food and drinks, or playing music (Ziffer 2005, 133-4).

In Mesopotamia, banquets are first depicted around 3000 BCE as part of royal symbolism and were associated with the redistribution of food by the king to the population at large (Ziffer 2005, 133). These images decorate walls, furniture, cylinder seals, and objects such as votive plaques dedicated in temples (Reade 1995, 38). The associations of the banquet changed over time and it became primarily an event “used to reaffirm rank, for decision making and as an opportunity to discuss matters of great importance [and] thus became a high point of court life and an efficient tool in power politics” (Ziffer 2005, 133). In Mesopotamia, the image of the ruler feasting alone symbolized the wealth of the people as a whole (Ziffer 2005, 133), and this would presumably also be the case for the image of the king and queen feasting together. Frances Pinnock traces a development of the motif whereby a greater variety of themes and composition in Sumerian depictions give way to the standardization of a male and female pair sometimes accompanied by servants in Akkadian depictions (Pinnock 1994, 16, but cf. Selz 1983 for a significant number of homosexual pairs), such as the seal from Tell Mozan depicting the seated king with a cup accompanied by the seated queen and two children (Ziffer 2005, 138, Fig. 12). The Sumerian evidence also provides examples of banqueting by single individuals and pairs (Pinnock 1994, 16), but the Akkadian representations favour the heterosexual or homosexual pair of banqueters and these three variations (m/f, m/m, f/f) are the only ones depicted with any frequency (Selz 1983, 492-8). The banqueting images are often associated with depictions of battle,
hunting, or tribute scenes. On the Standard of Ur [Fig. 3], which is an ivory and lapis lazuli inlay covering the soundbox of a lyre, the king is depicted as the largest among a total of seven men who sit and drink, resting on their left elbows and holding cups in their right hands, accompanied by servants, a lyre-player and a singer; on the lower two registers servants lead animals to sacrifice and/or butchering, and bring other goods presumably involved in the preparation of a feast. On the reverse of the box is depicted a chariot battle, an infantry battle, and a tribute procession where captives are led before the standing king. More important for the connections with banqueting iconography in the East Mediterranean are the depictions of banqueting pairs where a status hierarchy is not visible between them, as can be seen on an Early Dynastic II cylinder seal (Pinnock 1994, Pl. Ia, on an Early Dynastic III votive relief plaque (Pinnock 1994, Pl. Ie), and on more than a dozen Akkadian seals spanning the entire Akkadian period and into the post-Akkadian period in Mesopotamia discussed by Selz (1983, Taf. 39, Figs. 444, 445; Taf. 40, Figs. 459, 462, 472 [Fig. 4]; Taf. 41, Figs. 481, 488; Taf. 43, Figs. 501, 507, 514, 526; Taf. 46, Figs. 581, 601 [Fig. 5]).

Egyptian depictions of banqueting begin at around the same time as the Mesopotamian, or a little later, on stelai of the third dynasty in the first half of the third millennium BCE (Dentzer 1982, 26). Jean-Marie Dentzer expertly describes the motif, which is markedly homogeneous throughout Egyptian history (Dentzer 1982, 26-7), and is usually deployed in a funerary context. A seated individual is represented as receiving offerings of food and drink from servants or officials. There is always a table laden with food before him. The offerings are often accompanied by musicians and dancing. He is sometimes accompanied by his spouse, or by his spouse and children, and these may be
seated next to him or across from him, but it is much rarer for them to face him. The motif is sometimes elaborated to include many other banqueters who sit on the ground and are served food and drink by servants (Dentzer 1982, Fig 21 [Fig. 6]). Another variation of the scene shows women seated on the ground, being served drinks and listening to music [Fig. 7]. The Egyptian tradition appears unaffected by the Akkadian tradition of depicting pairs seated facing one another in a way that suggests equal status, which would prove to be so influential in Anatolia and the Aegean. One example in Egyptian art where a heterosexual pair sit across from one another is a representation not of Egyptians but of a Syrian mercenary and his companion (Dentzer 1982, 32, Fig. 22 [Fig. 8]), which should be seen as an exception that proves the rule that Egyptian representations were not significantly affected by the preference in Mesopotamia and Syria for depictions of pairs of banqueters, and anyway clearly differentiate between the status of the two participants – only the man drinks. There are fascinating Egyptian painted ostraka related to mythological stories involving the reversal or upheaval of the natural order of the world. They are evocative representations of banqueting with “the other” and of how ancient Egyptians conceived of harmony, which in these images is presented as a banquet. In this topsy-turvy world, a cat serves a piece of poultry to a seated mouse [Fig. 9], and a cat and a duck sit down to a meal together [Fig. 10].

The representations of banqueting in the Levant follow the pattern of Egypt more closely than they do that of Akkadian culture. The motif of the pair of seated banqueters, such as is depicted on an Old Syrian ritual basin from Ebla (Pinnock 1994, Pl. VIa; Ziffer 2005, Fig. 16; Dentzer 1982, Fig. 25), does not appear on the thirteenth-twelfth century ivory plaques from Megiddo and Tell el Far‘ah (cf. Pinnock 1994, 23, who wants to see a
pair of banqueters [Fig. 11), which depict either a single male seated banqueter accompanied by a standing female who faces him (Ziffer 2005, Fig. 21 and 23a) or a single male seated banqueter faced by pairs of male banqueters two-to-a-bench (Ziffer 2005, Fig. 22 [Fig. 12]) who drink from smaller bowls and are not supplied with a table of food, as is their host. In the Levant the standard depiction is of a single male banqueter, possibly attended by a wife or servants, as depicted on the thirteenth or twelfth century Ahiram sarcophagus from Byblos (Ziffer 2005, 154-5, Fig. 24a-e [Fig. 13]), and this motif appears throughout Syria-Palestine in the second and first millennium BCE, on cylinder seals, statuary, sarcophagi, and ivory panels for inlay on furniture.

The iconography of the banquet in LBA Anatolia adheres to the pattern established in Akkadian Mesopotamia, with depictions featuring a pair of seated banqueters, but also features many depictions of a single banqueter (Dentzer 1982, 34; Orthmann 1971, 380) as is common in Egypt and the Levant. The images appear on relief vases, cylinder seals, and reliefs on stone (Dentzer 1982, 34-5). Orthmann interprets the images of a single banqueter as representations of a divinity (1971, 380), but this is also the case for the king at Alaca Höyük [Fig. 14]. On the neck of a relief vase found at Bitik, a banqueting human couple sits face-to-face and is associated with processions of servants with offerings and warriors on the belly of the vase (Dentzer 1982, 34; Orthmann 1971, 370, No. 1). On a stone relief from Yasilikaya, a divine heterosexual pair sits on either side of a table or altar (Orthmann 1971, 370, No. 2), a pattern repeated on an unprovenanced stone relief from Yagri, where a banqueting pair sit across from one another, but it is not possible to tell whether they are human or divine (Dentzer 1982, 34; Orthmann 1971, 370, No. 3). On a stone relief from Maraş, an aristocratic heterosexual couple banquets seated across from one another in the
company of their child, who stands (Orthmann 1971, Maraş C/1) [Fig. 15]. On a seal from Bogazköy, an individual sits before a table and a man standing opposite him or her offers a libation (Dentzer 1982, 34).

In the Aegean world, feasting scenes appear on frescoes from LM I on Crete to LH III B on the mainland (Wright 2004, 155) and on pictorial kraters, larnakes, and a ring. They follow the pattern established in the Akkadian sphere and practiced in Anatolia where male or female individuals are either depicted banqueting in pairs sitting on either side of a table from one another, or alone. A number of frescoes depict the preparation for a banquet and processions bringing food and drink but do not feature, in their current state of preservation, any people eating and drinking. This is the case with a LM I fresco from Ayia Irini on Kea (Wright 2004, Fig. 9 [Fig. 16]), a LM I fresco from Tylissos on Crete (Wright 2004, Fig. 8 [Fig. 17]), and a LH III fresco from Pylos (Wright 2004, Fig. 10 [Fig. 18]).

Depictions of people in the act of consumption of food and drink are rare, and the state of preservation makes it difficult to identify specifics in the images. On the relevant fragments of the Campstool Fresco from Knossos [Fig. 19], a decorated kylix is offered by one individual to another. By the colour of their skin, they should both be men. In a related fragment, the lower half of an individual sits on a campstool. There is debate as to whether the men are human or divine and whether the man offering the cup is seated or standing (Wright 2004, 162-6). Another fragment of the fresco shows a hand holding what appears to be a chalice, a vessel that is usually associated with the divine. For all their ambiguity, the evidence from the Pylos Megaron and the Campstool Frescoes are consistent with the situation in contemporary Mesopotamia and Anatolia, with banqueters appearing alone but especially in pairs, accompanied by servants bringing food and drink and playing music. A
similar problem with specificity is encountered with the Pylos Megaron Fresco (Wright 2004, Fig. 13 [Fig. 20]). It seems that two pairs of individuals sit across small tables from one another. The restoration depicts pairs of men holding kylikes, but the preserved portions indicate only that in the one case, two individuals of undetermined sex sit on campstools across a table from one another, and that in the other case an individual of undetermined sex sits on a campstool at a table. What we do know is that these representations are associated with a female lyre-player and an elaborate procession of servants bringing food, drink, and sacrificial animals, so the seated persons are almost certainly participating in a banquet, but we do not know whether they were eating, drinking, or waiting for the banquet to be served, or whether they were homo- or heterosexual pairs. The Aegean evidence, while containing examples of single banqueters, does not show a preference for this type of representation as can be seen in the Levant and Egypt.

There are two unequivocal depictions of banqueting from Tiryns. One is a gold signet ring depicting a seated goddess holding a chalice awaiting service by four animal-human hybrid genii who carry beaked jugs (Wright 2004, 165, Fig. 16 [Fig. 21]). The second is a pictorial krater from Tiryns which depicts a man holding a kylix and sitting on a chair similar to a campstool while two chariots race toward him (Wright 2004, 165, Fig. 17 [Fig. 22]). These unequivocal representations in combination with the more ambiguous examples from frescoes indicate that the representation of banqueting in the Aegean world, characterized by the depiction of individual humans or gods banqueting alone or in pairs, follows the pattern already established in the Akkadian period in Mesopotamia and employed in Anatolia in the periods contemporary with Minoan and Mycenaean civilization. The presentation of offerings to a seated divinity who holds a cup, drinks, or sits before a
table of food, is a type of representation that is common to the Hittites, Akkadians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Levantines, Mycenaeans and Cretans, and therefore, while I see closer connections between Mesopotamia and Anatolia in terms of representations of the banqueting pair, the offering ceremony to a seated banqueting god or goddess follows a similar pattern in all of the regions studied.

This iconography relates generally to the evidence of multicultural banqueting provided by the popularity of Mycenaean ceramics in the LBA. Elites in the eastern Mediterranean became interested in some aspects of Mycenaean drinking practice possibly because their banqueting equipment appealed to the ideas of the Levantine elite about themselves, and it also gave those elites an opportunity to associate with external symbols of power and its associated esoteric knowledge, which further separates them from other elites or non-elites in their home communities, following the anthropological theory of Mary Helms (1988, 262-4). Both the Minoan and Mycenaean iconography of banqueting hold to the same iconographical topoi, but the closest parallels are in Hittite and Akkadian or Babylonian representations, while Levantine and Egyptian parallels are with the representations of offerings to deities, and also on the krater from Tiryns [Fig. 22] where a man sits and drinks, probably alone, as chariots race towards him. It is evidence that Aegean elites became familiar with aspects of Mesopotamian or Hittite banqueting practice, that is, its styles of representation, and these styles appealed to the Aegean elite’s ideas about themselves and provided them an opportunity to associate themselves with external symbols of power, and they therefore represented banqueting in their material culture in a way that adheres in a general way to external patterns of representation, but the mechanism by which this contact and influence occurred is not very clear. The type is already established on Crete
before the Monopalatial Period, and the Mycenaeans adapted it along with certain other aspects of Minoan banqueting, such as vessels of precious metal. It is possible that the style of representation on Crete was influenced by a much older Mesopotamian/East Mediterranean style such as that seen on an Old Syrian ritual basin from Ebla (Ziffer 2005, Fig. 16; Pinnock 1994, Pl. VIa; Dentzer 1982, 31, Fig. 25 [Fig. 23]). I am more comfortable with a hypothesis of Mesopotamian influence on Crete via a Levantine intermediary at the beginning of the LBA or end of the MBA than with contact between central Anatolia and Crete in the same time period, since there is much more evidence of Crete being connected in a network of East and South Mediterranean contacts than one of mainland Anatolian contacts. However, the Ahhiyawa texts discussed below attest diplomatic relations between the Mycenaeans and Hittites beginning in the fifteenth century, and in such a situation, there could easily have been Hittite influence on the banqueting practices of Crete at the beginning of the LBA.

The iconography of the banquet itself does not provide any information about how people from the Aegean and Mesopotamia came into contact and became familiar with one another’s banqueting traditions, but some of the other events depicted in association with banqueting representations do provide some clues as to the circumstances under which representatives of these populations may have witnessed the banqueting traditions of the others. The banquet is often represented in association with depictions of processions bringing food and drink, or the spoils of battle. Though these representations clearly represent many different specific elite rituals, it can easily be observed that one of the occasions for feasting is the receipt of tribute of all kinds, either from defeated enemies, vassals, or allies. The offering of tribute is mentioned by Wright as one of the function of
feasts at the highest social level in Mycenaean society (2004, 155), and Ziffer presents the Levantine drinking ceremony as a locus for political decision making and as a tool of power politics (2005, 133). These two interpretations of banqueting practices provide a basis for the hypothesis that representatives of foreign populations may on occasion have attended such events both in the Aegean and the Levant in order to establish or affirm economic, political, or military relationships that are in evidence, for example, in the trade of Mycenaean ceramics and the products of the thirteenth century ivory-working school (Feldman 2005; Steel 2004, 289). Viewing the representations of banqueting in their context as part of a broader series of images depicting offering-ceremonies involving tribute and the spoils of war establishes rich ground for theorising the mode of cultural contact between Aegean and Levantine populations in the LBA, for events involving banqueting appear as nodes in the network of international East Mediterranean economic and political relationships, whereby alliances, subordination, and the threat of war are articulated. For banquets to function as rituals involving the receipt of tribute and as tools of power-politics, almost by definition such banquets would not exclude foreigners, but would be open to certain special representatives from other East Mediterranean and Mesopotamian populations, and therefore would provide opportunities to witness foreign banqueting practices, and possibly to participate in the banquet. With this theory we have established new social and cultural milieux that would facilitate the learning and adaptation of foreign banqueting practices.
Banqueting, Hospitality, and Diplomacy: The Amarna Letters

There is no better witness to the international dynamics of tribute, gift-giving, alliances, negotiation and subordination in LBA East Mediterranean politics than the diplomatic letters found at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt. As a conclusion to this section on the evidence for multicultural banqueting in the LBA, I will discuss the Amarna evidence in conjunction with the idea outlined above that banqueting was involved in events through which representatives of East Mediterranean populations gathered together, negotiated various economic and political matters and expressed their relationships to one another. This evidence relates to the idea of *xenia* found later in Archaic Greek literature, but as we will see in Chapter 3, not all multicultural banquets in early Greek are described in terms of *xenia*.

No source provides more information about the dynamics of economic, political, and social relations between East Mediterranean and Mesopotamian states and peoples in the LBA than the diplomatic letters discovered at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt in 1887 CE. Written almost exclusively in Akkadian and dating from the reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten (1391-1334 BCE), they represent an Egyptian archive of diplomatic correspondence with other major powers, smaller independent states, and vassal kingdoms in Syria-Palestine (Cohen and Westbrook 2000, 6-9). Another body of letters are those found at Hattusa that are copies of correspondence sent by the Hittite king to his Ahhiyawan (probably Mycenaean) counterpart (Beckman, Bryce, and Cline 2011, 3-4), and these deserve consideration alongside the Amarna letters as evidence of the same diplomatic system. Four
aspects of the relationships between states revealed in these letters are relevant for our consideration of multicultural banqueting. Firstly, the mechanism by which gifts were given, tribute was offered, trade was conducted, marriages were negotiated and letters were delivered between the parties participating in the relationships in evidence in the Amarna letters was the deployment of envoys of various rank to the courts of their partner-states, journeys that would typically take several months. These envoys could be professional couriers, merchants involved in large-scale trade, or high-ranking officials in their home states acting as ambassadors (Liverani 2000, 22). Secondly, according to the traditional customs of hospitality operative throughout the region these envoys were hosted by the court of the king who was the intended recipient of the message, goods, or offer (Liverani 2000, 22). The practicalities of this hosting involve the provision of food, lodging and entertainments deemed appropriate to the rank of the envoy, and would therefore provide opportunities for the envoy to become familiar with the banqueting practices of his host’s court. Increasing the level of the envoy’s familiarity with the host’s court was the frequent prolongation of these diplomatic visits because of a culture of bargaining and contention that characterises both the actual negotiation occurring in the destination city and the posture the kings adopt toward one another in the letters (Liverani 2000, 19, 22). Envoys could therefore remain in the host court for more than a year or two as part of this process of negotiation, which seems to have had as its goal not low-cost transactions but rather the maintenance of the interstate relationship; the bargaining and protestations are driven by a desire to remain in contact (Liverani 2000, 19, 21). Thirdly, actual banquets are discussed in the letters – invitations to banquets are made and protestations about being left off the guest-list are levelled against the correspondent; for example, in EA 3, the king of Babylon, Kadashman-
Enlil, protests not having been invited by Pharaoh to a feast at Amarna and issues an invitation to Pharaoh to a banquet in Babylon (Liverani 2000, 18-9). Finally, some diplomatic relationships among states and individuals were defined in terms of food and drink. In the Tawagalawa letter, the King of Hatti, probably Hattusili III (1286-1265 BCE), is trying to solve a multipolar diplomatic dispute between him and some men acquainted with an unnamed Ahhiyawan king. In the letter addressed to the unnamed king, he explains Hittite diplomatic principles, stating that safe passage through his territory is established once someone has been sent bread and beer (Beckman et al. 2011, AhT 4 §8). Through these four aspects of Great Powers diplomacy, we see that multicultural banqueting was a common feature of diplomatic practice, related to the hosting of envoys; that the fictive kinship among brother-kings was sometimes expressed by invitations to royal banquets, however unlikely it might be that a king of one land would actually travel to the court of another; and that food and drink could be deployed with specific diplomatic meaning. They defined, in part, relations among different individuals and states.

The area linked by this kind of diplomacy involving the exchange of letters and envoys covered the entire Fertile Crescent and extended west to Arzawa in south-western Asia Minor and Alashiya on Cyprus. The kingdoms inhabiting the Fertile Crescent – Egypt, Hattusa, Mitanni, Assyria, and Babylon – were the core, to use World Systems terminology, and the periphery extended west to coastal Anatolia and the eastern Mediterranean, and filled in the areas between the great powers with vassal kingdoms, such as Byblos, Ugarit, and Qadesh in Syria-Palestine, subject to the competing interests of Egypt and Hattusa. The Mycenaeans were peripherally engaged in the Great Powers system based on the Ahhiyawa texts (but cf. Podany 2010, 260), and they were involved in trade with a number of areas that
were involved in the system, such as Cyprus and Ugarit, as I have illustrated above. The relations the Mycenaean states had with Hattusa are difficult to characterise; there is little evidence of trade between Mainland Greece and Hattusa (Beckman et al. 2011, 268-9), beyond a small amount of LH pottery at Boğazköy and Masar Höyük. There are, however, indications of interstate relations in the Ahhiyawa texts. There is very nearly scholarly consensus that the Hittite term *Ahhiyawa* refers to a Mycenaean state or states, most likely Mycenae in Mainland Greece, but possibly may refer to a state or states on the Aegean islands or may refer to the entire Mycenaean world, including Miletus (Beckman et al. 2011, 3-4). The relevance of these texts to the present study is what they indicate about direct diplomatic relations between the Hittites and Mycenaean states, and about to what extent the Mycenaecans participated in the Great Powers system.

With regard to the latter question, it is highly relevant that King Tudhaliya IV of Hattusa, in a treaty with his relative and vassal King Shaushga-muwa of Amurru in Syria dated to the late thirteenth century, explicitly states his relations to other kings in the Great Powers system: *AhT 2 §13 (A iv 1-3) “And the kings who are my equals in rank are the King of Egypt, the King of Babylonia, the King of Assyria, and the King of Ahhiyawa”* (Beckman et al. 2011, 61). Thus, from the perspective of the Hittite king, the king of Ahhiyawa was a high-ranking member of the Great Powers system. The fact that documents mentioning the Aegean in diplomatic terms are found only at Hattusa suggest that the same view may not have been held by the kings of Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria. Nevertheless, this document suggests that the relations of the Hittite king with the Ahhiyawan king were of a similar significance as his relations with the Egyptian king, for example.
The question of the nature of the diplomatic relations between the Hittite and Ahhiyawan kings is more difficult to answer. Of twenty-nine documents in Hittite archives which mention Ahhiyawa, only three are letters between the kings of Hattusa and Ahhiyawa, two from Hittite kings to kings of Ahhiyawa (Beckman et al., AhT 9, mid-fourteenth-early thirteenth century; AhT 4, mid-thirteenth century) and one from a king of Ahhiyawa to a Hittite king (Beckman et al. 2011, 7; AhT 6, early-mid-thirteenth century). In the letters, the Hittite king refers to himself and the king of Ahhiyawa as “we the brothers” (AhT 9 §3) and to the Ahhiyawan king as “my brother” (AhT 4 §8), and the Ahhiyawan king calls the Hittite king “my brother” (AhT 6 §3; §5). The details of the texts mentioned above suggest that some of the conditions of the Great Powers system were in operation between the kings of Hattusa and Ahhiyawa, including an ideology of equality and a relationship described in familial terms. However, in the twenty-nine texts assembled by Beckman, Bryce, and Cline, there is no mention of the exchange of gifts between the two kings, which is very informative about their relationships, since the sending and receiving of gifts was typical of the relationships between the other Great Kings. This absence is the corollary to the near absence of Hittite material in the Mycenaean world and of Mycenaean material at Hattusa (Beckman et al. 268-9), but the two powers had an area of interaction in western Asia Minor. The general picture that emerges from these texts is that the relations between the Hittites and the Mycenaens between the fifteenth and thirteenth centuries was defined more by conflict and détente regarding the territories of coastal Asia Minor, than by cooperation, trade, and alliances (Beckman et al. 2011, 274-5). Nevertheless, all of the issues addressed in the documents, such as requests for the return of captives, for military cooperation, and for the reception of exiles, presuppose the exchange of ambassadors to negotiate these
affairs, ambassadors who would have been hosted by the destination court in a style commensurate with their status.

The Amarna Letters indicate that these states conducted trade as part of more extensive relationships that involved diplomatic envoys, offers of marriage-alliances, and was characterised by long periods of residence in their partners’ courts and cities. Therefore it is beyond doubt that events that could be described as multicultural banqueting took place often as part of the requirements of diplomacy, trade, negotiation, and hospitality in the Amarna period. Contemporary with the Amarna evidence are Hittite texts which use the formulae of Amarna diplomacy in communication between Hattusa and Ahhiyawa, very likely Mycenae. From the Hittite pole of the Great Powers system, the king of Mycenae was a Great King participating in the system.

In considering the possibilities of multicultural banqueting involving Aegean, central Mediterranean, and East Mediterranean populations, I am dealing in part with the dynamics of the relationships between a state or states involved in the exchange of diplomatic letters with the Hittite king, such as Mycenae, or possibly even places like Pylos or Knossos, with an independent state on the periphery of the Great Powers system, in the case of Alashiya on Cyprus, and with a state that was a wealthy and important vassal first of Egypt and then of Hattusa, in the case of Ugarit. It is not necessary that those involved in coordinating trade in the kingdoms of Alashiya and Ugarit would have extended the diplomatic apparatus of trade, negotiation, and hospitality required for participation in the Great Powers system to their trading partners who were not on a first-name basis with the Pharaoh. On the other hand, considering that the Hittite king thought that the king of Ahhiyawa afforded treatment as a Great King, it is very hard to imagine that a state like Alashiya or Ugarit, which had invested
in the diplomatic infrastructure of appropriate facilities for negotiation and hospitality and had designated personnel to carry out these functions, which were necessary for their relations with the Great Powers, would not have brought these resources to bear in their negotiations with other trading partners. Alashiya and Ugarit may even have regarded the king of Ahhiyawa as a Great King, and hosted his envoys as such, but we can only speculate about this. I am not arguing that the details of the hospitality practices between participants in the Great Powers system would have been extended unchanged to all their trading partners, but rather that the general outline of relations that the Amarna letters provide would have been operative in the relations between minor members in the Great Powers system and their other trading partners who may not have been involved in the system at the same level. However, the Hittite evidence suggests that the Mycenaeans may have been full, if somewhat distant, members of the system, at least from the perspective of the Hittites, a perspective which was aware of events at Ugarit and Alashiya.

This general outline provided by the Amarna letters and the Ahhiyawa texts articulates a system where diplomacy and trade are necessarily entwined with other social and political activities including reciprocal bonds of hospitality, which by definition feature events where members of more than one cultural or linguistic group eat, drink, and enjoy entertainments together. All of the LBA evidence assembled above that attests to some level of more or less mutual familiarity in the realm of banqueting practices and equipment between the Mycenaeans and Sicily, Minoan Crete, Cyprus, Ugarit, and Hattusa is very elegantly accounted for by an Amarna-like system of diplomatic trading relations involving long periods of hospitality.
The evidence assembled above makes a clear case that multicultural banqueting was a characteristic of relations between Greeks and non-Greeks in the Late Bronze Age. By means of an international network of persons travelling for the purpose of diplomacy, trade or other arrangements requiring negotiation, Mycenaean Greeks were hosted by their partners, and this hospitality could have been of the highest level, that is, the hospitality of the ruling court in the destination. This was certainly the case with respect to relations with Sicily, Crete, and Cyprus, while the same cannot be said of Ugarit, which may have acquired its interest in Mycenaean banqueting equipment though its partnerships with Cyprus, while it is even more likely that the Mycenaeans became acquainted with the Near Eastern pattern of representation of banqueting through Cypriot and Cretan intermediaries; however, neither of these probabilities rule out direct hospitality relations between Ugarit and Mycenaean states. In their turn, Mycenaeans would have hosted their partners’ representatives during their visits to the Aegean. I think that the underlying reason for the flexibility of each of these populations in incorporating foreign equipment, styles of representation, and practices into their local banqueting traditions is the process described by Louise Steel (2004), following Mary Helms (1988, 262-4), whereby elites construct their prestige and symbolic power partly by reference to external symbolic systems and the esoteric knowledge they presuppose (Steel 2004, 282, 288).

Iron Age Transitions – New Communities, New Elites, New Styles

The end of the LBA in the East Mediterranean, and in the Aegean the transition from LH III B - LH III C, is characterised by major political upheavals, war, and destruction in
the Mycenaean states on the mainland and on Crete, in western and central Anatolia, and at Ugarit. I have mentioned above that in LH III C, Mycenaeans increased their trading activities with Sicily and southern Italy and this is part of a pattern where Mycenaeans are fleeing the Aegean for areas that were less affected by the East Mediterranean upheavals, so while some intensified contact with the central Mediterranean, others fled to Cyprus and southern Palestine. It is now generally agreed by scholars that the Early Iron Age (EIA) inhabitants of Philistia were Aegean in origin (Morris 2007, 216–7), and that the warlike Sea Peoples mentioned in Egyptian texts were a conglomerate of various groups with Aegean components (Jung 2010, 177). It is likely that some of these refugees had been elites in the failed Mycenaean states accompanied by their followers (Doumas 1998, 130), since people with fewer resources would not have been able to travel long distances to seek refuge. In an environment of multiple disruptions, some Mycenaeans sought refuge, often violently, in areas of the East Mediterranean less affected by the collapse, and these included Egypt, Cyprus, and southern Palestine.

As I write this, the EIA (ca. 1100-900 BCE) Mediterranean continues to be a rich and dynamic area of research. Just twenty years ago it was very common to hear the term “Dark Age” to describe the roughly three hundred years after the end of the Bronze Age, but scholars need to resort to the idea of a Dark Age only insofar as EIA evidence is absent, and happily, though it remains sparse, it is no longer so rare as to justify the term Dark Age. Precocious EIA sites like Lefkandi do not seem as isolated as they once did considering the research on EIA phases of various sites such as Athens, Argos, Tiryns (Jung 2010), and especially those on the islands, such as Knossos, Phaistos (Borgna 2004a; 2004b), and Kommos on Crete, and Kition, Paphos, Salamis and Amathus on Cyprus (Douplouy 2006,
These island sites either recovered more quickly from the LBA disruptions, were less affected by them, or were founded in their wake. There is now sufficient EIA evidence in various areas of the Mediterranean to permit the observation and analysis of regional or supraregional historical patterns, and to discuss aspects of social and cultural history such as banqueting in a broad geographical context where we can observe the links between areas of the Mediterranean in terms of their social practices and symbolic systems, such as has been done recently by Susan Sherratt (2004 and 2010), Alain Duplouy (2006), Ingrid Strøm (2001), and more generally by Ian Morris (2000 and 2007).

It is necessary here to describe in outline some of the EIA developments relevant to considerations of multicultural banqueting and to the emergence of reclined banqueting in particular, which occurred in the ninth or eighth century (Late Geometric period-Early Archaic period), as I will argue in Chapter 2. Three developments are central to these considerations: 1) The preferred locations for feasting rituals in Mainland Greece and Crete shift, but in opposite directions, the Mainland feasts moving from the palaces to isolated shrines and the Cretan feasts moving from the palaces to the urban settlements (Marakas 2010). These shifts are related to the power instability in the areas previously dominated by Mycenaean palaces, and the emergence of different individuals and groups vying for status at the top of the social hierarchy, which gave rise to new types of communities and new styles of banqueting (Borgna 2004b, 269); 2) The development in eleventh-century Cyprus, and subsequent spread to Euboea, Crete, Argos, Etruria, and Sardinia of a somewhat standardized warrior feasting equipment, including swords, knives, cauldrons, tripods, cups, bowls, kraters, spits, fire-dogs, and cheese-graters, and the related development of heroic burials with horses and chariots (Nijboer 2013; Stary 1994; 2000); and 3) The rising
prominence in the East Mediterranean of the Phoenician states in the wake of the destruction of Ugarit, their naval exploration of the Mediterranean, and the special case of Cyprus.

Ritual Feasting in Early Iron Age Crete and Mainland Greece

A number of authors have observed that in LBA Mainland Greece large-scale feasting and drinking seems to have been tightly controlled by the palaces and hosted in them (Borgna 2004b, 267-8; Marakas 2010, 117-8). The most important archaeological evidence for this practice comes from Pylos and Midea, two palatial sites in the Peloponnese. While this is the largest scale feasting in evidence, it never reached the proportions of LBA Cretan feasting, which seemed to be based on a less exclusionary principle (Borgna 2004b, 256, 263). Mycenaean feasts were primarily a venue for elite competition, and were not so much communal feasts as they were the feasts of a big man (\textit{wanax}) and his followers (Wright 2004, 148, 154-6). Important changes in banqueting practices occurred with the fall of the palaces and the destabilization of Mycenaean states. The palaces were, with the exception of developments at Tiryns, no longer centers of political and economic life, and they were therefore no longer the location of rituals that articulate the ruler’s relationship with the community, his ancestors, and the gods (Borgna 2004b, 263). Importantly, the Mycenaean rulers themselves were either dead, much reduced, or gone (Doumas 1998, 130), and depending on the circumstances of the abandonments, some due to violent conflict, the palaces may have been considered unsafe. Thus, at the beginning of the Protogeometric period (PG) people began to use the isolated nature shrines
of the LH III B-C periods as the locations of their sacrificial and feasting rituals (Marakas 2010, 117). These were the shrines that were not associated with settlements or cemeteries. In LH III B, these shrines received dedications of small man-made votives and contain no evidence of feasting or animal sacrifice, but in the PG they became the primary focus of sacrificial and feasting activity in Mainland Greece (Marakas 2010, 117). Tiryns is the one Mycenaean site where the area dedicated to feasting remains closely associated with the palace in the PG (Jung 2010, 171-3), while at Mycenae settlement continued in the area of the citadel after the fall of the palace (Jung 2010, 173). Marakas’ analysis differs from mine in that she draws distinctions between meat-eating and drinking, and so the transition she traces in the use of the isolated shrines has to do specifically with meat-eating and animal sacrifice. Drinking is in evidence at all LBA shrines in Mainland Greece according to Marakas (126)—palatial shrines, settlement shrines, and isolated shrines—and this should cause us to question how centrally controlled wine and drinking were in Mycenaean Greece, or what kind of drinking was controlled (cf. Borgna 2004b, 267-8). It would seem to have to do with scale, and none of the isolated shrines in the LBA have evidence of drinking comparable in volume to that found at Pylos and Midea.

In the PG, the abandoned palaces no longer held their prior significance and may have seemed as distinctly inappropriate places to make offerings to the gods and host festivities in the PG, as being associated with disaster, internal conflict, possibly destructive rulers, and the threat of renewed violence at the hands of those who attacked some of them. There seems to be a general pattern of people repurposing their isolated, non-urban shrines to be the focus of their sacrificial and feasting activity. Sites where this process is visible include Amyklai in Lakonia (Marakas 2010, 25), Kalapodi in Phocis (Marakas 2010, 39),
and Mt. Hymettus in Attica (Marakas 2010, 48). A development clearly related to the repurposing of isolated shrines is the founding of new isolated shrines in the PG, and this is visible at Aetos on Ithaca (Marakas 2010, 18), at Olympia (Marakas 2010, 58), and at Poseidi on the Kassandra branch of the Chalkidian peninsula (Marakas 2010, 66). My interpretation of palatial structures or Mycenaean settlements seeming like inappropriate places for feasting rituals should not be taken too far, because, as is well known, many Mycenaean sites were not entirely abandoned, for example Athens and Tiryns, and remained settlements with associated cult activities in the PG and Iron Age. Mycenae is another exception, where there is evidence of a shrine on the site of the destroyed palace (Jung 2010). In an interesting case that is mirrored at Kommos on Crete, an abandoned Mycenaean settlement on the Corinthian Isthmus becomes an isolated shrine in the PG, complete with evidence of feasting and sacrifice (Marakas 2010, 38). The general picture of banqueting practices in Mainland Greece that emerges in the PG is of a population much reduced in numbers and suffering from economic depression, no longer polarized by the power of the palaces, choosing sites for their feasting rituals that had not before been used for elite Mycenaean feasting, and in general had the characteristic of not being directly associated with any one particular settlement. While these festivities may have gained therefore a more inclusive quality in the EIA, in terms of the inclusion both of non-elites and of people from many settlements, the likelihood that they included events we could describe as multicultural banquets decreases, since by being isolated these ritual sites turned away from the network of contacts with the East and Central Mediterranean previously engaged by the Mycenaean states. The isolation from international contact did not last very long in some areas, with imports from Egypt and the Levant appearing in Olympia, the Idaean cave on Crete, and
Lefkandi in the tenth century BCE (Matthäus 2006, 110, 114; Dirlmeier-Kilian 2000, 152, 158).

Also on Crete, the transition from the LBA to the EIA sees a shift in the preferred location for feasting activities. In the Protopalatial and Neopalatial periods on Crete (MM-LM I) Minoan palaces were well equipped with large rooms dedicated to banqueting and large amounts of banqueting equipment (Borgna 2004b, 257). Smaller rooms for the same purpose can be identified at the Minoan villas at Galatas and Petras (Borgna 2004b, 258). The feasts at the palaces most likely involved large numbers of people, both elite and non-elite, as suggested by the hundreds of conical cups found in a store-room near the Quartiere signorile di nord-ovest of Agia Triada (Borgna 2004b, 265, Gillis 1990). During the Monopalatial period (LM II – LM III B, ca. 1450-1200 BCE), under Mycenaean influence, banqueting practices on Crete became more like those on the Mainland, characterised by elite competition, display, and exclusivity (Borgna 2004b, 261-3). Still focused on the palaces and villas, although many of these suffered attacks in LM I B associated with Mycenaean aggression, these settlements operated under a new ideology and feasting became distinctly less communal.

With the Mycenaean domination, banqueting practices and banqueting ideology were transformed on Crete and closely followed the patterns established in the peer polities of the Mycenaean states. With the fall of the Mycenaean palaces and the destruction of Knossos at the end of LM III B, the reaction of the Cretan population to the new unstable political situation differed from that of the Mainland Greeks, and the banqueting equipment and practices that came to the island with the Mycenaean were employed in new ways by new elites attempting to establish dominance in the absence of Monopalatial centralized control.
Large-scale feasting ceremonies moved from palatial and villa contexts to urban contexts in the Subminoan period and the PG, becoming occasions “for ideological and political mobilization and struggle, important in creating power relationships in the new political arena of unstable systems” (Borgna 2004b, 269). The movement of feasting from palace to city is more of a change in the type of community than a change of location. Lacking a system of central control, feasting no longer occurred in the palaces but in other, seemingly more public, areas of the settlement. The use of elaborate pottery for drinking and dining in LM III C Crete seems to be connected with the increasing power of several settlements, such as Phaistos, Kavousi, and Karphi, and the desire of local elites to amass economic and symbolic capital (Borgna 2004a, 179-80; Borgna 2004b, 270).

On the island of Crete, the settlements at Knossos and Phaistos re-emerge as international players in East Mediterranean interstate networks in the eleventh century, earlier than sites on the mainland. One of the possible reasons for their EIA prominence may have been that some prominent EIA communities remained at the same sites as important LBA centres, and were therefore more identifiable by East Mediterranean explorers and traders. However, many people moved from LBA sites to more defensible mountainous settlements, and there are so many of these that Crete did not seem to suffer the same population decline as the Mainland and other Aegean islands (Morris 2007, 217). We must consider the fact of the larger, denser population, the presence of the resurgent LBA settlements of Knossos and Phaistos, and the south-eastern location of the island when accounting for its EIA prominence. Part of the rising prominence of Phaistos in the EIA was the organisation of large feasting events, and the likely use of these events by the new elite to enhance their prestige and power. At the same time, the abandoned harbour of Kommos
becomes a coastal shrine with ample evidence for drinking and feasting, with an assemblage of pottery including local, East Greek, and Levantine wares, and a style of shrine that seems to be a hybrid of local style and a style recognised from later artefacts as being Phoenician. I believe that the new elites at Phaistos and Knossos attracted attention to their communities through their aggrandizing behaviour. Considering that this aggrandizing involved banqueting and is contemporaneous with the renewed appearance of imports on the island, the EIA cultural dynamics of these sites involve the possibility that the new elites might have hosted and entertained various visitors from Euboea, the Mainland, Egypt, and the Levant.

**The Emergence of the EIA Warrior Feasting Equipment**

The popularity in the EIA and Geometric period of a complex of grave-goods associated with feasting, wealth, and war, is the strongest evidence for the cultural exchange of banqueting practices and ideology before the appearance of depictions of reclined banqueting in the eighth century. The elements of this equipment appear first in tombs at Palaipaphos on Cyprus in the eleventh century, and recognizably similar assemblages spread from there to Knossos and Lefkandi in the tenth century, Kavousi on Crete, Argos, and Salamis on Cyprus in the eighth century, reaching Etruria, Sardinia, and southern Germany in the seventh century (Stary 1994, 622 and *passim*). The argument advanced in Albert Nijboer’s 2013 article entitled “Banquet, marzeah, symposion and symposium during the Iron Age: Disparity and mimicry” is that local elites of these regions selectively adopted certain aspects of Levantine banqueting practice and equipment during meetings with
foreigners which involved banqueting (Nijboer 2013, 98, 119-20). These grave-goods often include Near Eastern products, especially metalwork, and Alain Duplouy has argued that the acquisition of foreign goods was part of an effort to articulate high status and be recognized as elite by other elites in one’s home community (2006, 164-9). Already twenty years ago, Stary considered the continuities in funereal banqueting equipment as part of the movement of Aegean-Levantine banqueting practices and ideology westward through the Mediterranean to the Tyrrhenian, central Europe, and Spain. Nijboer, however, took a very important next step in saying that this transference of practices and ideas likely occurred at actual banquets attended by local elites and foreign guests and that such occasions would be conducive to exchanges of other kinds including economic, religious, and political information, and Nijboer’s arguments contributed a significant amount to the inspiration for this dissertation.

The earliest identified tomb which contains elements of this IA warrior feasting grave-complex is found at Palaepaphos-Skales, Tomb 49, dated to the second half of the eleventh century or CGI period (Strøm 2001, 368; Karageorghis 1983, 76; Masson and Masson 1983, 411). The grave-goods include three spits (Nos. 16, 17, 18), known as obeloi in ancient Greek. No. 16 is engraved with a script transitional between the undeciphered Cypro-Minoan script and the Paphian variety of the Cypriot Syllabic script, and has been read as the genitive of the Greek personal name Opheltes (Masson and Masson 1983, 413). No. 17 bears an inscription which could either be Cypro-Minoan or Paphian Syllabic, but in any case, is a brief, probably ritual, formula of two identical signs divided by a vertical bar (Masson and Masson 1983, 413). No. 18 is inscribed with an X-character, which is found on earlier inscriptions from Kition.
These obelói were found in association with the remains of three humans, and a large number of grave goods also related to banqueting, such as a bronze tripod, bronze strainer, bronze and ceramic bowls and cups, and imported Canaanite vessels. The presence of a knife has significance both for banqueting and battle, and the spearhead found in the tomb has clear military significance. Other tombs on Cyprus, at Paphos, Salamis, and Kition, show similar characteristics, but all are at least two hundred years later, and thus are not evidence of the beginnings of this grave-good complex, but rather of its later development. The evidence for warrior feasting equipment shows a general northwestern trajectory of the movement of this grave-good complex through the Mediterranean and Europe.

Following the Paphian example, similar grave-goods appear at Lefkandi in Toumba Tomb 79 (Nijboer 2013) and in the burial beneath the apsidal building at the Toumba cemetery (Lemos 1998, 286) and at Knossos in the Fortetsa and North cemeteries (Negbi 1992, 607) in the tenth century. Reflecting what has become the recognized development of Greek overseas contacts in the EIA, the adaptation of the warrior feasting grave-goods is limited to sites on Cyprus, Lefkandi, and Knossos until the eighth century, when the complex is recognized in a tholos-tomb at Kavousi on Crete and in Grave 54 at Argos (Stary 1994, 609-11). In the seventh century, this warrior feasting equipment can be described as a Pan-Mediterranean phenomenon, being recognized in the Tomba Regolini-Galassi in Cerveteri, in the Tomba dei flabelli di bronzo in Poggio della Porcareccia near Populonia (Stary 1994, 611-12), in Grave 74 of the cemetery Im Ried West at Beilngries near Oberpfalz, Germany (Stary 1994, 617), and at La Joya in Huelva, El Palmerón in Niebla, and at Cástulo in Guadalimar, Spain (Stary 1994, 617).
Regarding the military significance of these grave assemblages, an important and impressive development of the complex is the incorporation into the graves of chariots, wagons, and sacrificed, or possibly simply deceased, horses. In the IA, this practice first appears at Lefkandi, in the elite burial beneath the apsidal building at the Toumba cemetery in the tenth century, where four horses are buried in one of two shafts, the other containing a cremated warrior in an amphora and the skeleton of a woman (Lemos 1998, 286). Two of the horses had iron bits in their mouths, and the warrior’s grave was equipped with the normal components of the elite burials at Toumba: sword, whetstone, and a knife (Lemos 1998, 282). A similar practice appears in some graves at Salamis, Cyprus, in the eighth century. The richest grave is Tomb 79, which includes among its hundreds of objects the skeleton of a horse, a chariot, a four-wheeled wagon, a throne, bed, and table each with ivory inlay, two iron firedogs, twelve iron spits, a tripod and a cauldron with griffon-head protomes (Stary 1994, 608). In a trajectory that matches what we know about Greek overseas networks and expansion in the IA, i.e. that the Euboeans, with their close relations to Cyprus, led the Greek expansion west (Duplouy 2006, 165), a similar practice appears in the Tomba Regolini-Galassi at Cerveteri in Etruria in the seventh century; this tomb contains a two-wheeled wagon, a four-wheeled wagon, two iron firedogs, two bronze firedogs, and twenty spits.

Implicated in the ideology that connects warrior skill, wealth, and banqueting are symbols of horse owning, horse breeding, horsemanship, hunting, chariot warfare, and the remarkable ability of a dead warrior to be delivered to his grave on a hearse pulled by a horse he owns. Comparable in their time to our luxury sports cars or fighter jets, horses were expensive, fast, fragile, and became symbols of the highest status in social, political, and
military affairs. This ideology of the horse was part of the ideological package that involves banqueting and warrior skill, parts of which were selectively adapted by local elites throughout the Mediterranean in the EIA and IA (Geometric period). It is part of what is known as Orientalizing, or the development of the Mediterranean koine, but these concepts are less informative about the process than the simple statement that local elites adapted elements of the cultural practices of peoples they came into contact with. Adaptation based on contact sounds quite benign, but the transference of expressly military knowledge and material, of which the chariot is one aspect, suggests that the contact in question had a military dimension, and these elites who came to emulate one another also very likely met in combat on occasion (Stary 2000, 218). The realization that cultural contacts in the IA Mediterranean were sometimes hostile does not essentially change the general dynamics of cultural exchange. Local elites selectively adapted elements of the cultures of those they came into contact with, and while there are multiple motivations for why this occurred, one is that elites seek relationships with external systems of status marking in order to enhance their prestige in their home communities and be recognized as elite by foreigners.

An important aspect of the cultural geography of the EIA and IA Mediterranean, determining which peoples were encountered by whom, was the exploration and colonisation of the Mediterranean by Phoenicians and Aramaic-speaking North Syrians beginning in the twelfth century BCE (Gubel 2006, 87; Negbi 1992, 604). The Phoenicians and Syrians, as being the foreigners most often encountered by the Greeks in the PG and Geometric Mediterranean, were very important for the development of Greek networks of exchange with the Near East, Greek adaptations of cultural phenomena we identify as being Near Eastern, and Greece’s own process of exploration, colonisation, and polis formation.
Of all the Greeks’ contacts with non-Greeks, it is contact with the Phoenicians and related Semitic-speaking groups that had the most profound impact on the development of Archaic Greek society. The rest of this chapter will be devoted to examining the networks of contacts involving Greeks, Phoenicians, Etruscans, and Sicilians in terms of the evidence for multicultural banqueting provided by the development of reclined banqueting, but first I wish to set the stage by discussing the salient elements of Phoenician expansion.

**Phoenicia, the Phoenician Expansion, and the Special Case of Cyprus**

Besides the fact that their exploration of the Mediterranean likely brought Phoenicians to areas inhabited by Greek-speakers, such as Rhodes, Samos, Knossos, Kommos, Lefkandi (Negbi 1992, 606-8), there are a number of reasons why the Phoenician element in Greek contact with non-Greeks was very important and influential. The first thing we must always keep in mind when considering contact between Greeks and Phoenicians in the IA is that at the end of the LBA, amidst the disturbances on the Levantine coast and the Balkan peninsula, namely the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces and of Ugarit, Mainland and Aegean Greeks as well as large numbers of Canaanites sought refuge on Cyprus (Morris 2007, 216-7; Negbi 1992, 604). These Canaanites fleeing the unstable situation in the Levant at the end of the LBA are one and the same as the people we refer to as Phoenicians in the IA. Thus, beginning in the twelfth century BCE, West Semitic-speaking Phoenicians and Greeks inhabited settlements that were both quite close to one another and united by their presence on the same circumscribed piece of land in the East Mediterranean (Negbi
1992, 604-5). In addition, some of these settlements, such as Amathus and Kition, have evidence of being multicultural communities inhabited by Greeks and Phoenicians already in the twelfth century. Therefore, when considering the Phoenician expansion, we must imagine the Phoenician sites on Cyprus as the first step in this process, even though the model we employ to understand the migration is one of refuge, since Cypriot Phoenicians played an important role in the subsequent development of the network of Phoenician settlements in the Mediterranean. By the same token, we must acknowledge that the first place they settled outside their homeland was a relatively large island being settled at the same time by refugee Greeks fleeing the Mainland and the Aegean. We do not normally consider the migration of Greeks from the Aegean to Cyprus and the southern Levant as part of Greek colonisation because of the four hundred years that separate this population movement from the Greek settlement of Sicily and southern Italy, but there is not such a great gap between Phoenician refuge on Cyprus and their expansion further afield in the Mediterranean, with evidence of visits to Spain at the end of the twelfth century, and Crete and Sardinia in the tenth century (Gubel 2006, 87; Negbi 1992, 607-10; 1 Kings 10:22, of Hiram and Solomon; 1 Kings 22:49-50, 2 Chronicles 20:35-7, of ninth century Judahite kings).

Another aspect of Phoenician expansion that is relevant for understanding Greek contact with non-Greeks is that prior to the collapse of the international system in LH III B, the Canaanites along with the Cypriots had been the population in the Mediterranean most interested in Mycenaean ceramics, and the Mycenaean were consumers of Canaanite crafts such as ivory-work. This familiarity with one another, whose exact details are difficult to define, would have facilitated mutual recognition, communication, and interstate relations in
the IA first on Cyprus, but also later on Crete and at Lefkandi. This basic theory rests on a few hypothetical premises. Two hundred years (from the beginning of the Phoenician expansion in the twelfth century to the renewed appearance of Levantine imports on Crete in the tenth century) is not sufficient time for the Greeks on Cyprus to forget that they originated in lands northwest across the sea, nor is it sufficient time for the Cretans to forget that they once received impressive visitors from the West, North, East and South, who each carried certain types of commodities, nor is it sufficient time for the Phoenicians to forget that they once participated in large-scale international trading ventures involving raw materials, agricultural products including wine, and luxury goods. To the contrary, the memories and monuments of the LBA heyday was a powerful inheritance that exerted pressure on individuals and states in the EIA, at least on those who were in a secure enough position to take physical and financial risks. It was clear to all emergent states in the EIA East Mediterranean – Sidon, Tyre, Paphos, Knossos, Phaistos, Athens, Lefkandi – that maritime trade and having relationships with overseas foreigners was a key to wealth and power. This was clear to them because it had been the case before, and their knowledge of this past shaped their view of the unfamiliar ship on the horizon, not into an entirely benign view of foreign traders, but into a perspective that considered the foreigner an opportunity for advancement. The premise of this dissertation is that this renewed interest in foreigners and foreign products in the EIA led to actual events where Greeks and Phoenicians, or other West Semites, Egyptians, Lydians, etc., banqueted together as part of guest-friendship or as part of religious or civic events. On each occasion, there was very likely an economic motive, but the resulting affects on the development of Archaic Greek society ranged far
beyond the sphere of trade and the economy into poetry, art, politics, religion, and of course, forms of conviviality.
Chapter 2: The Development of Reclined Banqueting in the Mediterranean – Phoenicia and the Levant, Cyprus, Crete, Anatolia, Assyria, Corinth, Etruria, and Sicily

Introduction

Reclining back with the legs on a horizontal axis, one knee bent, leaning on the left elbow and leaving the right hand free to hold a drinking vessel or morsel of food is quite a distinctive and highly marked mode of consuming food and drink. The markedness of the behaviour, even in its variations as banqueters lie on their fronts or adopt different postures for music or sex, is what I believe gives it its power as evidence for multicultural banqueting. It is not only an artistic motif, which may in itself be quite complex, such as the tree of life (Markoe 1996, 49), hybrid creatures and animal friezes (Gunter 2009, 64, 67, 90). If we think about reclined banqueting simply as a representation, as an image, it is more complex than all of these examples of Near Eastern artistic motifs that were adapted by the Greeks and Etruscans, and also it was used not to represent something foreign or external from the intended viewer, consumer, or audience for the product; it was intended as a reflection of the behaviour of the consumer and how he might employ the object or the building the image adorns. I am able to assert this because there is no doubt that the Greeks, Sikels, and Etruscans did not simply adopt reclined banqueting as a form of representation, but as an actual behaviour – a form of conviviality that came to define their cultures.

This study is not concerned with the ultimate origins of reclined banqueting, but only its adaptation by various peoples in the first millennium BCE as evidence for multicultural
banqueting. Burkhard Fehr (1971) argued that the practice ultimately derives from Near Eastern nomads, with their temporary establishments of luxurious living. However, our evidence for the practice clearly associates it with Near Eastern royals and with the elites of Greek, Sikel, and Etruscan cities; that is, with the aristocrats of settled communities. In studies where the origin of the practice is relevant, it is better sought in the royal archives at Mari, dated to the early second millennium BCE, where two kinds of couch are specified, one for sleeping, and one for use while awake (Dentzer 1982, 67), just as the archives of Ashurbanipal state that he used both a day-time and night-time couch (Dentzer 1982, 69). In both of these texts, however, the consumption of food is not mentioned.

**Phoenicia and the Levant**

The earliest securely dated evidence for reclined banqueting in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian worlds is a section of Hebrew poetry from the woeful eighth-century prophet Amos. In a section of his prophecies (Books 3-6) regarded as being part of his original oracular preaching combined with other materials into a book by his followers around 735 BCE (Hadjiev 2009, 3-4), Amos warns the ruling elite of Zion and Samaria of coming disaster as a result of their dissolute behaviour and religious disobedience (Andersen

---

5 The date stated by Hadjiev in the mid-eighth century is supported by a majority of scholars who see verses 4 and 6 as products of the eighth or seventh centuries. As with any redacted text that took shape over centuries, these dates are not completely secure, and many scholars see the book in its final form as a product of the Persian or Hellenistic period.
and Freedman 1987, 557), and characterizes these wealthy people as follows (Amos 6:4-7, NRSV):

Alas for those who lie on beds of ivory,
and lounge on their couches,
and eat lambs from the flock,
and calves from the stall;
who sing idle songs to the sound of the harp,
and like David improvise on instruments of music;
who drink wine from bowls,
and anoint themselves with the finest oils,
but are not grieved over the ruin of Joseph!

Therefore they shall now be the first to go into exile,
and the revelry of the loungers shall pass away.

While this passage is highly suggestive of reclined banqueting, it does not unequivocally indicate that the lying, lounging, eating, and drinking were occurring simultaneously, nor that the lounging resembled what we see later in Assyria, Cyprus, Corinth, and Etruria. Most scholarly discussions of the banqueting practices described in this passage focus on the West Semitic institution of the marzēah, mentioned in Amos 6:7, and translated above as ‘revelry’ (Barstad 1984, 127-42). I wish to make the point that the practices described above involve
reclined banqueting of a type very similar to the later representations from elsewhere in Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean. Basing my argument on the meaning of marzēaḥ would make it circular since Amos 6 provides some of the most important evidence for the definition of the marzēaḥ. Rather, I found my argument on the agreement among Biblical scholars that Amos is criticising a set of celebratory behaviours associated with one another, and not listing a number of separate activities that characterise these excessive elites (Barstad 1984, 141), and on the semantics and pragmatics of the plural nouns miṭṭōt ‘beds,’ and ʿaršōt ‘couches.’ Adducing parallels from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible I will show that the semantics of these words are clearly broad enough to permit their use as banqueting furniture, that Amos 6 is not the only text that demonstrates this association, and that the other contexts of these words, that is, how their referents are used in the societies depicted in the Hebrew Bible, help us to understand the events described in Amos 6.

The most salient aspect of the use of the nouns miṭṭōt, singular miṭṭāh, and ʿaršōt, singular ʿereš, in the Hebrew Bible is that they sometimes appear as formulaic binary parallels in the bicola of Hebrew poetry, and prophecy in prose, with miṭṭāh always preceding ʿereš (Amos 3:12, 6:4; Psalms 6:6). This pairing of nouns for furniture is used in passages associated with laziness and dissolution or with fear and grief. The passages suggesting laziness and dissolution are Amos 6:4 above, and also Amos 3:12, of very similar import to his warnings quoted above (NRSV): “Thus says the LORD: As the shepherd rescues from the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear, so shall the people of Israel who live in Samaria be rescued, with the corner of a couch and part of a bed.” Here we have a prophecy citing part of the same behaviours mentioned in Amos 6 and promising the same result. This second earlier reference to the Samarian proclivity for lounging on couches and
beds reinforces the idea that it was a characteristic of elite culture at the time. There is no mention of banqueting in 3:12, but Amos seems to connect the couch and bed to the Samarians’ devotion to leisure, not to a devotion to sleep. His statement seems to imply that the Israelites in Samaria are always lolling about on their couches and beds, waking and sleeping, and in this sense we find support for the interpretation of Amos 6 as involving reclined banqueting; in 3:12, he characterises the people as being entirely devoted to leisure to the extent that beds and couches have become the most characteristic thing about the people, and when they die, nothing will be left but pieces of bodies, beds, and couches. Part of this portrayal of people living out their lives mostly horizontal would involve eating and drinking while reclined on beds and couches, since they seem permanently attached to them. The prophet’s message of warning links the reclining on couches in Amos 3:12 and 6:4; rather than behaving properly in the eyes of the god, the people devote their lives to destructive luxury, characterized by reclining on beds and couches. We do not need to see here a historical reality about the Samarian elites being lazy, dissolute, and having difficulty prying themselves from their couches. We must acknowledge, however, that elite individuals wakefully enjoying themselves on couches was a reference to a social practice comprehensible to the audiences of the text and preaching of Amos. Luxuriating on couches while enjoying food, wine, and music, was an activity known in Syria-Palestine in the eighth and seventh centuries.

The passage that pairs mitṭāh ‘bed,’ and ʿereṣ ‘couch,’ in connection with grief and fear is Psalm 6:6. A man languishing in fear of death, his enemies, and the god’s anger says:

I am weary with my moaning; 6

every night I flood my bed with
tears;  
I drench my couch with my  
weeping.  
My eyes waste away because of  
grief;  
They grow weak because of all  
my foes.

Here we have the couch and bed paired, but there is no sense of leisure, laziness, or dissolution. They are paired for rhetorical amplification, as in the examples from Amos, but here it is the amplification of a sense of despair, restlessness, and sleeplessness. The speaker in the poem has gone to his couch and his bed at night, presumably to sleep, but the comfort necessary for sleep escapes him as he is gripped with grief and fear. The very comfort that escapes the speaker in the psalm is the one Amos says is excessively enjoyed by the Samarians at their peril – carelessness. As the speaker in the psalm goes to his bed and his couch by night, an appropriate time for sleep and comfort, and finds none, the inverse operates for the Samarians in Amos 3 and 6; they go to their beds and couches when they should be full of care about their imminent destruction and their disobedience, and they take pleasure in their beds, couches, feasting, drinking, and music, although they should, like the speaker in the psalm, be wracked with fear and grief, according to Amos.

All the other times miṭṭāh and ʿereš appear in the Hebrew Bible, they are not paired. The uses of miṭṭāh include a bed for sleeping (2 Samuel 4:7; 1 Kings 17:19, 21:4; 2 Kings 4:10, 4:21, 4:32, 11:2; 2 Chronicles 22:11, 24:25), a bed used as a funeral bier (2 Samuel 3:31), remaining in bed as a symbol of laziness (Proverbs 26:14), and a bed used for recovery from injury as a metaphor for appealing to another god instead of the god of Israel,
which will lead to death (2 Kings 1:4). One other early and specific use of miṭṭāh which can help us understand its function in Amos is the appearance of the word in the Song of Solomon with the special meaning ‘litter’ or ‘palanquin’ (Song of Solomon 3:7). This use of the word can easily help explain the use of ‘beds’ at the festivities described by Amos; the same term is used not of beds, but of litters made of precious materials. Whether the couches were mobile or immobile is not important, but in the Song of Solomon miṭṭāh is furniture used during wakeful enjoyment, just as it is described by Amos, in the latter case as further testimony of the luxury, ease, and dissolution of the Samarian elites.

Besides the Song of Solomon reference, there are three uses of miṭṭāh which are particularly important for the interpretation of the behaviours mentioned in Amos 6. The first of these appears in Ezekiel, dated to the first quarter of the sixth century BCE. In a prophecy, Ezekiel says that the god said to him (Ezekiel 23:38-45):

Moreover this they have done to me: they have defiled my sanctuary on the same day and profaned my sabbaths. [39] For when they had slaughtered their children for their idols, on the same day they came into my sanctuary to profane it. This is what they did in my house. [40] They even sent for men to come from far away, to whom a messenger was sent, and they came. For them you bathed yourself, painted your eyes, and decked yourself in ornaments; [41] you sat on a stately couch [miṭṭāh], with a table spread before it on which you had placed my incense and my oil. [42] The sounds of a raucous multitude was around her, with many of the rabble brought in drunken from the wilderness; and they put bracelets on the arms of the women, and beautiful crowns upon their heads. [43] Then I said, Ah, she is worn out with adulteries, but they carry on their sexual acts with her. [44] For they have gone in to her, as one goes in to a whore. Thus they went in to Oholah [representing Samaria] and to Oholibah [representing Jerusalem], wanton women. [45] But righteous judges shall declare them guilty of adultery and of bloodshed; because they are adulteresses and blood is on their hands.
Here *miṭṭāh* is interpreted as ‘couch,’ as it is in 2 Samuel 4:7, where *miṭṭāh* is nevertheless a piece of furniture in a bedchamber that someone lies upon. This particular use of *miṭṭāh* in Ezekiel is highly relevant for the interpretation of Amos 6, dated around one hundred and fifty years earlier. In Ezekiel 23:41, a *miṭṭāh* is a piece of furniture used as part of a raucous celebration inside a temple of Yahweh, involving oil, incense, cosmetics, bracelets, crowns, drunkenness, and sex. Many of the drunken guests are not local, but have been summoned “from far away” (Ezekiel 23:40). The association of the *miṭṭāh* with a table for oil and incense recalls both the description of the celebration in Amos 6, where people recline and anoint themselves, and our earliest representations of reclined banqueting, where small tables stand before the *klínai*.

Similarly revealing examples of the use of *miṭṭāh* come from the much later text of the Book of Esther. These examples are in the context of the Persian court of the king Xerxes II (r. 424 BCE), and provide for us two images of reclined banqueting in Persian royal culture. The passages are Esther 1:6, which describes the preparations for a banquet in Susa, which include gold and silver couches (*miṭṭôt*), and Esther 7:8, which describes Esther reclining on a couch (*miṭṭāh*) in a banquet hall, and a man throwing himself onto her couch. These passages from Esther illustrate that in the Persian period, when the custom of reclined banqueting was widely practiced in the Mediterranean and in Mesopotamia as far east as Iran, it is the word usually translated in Amos 6 as ‘bed’ which becomes a standard Hebrew word for what Classical scholars would call a *klínē*.

Before looking at the uses of *ʿereš* when it is not paired with *miṭṭāh*, it is necessary to discuss the relationship of *miṭṭāh* to *klínē*, and how we can interpret the appearance of these words in texts, and their referents in iconography. The semantics of the terms and
pragmatics of their referents match closely, with both the Hebrew and the Greek term referring to furniture used for sleeping, eating and entertainment, recovering from illness, and carrying the dead (‘bier’). They stem from roots with closely related meanings: נѣ has the basic meaning ‘to stretch out’ in Hebrew; the Greek root κλι has the basic meaning ‘to cause to lean or recline’ (LSJ s.v. κλίνω). The appearance of these words in a text, therefore, does not automatically suggest the practice of reclined banqueting. According to the narrative context, the words can have a wide range of meanings. As we will see below in my discussion of reclined banqueting iconography in Greece, the object referred to by κλίνη is nothing other than a couch or bed (Andrianou 2009, 31-2), usually used for sleeping, but sometimes deployed in a special way at banquets. The object does not determine reclined banqueting, but the context of its use. When Alcman combines κλίναι with tables, various foodstuffs, and a beverage, we can be sure that he is referring to a reclined banquet. In iconography, a similar principle holds. An isolated image of a couch or bed does not indicate reclined banqueting. However, if the furniture is associated in the iconography with servants, musicians, food, vessels for drinks, etc., then we can confidently state that the object is intended for use at a reclined banquet.

The very roots of the words in both Hebrew and Greek reveal how these objects were intended to be used, and the fact of reclining is not in doubt. If a κλίνη or a מיתָּה is used in connection with banqueting, the posture of the banqueters is surely reclined, or involves reclining in the various positions a banqueter might assume. Getting back to the Hebrew passages, a further linguistic indication that the activities depicted in Amos 6 and Esther 7 are indeed reclined banqueting is the absence of the normal word for a chair or throne,
kiṣṣē’. If these banquets were not reclining, why do they involve furniture intended for reclining to the exclusion of furniture intended for sitting upright?

A look at the uses and semantics of the word ‘ereš ‘couch’ also produces many early examples that are useful for understanding the events in Amos 6. In some cases, the semantics and pragmatics seem indistinguishable from miṭṭāh: it indicates a sickbed (Psalm 41:3), a bed for sleeping (Psalm 132:3), and a bed that should bring comfort (Job 7:13). ‘ereš, like miṭṭāh, can also mean ‘couch,’ and here we get two early examples from Proverbs and the Song of Solomon, where the ‘ereš in question seems to function very much as it does in Amos 6.

In Proverbs 7:16-18, a prostitute speaks, and as she tries to tempt a young man to come into her house, she says:

I have decked my couch [‘ereš] with 16 coverings,
colored spreads of Egyptian linen;
I have perfumed my bed with 17 myrrh,
aloes and cinnamon.
Come, let us take our fill of love 18 until morning;
let us delight ourselves with love.

Here we have the word ‘ereš associated with the luxuriant behaviour of anointing with fragrant oils, as it is in the revelry described by Amos. In its erotic content and the presence
of a couch and fragrances, it matches closely the description of the festivities in the temple of Yahweh in Ezekiel 23:41. Here we have no banquet, but rather an element of erotic luxury used for an erotic purpose. But the same piece of furniture is present in Amos 6, combined with the use of fragrances, and so in Proverbs 7 we get an indication of the erotic valence of the equipment and behaviours described by Amos.

The appearance of ʿereš in the Song of Solomon 1:16 is closely collocated with another word for couch in 1:12, mēsab, and these two terms seem to refer to the same object at the same moment in time. Therefore, the meanings should be the same in both instances, but in 1:16, when ʿereš is used, the ‘couch’ has a more metaphorical meaning.

While the king was on his couch [mēsab],

my nard gave forth its

fragrance.

My beloved is to me a bag of

myrrh

that lies between my breasts.

My beloved is to me a cluster of

henna blossoms

in the vinyards of En-gedi.

Ah, you are beautiful, my love;

ah, you are beautiful;
your eyes are doves.

Ah, you are beautiful, my

beloved,

truly lovely.

Our couch [ʿereš] is green;
The beams of our house are cedar,
our rafters are pine.

In these examples, we see a mēsāb mentioned as a piece of furniture that the king is using, a couch. The content of the poem shows that a woman is also present who sees the king on his couch, but by the time of 1:16, the woman seems to share the couch with the king, and to speak about the couch as if it symbolizes their relationship, as being “green,” springlike, and fertile. At the time the couch is being shared, it is a ʿereš. The woman’s speech seems to suggest motion towards the king on his couch, first talking about it as if it is somewhat distant, but soon speaking as if she is on the couch with the king and enjoying its pleasures. In this passage, the couch is a symbol of royal ease and prestige, a place for the enjoyment of luxury and erotic pleasure. As the couch is used by elite people who are not sleeping, but rather enjoying the pleasures of life such as love and expensive fragrances, we have here yet another parallel for the use of the couch by the elite Samarians in Amos 6. I think it is significant that different terms are used for the couch occupied by the king alone and for the couch occupied by the king and a woman, and that when occupied by both, the term used is the same as one of the pieces of furniture used by the revelers in Amos 6. In the Song of Solomon, the couch is not used at a banquet, but rather as a place for the waking enjoyment of ease, luxury, and intimacy by elite people, and this, like the earlier comparative examples, should help us understand the function of this piece of furniture at the banquet mentioned in Amos, and also should suggest that the couches and beds used in Amos 6 could be occupied by more than one person at a time.
The results of the comparanda assembled above are that we see that *miṭṭāh* and *ʿereš* both have basic uses that mean ‘bed’ and ‘couch’ for sleep, comfort, and recovering from illness, but they both also have more marked uses, where they are furniture used, often by the elite, in ritual or quasi-ritual activities involving expensive luxuries, sex, fragrances, and sometimes wine. It is clearly to these more specialized uses of *miṭṭāh* and *ʿereš* that Amos refers. Taking this into account, when we imagine people situated on these pieces of furniture while they eat, drink, play music, sing, and anoint themselves with oil, it is quite clear that some of the postures they would adopt could be characterized as reclined banqueting. The thing that immediately strikes the reader of Eric Gubel’s treatise on Phoenician furniture is that there is no archaeological material which manifests the linguistic distinctions between the furniture types *miṭṭāh* and *ʿereš* found in Hebrew. In the case of Hebrew, almost all of the words used for couch and bed are interchangeable, so it seems that from a West Semitic perspective, the sorts of furniture used at the celebration described by Amos are not distinguishable by form, but only by use. That is, it is always a bed, but how the bed is used determines whether it is furniture for a reclined banquet.

I regard the idea that the revelers in Amos 6 are participating in a reclined banquet as rather uncontroversial, but in the scholarship about Amos 6 as evidence for the reclined banquet, it is more often assumed than demonstrated with comparanda from the Hebrew Bible. I have adduced this evidence in an attempt to describe a Phoenician social and religious practice, and some would regard this as problematic. Put very simply, none of the examples of reclined banqueting or other waking activities conducted on beds and couches are regarded as the appropriate behaviour of Judahites and Israelites, but are rather the actions of the religiously disobedient, who share in the religious practices of the surrounding
peoples. These surrounding peoples are Iron Age Canaanites, who are one and the same cultural group as Phoenicians. There are, of course, regional variations, but in general, all this disobedient behaviour the Hebrew Bible refers to is none other than Phoenician social and religious practice. Strengthening the argument that Phoenician practices can be seen in a description of elite Samarians is the large amount of Phoenician-style ivories found at Samaria, all of which are meant as fittings for expensive furniture such as couches. Amos criticizes the Israelites in Samaria for their luxurious behaviour on ivory couches in the face of danger, and archaeology confirms that wealthy Samarians in the first half of the first millennium BCE used the furniture Amos describes, furniture with ivory fittings crafted in the Phoenician style. The continuity of language, society, and religion in the Iron Age Levant combined with the evidence that Samarian elites used furniture crafted in the Phoenician style of ivory carving indicates allows us to connect Amos’ criticism of the Samarian elites to Phoenician social practices of the same period, that is, the eighth and seventh centuries BCE.

Now, the fact that the prophets and others regard this behaviour as abhorrent, and the fact that the Hebrew Bible has very particular audiences in mind, should cause us to suspect that some of the practices mentioned are exaggerated, distorted, and misunderstood. In the examples assembled above, I have no doubt that the nature of the behaviour carried out on the beds and couches is mostly misunderstood by our Hebrew Bible informants. In Amos 6, Ezekiel 23, and even in the speech of the “prostitute” in Proverbs 7, the perspective of the text is mostly unaware of the possible religious significance of these behaviours; that is, this abhorrent behaviour may be religiously sanctioned in traditions not represented by the authors of the Hebrew Bible. I have no doubt that the authors of the Hebrew text
misunderstand the motivations of the people carrying out these activities, but there does not seem to be any particular aspect of the behaviour that is exaggerated or distorted, since the same activities are depicted on Phoenician- and Syrian-style drinking vessels (paterae) of the same period, to be discussed below. The depravity and dissolution are exaggerated, since these people may simply be doing what seems like acceptable religious and social practice, but the actions themselves, on which my study focuses, do not seem to have been subject to distorting exaggeration. The behaviours, then, would seem to be consistent with Phoenician practices, prominent in the culture of the Levant from coastal Syria to Sinai.

**Cyprus**

Jean-Marie Dentzer’s conclusion that the earliest evidence for reclined banqueting is on the wall relief of Ashurbanipal (BM 124920 [Fig. 24]), dated ca. 650 BCE, from Room S in the North Palace at Nineveh has exerted a powerful influence on subsequent scholarship, with some scholars presenting it as the earliest artistic representation of the motif as recently as 2003 (Dunbabin 2003, 14). However, three Phoenician- and North Syrian-style bronze and silver drinking bowls depicting reclined banqueting found on Cyprus were dated to the eighth and seventh centuries BCE by Glen Markoe in 1985 (154-6, Cy5, Cy6, Cy13). While in that same year Hartmut Matthäus dated these bowls significantly later (Matthäus 1985, 172-3, Nr. 424 ca. 600, Nr. 425 in the seventh century, Nr. 426 in the sixth century), he has since revised his opinion and has argued for dates as early as Markoe’s, and sometimes earlier (Matthäus 2008, 441-4; Matthäus 1999-2000, 48-50, Abb. 9-13). Vassos Karageorghis continues to see the bowls as products of the seventh and sixth centuries BCE.
The pioneering work on these bowls and their chronology was Einar Gjerstad’s 1946 article, but Markoe’s and Matthäus’ publications have become the standards, and the almost thirty years of subsequent research has refined our understanding of the bowls (paterae), and so in my arguments about their dates, I will focus on the competing opinions of Markoe, Matthäus, and Karageorghis.

One of the fragmentary silver bowls in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (74.51.4557 [Fig. 25]), probably from southwest Cyprus and reported by Cesnola to have been found “in the so-called “royal tomb” at Kourion” (Karageorghis 1999, 15), i.e. in the Kourion treasure, is generally regarded as earlier than the other two bowls (Markoe 1985, Cy6; Matthäus 1985, 424; Matthäus 1999-2000, 49-50, Abb. 11-12). On this bowl we see a man and a woman lying on couches, although importantly for comparative purposes, they lie on their fronts, and I will return to this issue later in the discussion. Each of them holds an object in one of their hands, which may be a piece of food or a drinking bowl, similar to the bowls held by the woman fourth to the left behind the woman on the couch (Karageorghis 1999, 16). Before the lady’s couch is a small staircase that aids her in getting on and off the couch. Between them are a table and a bowl containing fruit, or some other spheroid food. Female servants play music, bring beverages and drinking bowls, and bring prepared foods, including poultry.

This bowl is usually called Cypro-Phoenician (Markoe 1985, 151; Karageorghis 1999, 13), but its style is most closely related to North Syrian metal bowls from the ninth and eighth centuries BCE (Matthäus 2008, 441-4; Matthäus 1999-2000, 49), and I adopt Matthäus’ reading of the bowl as North Syrian. The specific characteristics of this bowl, with the broad, round features of the people depicted, recall the definition of North Syrian-
style (Winter 1976), which is an aspect of the bowls in Markoe’s groups I and II, dated from ca. 850-705 BCE (Markoe 1985, 149-53). Markoe regards the bowl as transitional between his groups III and IV, and therefore dated ca. 675 BCE (Markoe 1985, 153-4). Karageorghis agrees with Markoe’s dating (1999, 18). Matthäus says its closest stylistic parallel is a North Syrian bowl from the Iranian art market (Iran Bastan Museum, Teheran, Inv. No. 15198; Matthäus 1999-2000, 49; Markoe 1985, U6), which does not have a clear date, but it is worth pointing out the small group of metalwork with similar style and narrative content to which this bowl belongs. Similar scenes of processions, music, and banqueting, but not explicitly reclined banqueting, appear:

1) on a bronze votive shield from the Idaean cave (Heraklion Museum, Inv. No. 32), made on Crete with strong North Syrian influences, dated to the first half of the eighth century (Markoe 1985, Cr7; Matthäus 1999-2000, 52-4, Abb. 19);

2) on a North Syrian-style bronze bowl from Idalion (Metropolitan Museum of Art 74.51.5700) dated by Markoe to around 850-825 (Markoe 1985, 153, Cy3), and by Matthäus to around 800 (Matthäus 1985, 171, Nr. 423), with parallels at Lefkandi (around 900) and Athens (MG I);

3) on a North Syrian-style bronze bowl, reportedly from Sparta (Louvre, Paris, AO 4702), but possibly made on Crete, dated by Markoe to between 750-700 (Markoe 1985, 156, G3)

4) on a North Syrian-style bronze bowl from Olympia (National Archaeological Museum, Athens, Inv. No. NM 7941), dated by Markoe to between 750-700 (Markoe 1985, 153-4, G3);
5) and on a North Syrian-style bronze bowl from Lefkandi (Tomb 70, 18; Popham and Lemos 1996, Pl. 134, 145), dated to around 900 (Popham 1995, 103-6; Matthäus 2008, 441).

The North Syrian bowl in question (MMA 74.51.4557) therefore belongs to a group whose style and themes have antecedents in the tenth and ninth centuries. I agree with Matthäus that the bowl can hardly be later than 700 (Matthäus 1999-2000, 49), and I think that future refinement of the date of this bowl could lead to a significantly earlier date, but not one later than the latest possible one allowed by Markoe and Karageorghis, at 675 (Markoe 1985, 153-4; Karageorghis 1999, 18).

Thus, in the case of the North Syrian silver bowl in the MMA, we are dealing with a bowl whose closest affinities are with products of the ninth and eighth centuries, but may possibly be as late as 675. The most recent assessment puts the dates for the bowl between 710-675 BCE (Egetmeyer 2010, 667). Even with the latest date, in the early seventh century, this bowl predates Ashurbanipal’s relief (ca. 650), the appearance of reclined banqueting in Corinthian art (ca. 610-600), and in Etruscan art (ca. 630-20), and is the earliest representation of reclined banqueting in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian worlds.

Another aspect of this bowl that can help us understand its date and importance is the presence of two inscriptions in the Early Paphian variety of the Cypriot Syllabic script (Egetmeyer 2010, Kourion 4; Neumann 1999, 33). Of the group of six bowls (the above five in addition to MMA 74.51.4557) with similar styles and narrative themes assembled above, this bowl and number 4 have inscriptions, the latter in Aramaic. The first aspect of these inscriptions that deserves attention is the palaeography of the Early Paphian script. Masson says that the Early Paphian script appears in the sixth century, and therefore either the
chronological arguments synthesized above are incorrect, the palaeography of Early Paphian is incorrect, or the bowl was inscribed at least one hundred years after it was manufactured (Masson 1983). In the Kourion treasure from which Cesnola says this bowl comes, there are a pair of gold bracelets inscribed with identical phrases, ‘Etevandros | king of Paphos,’ and two other inscribed bowls, one with ‘Epiros,’ and one with ‘Akestor king of Paphos’ (Masson 1983, 192, 412; Karageorghis 1999, 18; Egetmeyer 2010, 667-8). Masson identifies the script as Early Paphian and dates these bracelets to the sixth or fifth century (1983, 192), but Egetmeyer suggests a date 675-650 BCE (2010, 667). The inscriptions on our bowl are qualitatively different because they name characters depicted in the figural decoration, and we have to take into consideration the possibility that space was left by the artist for the inscriptions (Karageorghis 1999, 18; Markoe 1985, 72-3), therefore making the manufacture of the bowl and the inscription nearly contemporaneous. In naming the characters depicted, it is distinct from the other nine inscribed bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean (Markoe 1985, 72), which consist of a single owner’s inscription, and is similar to the practice employed later on the Corinthian column kraters. The most recent autopsy and diplomatic transcription of these inscriptions was conducted by Günter Neumann in 1999. The two inscriptions are clearly related to the lying female and male figures, probably a king and queen (Karageorghis 1999, 15) or a god and goddess (Hermery 2001). For the inscription associated with the queen, of seven characters proceeding from left to right, Neumann offers the transcription \textit{ku-po-ro-[x]-t}ö-	extit{u-ṣa}, suggests a reading of \textit{me} for the unclear sign identified as \textit{x}, producing \textit{ku-po-ro-me-to-u-sa}, which he transcribes into alphabetic Greek as \textit{Kupromédousa}, a female personal name in the form of a feminine present active participle meaning “she who holds sway, reigns over Cyprus” (1999, 34). The
inscription above the king/god is less clear, and composed of four signs. Neumann offers the transcription \([x]-[x]-\text{le-se}\), and suggests that the remnants of the unclear signs are possibly consistent with the remains of \(pa\) and \(si\), which would produce an inscription of the Early Paphian dialect form for ‘king,’ \(pa\text{-si-le-se}\), alphabetic Greek \(\text{basileēs}\) (1999, 34). However fragmentary and problematic the inscription, it has led the most recent interpreter to posit a date of 710-675 BCE for the inscription.

The royal significance of Neumann’s reading of the man’s inscription is self-explanatory, and the name of the female is consistent with Paphian royal naming practices (Neumann 1999, 33). The earliest reference to royalty on Cyprus in the IA is found in the Letter of Wen-Amun (eleventh century), and continues on the stele of Sargon II (late eighth century) and the prism of Esharhaddon (early seventh century), on the latter of which the kings are named. Here there is a very enticing connection between the name of the king of Paphos rendered in Akkadian on the prism of Esharhaddon from 673/2 and the name of the Paphian king inscribed on the gold bracelets found in association with this bowl. Reyes renders the Akkadian as \(\text{Ituandar}\) (1994, 160), and Masson transcribes the Cypriot Syllabic as \(\text{Etewandros}\) (1983, 192); it is clear to me that this could be the rendering of the same name, as it has many fewer differences than recognized correspondences between other Greek words and Akkadian renderings, such as \(\text{Iawani}\) for \(\text{Iones}\) (Rollinger 2001). While scholars acknowledge that this is the same name, they tend to reject the idea that it may be the same person, arguing that “le nom d’Etéwandros a dû être porté par plusieurs rois de Paphos” (Masson 1983, 192). I agree, and it was also the name of a king who ruled Paphos at the time of Esharhaddon of Assyria (r. 681-669), making a king Etewandros contemporary with the date generally agreed by Matthäus, Markoe, and Karageorghis for the
North Syrian-style silver bowl MMA 74.51.4557 found by Cesnola, according to him in the same tomb as the golden bracelets inscribed ‘Etewandros king of Paphos.’

The North Syrian-style silver bowl discussed above depicts banqueting between two people who lie down while eating and drinking. It is not identical to the reclined banqueting that appears on the wall relief of Ashurbanipal and the Corinthian kraters. For this, we must look to another of our Cypriot bowls, this one a silver bowl in Phoenician-style, MMA 74.51.4555 [Fig. 26], which depicts a style of banqueting that is clearly the model for the later depictions in Assyria, Greece, and Etruria. The iconography of this bowl was treated extensively by Culican in 1982, who produced a large and beautiful drawing of it [Fig. 27]. It was found on Cyprus, and is currently part of the Cesnola Collection, but there is no other information about its archaeological context. It will constitute a touchstone for my dissertation because it is the depiction of reclined banqueting *par excellence*. In the outer register, an elite couple – already reclining in their wagon – are led out of a walled city for festivities in the open air. On the second register, servants lead animals for sacrifice and butchering, prepare food and drink, serve a drink to a male figure reclining on a *klínē*, and perform music for his benefit. Opposite him in the same register, servants kneel and bow before a seated female figure. In the third register, a series of male banqueters recline on mattresses on the ground, male servants prepare and serve drinks, and a female figure plays a drum or tambourine. This bowl shows the wide range of activities and events that might be part of a reclined banquet in the open air, including a horse relieving itself. It also reveals a greater variety in the reclining than is seen later, when the form is standardized. Here, the reclined banqueters all assume the same posture, but one reclines on a *klínē*, while the others recline on mattresses on the ground, embodying a social hierarchy with the king on the *klínē*,
and his courtiers on the matresses. Matthäus says that the closest stylistic parallels for the Phoenician-style MMA 74.51.4555 are “the huntsman’s day” bowl found in the Tomba Bernardini in Praeneste, Latium (Markoe 1985, E2) and bowls found in the Tomba Regolini Galassi in Cerveteri, Etruria (Markoe 1985, E6, E7, E8, E9), all with *termini ante quem* of the early seventh century, and that therefore the emergence of this group should be dated to the second half of the eighth century (Matthäus 1999-2000, 48). Culican suggests that this bowl may belong to the late eighth century (1982, 27), a date in general agreement with the date argued by Matthäus. Markoe dates it to around 675-625 (1985, 156), and Karageorghis follows Markoe’s date (2000, 181-2).

The stylistic evidence places this bowl in the late eighth or early seventh century at the latest, while finds of a stylistically similar bowl, but not strictly Phoenician, in Iran may raise the date of this style into the first half of the eighth century (Matthäus 2008, 443-4; Matthäus 1999-2000, 48). The date of this silver bowl from Cyprus is provided by Italian finds, but the dates of these finds, in the early seventh century, have not been calibrated to Hallstatt C dendrochronology in this account, and Hallstatt C correlation causes the finds from Etruria and Latium to be dated at least 50 years earlier, therefore raising the dates of the Tomba Bernardini and the Tomba Regolini Galassi into the mid-eighth century (Nijboer 2006, 289, with n. 5). My assessment of the date of this bowl is not based on Hallstatt C chronology, since a full consideration of this is outside the scope of this dissertation, but rather on the stylistic arguments made by Matthäus. The Hallstatt C evidence, however, provides yet more reason to doubt the low dating of this bowl provided by Markoe. The date of MMA 74.51.4555 is at the beginning of the seventh century, well before 675, but later than MMA 74.51.4557, and exists in a stylistic continuum with it, whereby 4555 represents
a stylistic and narrative elaboration in Phoenician style of the themes presented on 4557 in North Syrian style. I am willing to accept a mid-late-eighth century date for 4555, so long as it remains later than 4557, but I would want this to be because of a redating of the Italian contexts in Praeneste and Cerveteri, not because of Iranian finds, which may be too heterogeneous to help us date Phoenician-style material.

Following the range of dates provided by the stylistic analysis of Matthäus 1999-2000 and Culican 1982 and incorporating a chronological relationship with 4557 gives us a date range of ca. 750-675. Therefore, the Phoenician-style silver bowl MMA 74.51.4555 is the earliest depiction of reclined banqueting that takes a form identical to what we see later in Assyrian, Greek, and Etruscan art and society. The male banqueters recline on klínai resting on their left elbows, leaving their right hands free for drinks and food. Their left legs remain straight and their right legs are bent, presumably to provide support for the movements required by banqueting in such a position. It is relevant that only the men recline, and the woman, a queen, sits, similar to what we see on Ashurbanipal’s relief, but in contrast to the Middle Corinthian and Etruscan depictions. In the conclusion to this chapter I will devote a section to the question of gender in association with the reclined banquet.

The third Cypriot bowl which depicts reclined banqueting is a bronze Phoenician-style bowl in the British Museum (Inv. 1892/5-19/1 [Fig. 28]), claimed by Alessandro Cesnola to have been found in Salamis in 1877-8 CE. Markoe dated it to around 675-625, and Matthäus dated it to the early sixth or late seventh century in 1985 (Nr. 426, 172-3), but now considers it part of an older Egyptianising Phoenician tradition (Matthäus 1999-2000, 49). Matthäus regards the bowl as extremely difficult to date because it has no close stylistic parallels, and no parallels in narrative content (Matthäus, pers. comm., 14.02.2012).
central medallion is typical of Egyptianizing Phoenician products, and this depiction of Pharoah smiting enemies with divine protection does not show any peculiarities or diversions from other depictions of the theme in Phoenician art. The unusual narrative decoration is on the outer register, where male and female servants prepare and serve drinks and perform music, a female figure sits nursing a child and holding a lotus flower with two blossoms, while a reclined figure on a klinē before her holds four sprigs of vegetation. In a series of images with no parallels in Phoenician or North Syrian art, a reclined man on a klinē is accompanied by a woman who plays the lyre. In all the other depictions of female musicians, they never share a klinē with one of the banqueters. To their right a seated woman drinks from a bowl. To her right are images of erotic play, where a man carries and fondles a woman, and then a man and a woman have sex on a klinē. This prominent erotic element is not present on any of the other depictions of reclined banqueting in Phoenician or North Syrian art (or on any other eighth and seventh century depictions anywhere). Some aspects of the images on this bowl are very similar to what is described in Amos 6 and in Ezekiel 23, such as the close association of reclining with lyre-playing in Amos 6, and the association of drinking and sex at a festive occasion in Ezekiel 23. Another remarkable and unique element of this bowl is that there is no indication of the consumption of food, as there is on the other two bowls depicting some variety of reclined banquet. In this way, the festivities depicted on this bowl, BM 1892/5-19/1, are more closely connected to the religious celebration of drinking and the erotic mentioned in Ezekiel 23, while the New York bowls recall the scene described in Amos 6, with food, wine, music, and lying on klinai. There seems to be no reason to doubt the date given by Markoe of the mid-seventh century, but, as in the case of the other two bowls, further finds and research conducted by
Matthäus have suggested an earlier date, in this case into the eighth and early seventh century. I do agree with Markoe that this bowl is later than the other two, so whatever their absolute dates, the sequence of relative chronology for these bowls should be, from earliest to latest, MMA 74.51.4557, MMA 74.51.4555, BM 1892/5-19/1.

Lacking further information about the find context of MMA 74.51.4557, the fact that Cesnola said it was found in association with the gold bracelets of Etewandros makes it possible that this bowl, with part of an inscription which could read basileēs, was a possession of this same king, who ruled at the time of Esharhaddon’s prism, 673/2. In this case, this earliest of the three bowls could hardly be earlier than the end of the eighth century, with the other two being manufactured in the early-mid-seventh century. Without an association with the prism of Esharhaddon, and the King Ituandar mentioned there, the comparative evidence from Etruria, Latium, Lefkandi, Nimrud, and Crete suggest that these three bowls may have much earlier dates, as has been demonstrated by Matthäus in 1999-2000 and 2008, who points out that the earliest of these bowls may appear in the first half of the eighth century, with a chronology for the trio stretching into the early seventh century. This new chronological orientation must have an impact on the dating of the Cypriot Syllabic script, with a terminus ante quem for the appearance of the Paphian script of the early eighth century, which is in harmony with the date of the Opheltes obelós, inscribed with a script transitional between Cypro-Minoan and the Paphian script, representing the Greek language, and dated to the second half of the eleventh century. Even though I find the Etewandros/Ituandar connection more convincing than many other scholars, in my historical synthesis at the end of this chapter, I will use the higher dates argued for by Matthäus, because of the compelling evidence from the island of Crete.
Crete

The evidence which most clearly raises the date for the Cypriot North-Syrian and Phoenician bowls depicting reclined banqueting is some very fragmentary material from the Idaean cave. Fragments of two miniature bronze votive shields whose figural decoration includes depictions of klínai have been found and dated to the early eighth century. Though they are made in a style with close affinities to North Syrian style, it is clear that they are Cretan products and not imports because of the close connection of votive shields with the cult of Zeus and the myth of newborn Zeus on Crete, and stylistic peculiarities that link the shields closely with other Cretan metalwork. This material has been treated in an impressive series of articles by Hartmut Matthäus (Matthäus 1999-2000; 2000; 2005; 2008; 2011), and the evidence for reclined banqueting consists of fragments of two miniature bronze votive shields, one of which, National Museum of Athens X 11764 1a [Fig. 29], features a representation of a klinē in association with two standing female figures (Kunze 1931), likely part of a procession of servants involved in a banquet (Matthäus 2000, 545) similar to what is seen on MMA 74.51.4557 and its comparanda mentioned above. There may be a figure sitting or reclining on the klinē, but this is conjectural. The second fragment suggesting reclined banqueting, of which a photograph has never been published, is in the Heraklion Museum, No Inv. Nr [Fig. 30]. Hartmut Matthäus has kindly supplied a photograph to accompany this dissertation [Fig. 31]. This fragment likewise depicts part of a klinē, and importantly, very clearly depicts the small step-stool that is typical of early
representations of reclined banqueting on *klínai* (Matthäus 1999-2000, 54, 58, Abb. 21; Matthäus 2000, 546; cf. MMA 74.51.4557, Corinthian kraters Louvre E 629, Louvre E 634).

Since neither fragment depicts reclined banqueting clearly, in order to use them as evidence for the practice requires an argument based on the special use of the particular piece of furniture known in Archaic and Classical Greek as *klínē*, a word which makes its first appearance in Alcman (mid-late seventh century). The term has two primary meanings, ‘(banquet) couch’ and ‘bed’ (Baughan 2013, 3; Andrianou 2009, 31), and it therefore matches the semantic range of some of the Hebrew words discussed above. One of its primary meanings is in connection with banqueting, as we can see in its earliest use in Alcman, where the poet seems to be rehearsing the elements of a banquet (frag. 19 Page):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{κλίναι μὲν ἑπτὰ καὶ τόσαι τραπέζαι} & \quad 1 \\
\text{μακωνιᾶν ἄρτων ἐπιστεφοίσαι} & \\
\text{λίνω τε σασάμω τε κἠν πελίχναις} & \\
\dag \text{πεδεστε} \dag \text{χρυσοκόλλα.} & \quad 4 \\
\text{Seven klínai and just as many tables} & \quad 1 \\
\text{crowned atop with poppy-seed breads,} & \\
\text{and chrusokólla \dag come in! \dag} & \\
\text{[mixed] in cups with linseed and sesame-seed.} & \quad 4
\end{align*}
\]

In its first attestation in Greek, the *klínē* is a piece of furniture for a banquet, for which a laden table is supplied. The meanings of this word expand over the centuries, having a semantic range that mirrors those of Hebrew *miṭṭāh* and †ereš discussed above, i.e. *klínē* can refer to a piece of furniture for sleeping, for recovering from illness, and to a bier (*LSJ* 1996 s.v., Andrianou 2009, 31-2). In all of its uses, it refers to an object on which people recline or lie down. As mentioned in connection with the Hebrew texts, the context of the use of this
object determines its function. Therefore, the appearance of a klinē on NMA X 11764 1a suggests an association with reclined banqueting since the image seems to represent a ceremony with several people in attendance, and it is not a funerary scene, nor one where sleep is involved—in fact, representations of the klinē in the eighth and seventh centuries never involve sleep. The appearance of a klinē on an object ritually dedicated to Zeus in the Idaean cave, which itself depicts a ritual, is explained most elegantly by the idea of a sacrificial banquet during which at least one person reclines, which for some reason was represented on a shield closely connected to myths and rituals of Zeus on Crete. The Cretan shields and Alcman’s poem, being the earliest visual and literary references to klínai in the Greek-speaking world, suggest that this kind of furniture was very much at home at a banquet and that the banquet may have been the earliest Greek context for its use.

Besides the context of the images, we may consider the evidence of the furniture itself to argue for its use in a reclined banquet. One of the only works devoted to Greek furniture is Helmut Kyrieleis’ Throne und Klinen of 1969. As Kyrieleis observes, the appearance of the klinē on Corinthian vases of the late seventh century represents an adoption of an eastern Mediterranean type of furniture, put to use in the Greek context in a way that closely reproduced the Near Eastern practice (118-9), that is, in both regions the klinē was used for reclined banqueting. Kyrielies, understandably due to their fragmentary nature, did not consider the images on the Idaean shields, and therefore he was dealing with a chronology which has been proven incorrect. That is, the first appearance of the Near Eastern-style klinē in the Greek-speaking world was not on Corinthian vases found in Italy, rather, it appears on shields dedicated to Zeus on Mt. Ida in the first half of the eighth century at the latest. This means that no Near Eastern artistic representation of a klinē is
earlier than the Cretan representations, and the only data reliably contemporary are the 
verses of Amos 6. This creates a very difficult situation for arguments that insist on the Near 
Eastern origin of this object, since there is no explicit visual evidence for its existence in the 
Near East before the seventh century (the archaeological fragments of furniture do not 
explicitly inform us about the furniture’s appearance). The *klinē* that appears on NMA X 
11764 1a is of a type most similar to the one depicted on the Phoenician-style silver bowl 
MMA 74.51.4555 and on the relief of Ashurbanipal BM 124920, but both of those objects 
are later, and cannot be evidence for the use of the *klinē* on the Idaean fragments. The best 
evidence that the piece of furniture on the Idaean fragments is indeed a *klinē* used for 
reclined banqueting is that the only earlier representations of similar, but not identical, 
pieces of furniture in the Greek-speaking world are in funerary scenes on Geometric vases, 
e.g. Dipylon Krater (LG I, ca. 750 BCE), where the ‘*klinē*’ (although the word is not attested 
until the seventh century) is a bier. It is not a *klinē* with a clear stylistic link with the later 
Greek and Near Eastern representations, and we cannot determine its connection to the later 
furniture because of the schematic nature of Geometric art. The appearance on the Idaean 
fragments of a large piece of furniture, which is stylistically very similar to the later 
furniture of reclined banqueting, indicates that we are dealing with a representation of 
banqueting because funerary scenes are absent on Cretan votive shields, and the other 
figures present on NMA X 11764 1a are consistent with the representations of banqueting 
on the metalwork from Cyprus treated ablve. Since it must not be a funerary scene or a scene 
depicting sleep, because there are no parallels for such representations, the only use for this 
furniture which is consistent with the other representations on the Idaean fragments is that it
is intended for reclined banqueting, as it is used in later Phoenician, Assyrian, and Greek representations.

There remains a question of whether the *klínai* on the Idaean fragments are occupied or empty, and I must argue that since the only representations of empty *klínai* are on later Neo-Assyrian reliefs depicting preparations for a banquet in an Assyrian camp or the seizure of tribute from the Mediterranean coast (Reade 1995, Figs. 14, 16, 18), and that since these votive shields obviously do not depict these kinds of events, the *klínē* depicted on each fragment is very likely to have been occupied by a reclined banqueter, whose depiction we have lost due to the fragmentary condition of the shields. Mediating the force of this argument is that, on our earliest explicit representation of reclined banqueting, MMA 71.54.4555, and on the earlier North Syrian-style silver bowl MMA 71.54.4557, the forms of the horizontal banquet are various and seemingly in flux, with artists depicting the figures sometimes laying on their fronts, sometimes reclining, sometimes on *klínai*, sometimes on matresses on the ground. Therefore, on our earliest likely depictions of the reclined banquet represented by the Idaean shield fragments, we cannot reliably predict how the characters upon the *klínai* would have been rendered. It is certainly possible that the individuals are lying on their fronts, but I think it highly unlikely that the *klínai* are empty.

Although we do not have any representations of the kind of *klínai* which became associated with the reclined banquet earlier than the Idaean fragments, it remains likely that this piece of furniture in the Greek world is an adaptation of a Levantine object because of the many fragments of ivory inlay, in North Syrian and Phoenician style found throughout Syria-Palestine and Mesopotamia (Gubel 1987, 1). These decorative panels were incorporated into many different furnishings, but one of their uses was to decorate furniture.
of the exact type as is associated with reclined banqueting, as can plainly be seen in the
carefully rendered *klinē* on the relief of Ashurbanipal (ca. 650 BCE), BM 124920, where his
*klinē* is decorated with ivories depicting the woman-at-the-window and lions (Beach 1993, 96).

Before moving on, it is important to take stock of the importance of the Idaean
evidence for the history of reclined banqueting in the Iron Age and for the possibility of
multicultural banqueting. Like some readers of this text, when I began research into the
reclined banqueting phenomenon, I expected that the Levant and Mesopotamia would
provide clearly earlier examples of the practice, either in art or literature, but the Idaean
fragments indicate that our earliest evidence for reclined banqueting – anywhere – are the
roughly contemporary testimonies of the Hebrew text of Amos and the fragmentary bronze
votive shields dedicated to Zeus in the Idaean cave, both coming from around the middle of
the eighth century BCE, with the shields dated to the first half of the eighth century, and
Amos prophesying during the reign of Jeroboam II of Israel, ca. 786-746. As Matthäus has
pointed out, late ninth- and early eighth-century Crete must be regarded as having gone
through a “Proto-Orientalising” phase in metalwork, where North Syrian and Phoenician
models were adapted to local tastes and uses (Matthäus 1999-2000). The appearance of
metalwork influenced by the Levant but clearly created by Cretans at this early date must
cause us to reassess all arguments about resident Syrian and Phoenician artisans west of
Cyprus. The Idaean bronzes demonstrate that the early, Levantine-style metalwork found at
Knossos, Athens, and Pithekoussai may be influenced not directly by the Levant but by
Cretan “Proto-Orientalising” art (for Athens, Matthäus 1999-2000, 54). The complication
provided by the Idaean fragments of the *ex oriente lux* model for Greek art and for reclined
banqueting will cause significant revisions in scholarly accounts of cultural contact in the Iron Age, of the development of Greek art, and of the development of Archaic Greek society. For these revisions to take hold, the scholarly community will require more early-eighth century Cretan metalwork to be uncovered, suggesting the same early adaptation of North Syrian and Phoenician crafts.

For reclined banqueting and multicultural banqueting, the Idaean fragments indicate that the elites of Knossos, and probably also of Phaistos, Lyttos, Sybrita, and Gortyn, were the earliest Greek-speaking groups to demonstrate awareness of the practice and accoutrements of reclined banqueting, and therefore they must have had opportunities to witness West Semitic banqueting practices before the beginning of the eighth century. Starting in Crete, the development of reclined banqueting in the Greek world follows a path that is, in the first place, thoroughly Dorian, with the earliest evidence coming from the Idaean fragments, the larnax of the Corinthian tyrant Kypselos (Pausanias 5.17.5), Early Corinthian vase-painting, and representations in Sicily, Southern Italy, and Etruria, although these western examples demonstrate entangled influences from Corinthian, Euboean (non-Dorian), and Phoenician sources (Rathje 2010, 23). As the Greek-speaking world was creatively interpreting stimulus from its non-Greek neighbours in the Iron Age, Cretan populations were at the vanguard of these processes which resulted in the literature, art, social institutions, and states of Archaic Greece. Some of this stimulus occurred at commensal events where Cretan Greeks witnessed the banqueting behaviour of West Semitic people.

Anatolia
A prince of a Neo-Hittite kingdom in eastern Anatolia was commemorated with a funerary stele inscribed in Hieroglyphic Luwian found in Kululu, known as Kululu 2 [Fig. 32], dated to the mid-eighth century (Baughan 2013, 218), on which the prince speaks in the first person (Hawkins 1980, 220):

§1 I (am) Panunis the Sun-blessed prince.

§2 For me my children made here a sealed (?) document (?)).

§3 On my bed(s) eating and drinking…by the grace of Santas I died,

§4 and they ZARUMATA-ed the KAWARI’s for me. (or: and the KAWARI’s ZARUMATA-ed me.)

§5 Who(ever) shall remove me,

§6 whether he (be) a great man,

§7 or he (be) a…

§8 or whatever man he be,

§9 for him may the god Santa’s parwa’s stand on the stele,

§10 and for him may they set their seal on his house!

In Panunis’ self-description of his actions in §3, we have reminders of Amos’ descriptions of the behaviour of the Samarian elites, feasting on their beds by day, and it also foreshadows a text from the Annals of Ashurbanipal mentioned by Dentzer by way of interpreting the Ashurbanipal banquet relief, where it is written of the king that his happiness is due to his victories, the extent of his empire, the favour of the gods and “la douceur de ses rêves sur le lit de repos nocturne et la clarté de ses idées sur le lit de repos matinal” (1982, 69).

In quadrant A4 of the stele, there is the distinct image of a klinē. This is a Hieroglyphic Luwian logogram (LECTUS) indicating klinē, as it appears in §3 (Hawkins 2000, 489). Here we find combined linguistic and iconographic proof that the “bed(s)”
mentioned in §3 are the kind of furniture identified elsewhere in association with reclined banqueting.

The stele of Panunis is the earliest reference to the practice in the Anatolian sphere, and it is significant that it occurs in eastern not western Asia Minor, because this geographical orientation is in accord with the prevailing theory of the Greek adaptation of reclined banqueting, that it was due to contact with West Semitic cultures, not Anatolian ones. This is not to say that there were no Greek speakers in eastern Anatolia or northern Mesopotamia in the eighth century BCE, but there were many more in direct contact with West Semitic cultures at this time on the East Mediterranean coast, Cyprus, Crete, and the central Mediterranean.

The stele of Panunis establishes a pattern in representations of reclined banqueting in Anatolia, where they are most often deployed in funerary contexts in connection with “the actual placement of the dead on a banquet couch within a grave” (Baughan 2013, 3). This is prominent in the Phrygian cultural sphere, where reclined banqueting appears on many funerary stelae (Hawkins 1980, 222), but many of these are later than the temporal parameters of this study. Tumulus MM at Gordion is a well documented example of a Phrygian funerary banquet, and is dated to the mid-eighth or early seventh century (Simpson 2010, 132-4), shortly after the Panunis stele. This is very likely the burial of a Phrygian king, either Gordias or his son Midas, the Mita of Mushki in Assyrian documents (Simpson 2010, 133), and it contains our fullest documentation of an Iron Age banqueting service, including drinking and pouring vessels, serving tables, and an enormous 2.9 m x 1.9 m bed used as the coffin and bier of the king (Baughan 2013, 88; Simpson 2010, Frontispiece, 22, 127-8). This bed is not in the form of a klinē, but we have in Tumulus MM a practice clearly
related to other Near Eastern representations of reclined banqueting, such as the Phoenician-style silver bowl MMA 74.51.4555 and the relief of Ashurbanipal, where the king is the only one reclined on a bed as a banquet is served around him. We do not know if reclined banqueting was part of Phrygian royal life at this time, but something akin to it was part of royal death.

**Assyria**

The next appearance of reclined banqueting in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian worlds after the Cretan evidence and the Kululu stele, is the relief of Ashurbanipal, referred to a number of times above. Ashurbanipal’s banquet relief, found in 1854 by William Loftus in Room S in the west corner of Ashurbanipal’s North Palace at Nineveh, now in the British Museum (BM 124920 [Fig. 1.24]), is unique in Neo-Assyrian Art (Albenda 1976, 64), and has long been considered the earliest visual representation of reclined banqueting in the ancient Mediterranean and Mesopotamia (Albenda 1976, 49; Dentzer 1982, 58). Current scholarly interpretations of the relief do not sufficiently account for the appearance of the reclined banqueting motif in Neo-Assyrian art, and this desideratum was part of my motivation for developing this dissertation. Before offering a new account of the appearance of this motif, I will first describe and contextualize the relief on which it appears, and review the previous interpretations.

The relief depicts Ashurbanipal reclining on a couch or bed with a lotus flower in his left hand, and a drinking cup raised towards his mouth in his right. The legs of the bed depict scenes of leaping lions and nude women facing frontally. Richard Barnett argues that
the bed seems to be “an elegant Assyrian version of a Phoenician ivory bed, ornamented with panels of the “Woman at the Window”, a motif well known in Phoenician art” (1985, 1). Next to the bed, to the king’s left, is a table with food on it, and at the foot of the bed, queen Ashurshurrat sits in a chair and also lifts a drinking cup towards her mouth with her right hand, and in her left is a plant (Albenda 1976, 63). Around the couple “youths minister wine, Babylonian captives bring food, youths and maidens play music” (Barnett 1985, 1). The presence of the severed head of Teumman, the defeated king of Elam, hanging from a conifer tree behind the seated queen indicates that the banquet was likely held in celebration of this victory, which occurred in 653 BCE (Albenda 1977, 21; Barnett 1985, 4; King 1989, 104-5).

The position of the banquet scene with respect to the rest of the relief is significant [Fig. 33], as is the location of these reliefs with respect to the rest of the palace. The relief wall to which the banquet scene belongs is fragmentary. The banquet scene portion is 1.40m long and 0.45m high, and it belongs to the highest of three registers; using the dimensions of the banquet scene which is the largest surviving portion of the relief wall, the wall’s dimensions are extrapolated to be 7.10m long by 1.53m high, with each 0.45m register framed by a 0.037m-0.05m border (Albenda 1976, 60). On the top register are depicted, from left to right, an all-male procession of nine Assyrians and foreigners, notably an Assyrian kalu priest and two conquered Elamite elites, who bring food for the royal couple (Albenda 1976, 62-3); these move toward the royal couple, who are depicted in a grove of alternating conifers and date-palm trees (Albenda 1976, 63).

The relative elevation of everyone depicted in this register corresponds to their status: The king is highest, followed by the queen, who has a footstool that indicates either
royalty or divinity (Albenda 1976, 63), followed by the attendants (Albenda 1976, 64).
Importantly for the consideration of the reclined banquet, this hierarchy is also illustrated in terms of relative ease; Ashurbanipal reclines, the queen sits, and the attendants stand. The attendants in the wooded area are all female with the exception of one character, who tends to a horse far to the right, and their roles are as musicians, food bearers, fan bearers, attendants, and guardians (Albenda 1976, 65). To the right of the couple and outside the wooded area a procession of male musicians approach a pair of guardians (Albenda 1976, 63). The middle register below this depicts a row of alternating conifers and pruned shrub-like pomegranate trees, with two male guardians (Albenda 1976, 68). Below this, the lowest register depicts a reed thicket (Albenda 1976, 70).

The fragments of this relief wall were found amongst others in Room S, which is amongst a group of rooms (Rooms S, T, V, and W) set on an elevation “20 ft. below the level of the palace” (Albenda 1976, 49). Albenda notes that Room S had two levels (1976, 55) and that the banquet relief should be situated on the upper level (1976, 58), while reliefs depicting battles against Elamite cities and lion hunts adorned the lower level (1976, 55). The upper-level location of the banquet relief has led to its interpretation as an element of private décor, located “in a private apartment, perhaps the royal harem” (Barnett 1985, 5). The fact that it is located in a group of rooms significantly separated from the main areas of the palace supports the interpretation that the relief was meant for relatively private consumption.

As the depiction of a Neo-Assyrian king reclining at a banquet is unique, it is likewise unique for its genre. Visual depictions of victory celebrations, which usually involve some sort of banquet, typically feature kings seated (Barnett 1985, 2; Strommenger
1964, Pl. 194-5). Sargon II’s celebration of his victory at Muṣaṣir involved an all-male seated drinking party (Barnett 1985, 2). The gender dynamics of Ashurbanipal’s banquet are another element that set this relief apart from previous royal iconography. In earlier examples of the royal banquet, “only male attendants serve both the king and other banqueters as revealed on the bas-reliefs of Ashurnasirpal II and Sargon II” (Albenda 1976, 67; Strommenger Pl.194-5 for Ashurnasirpal II). Typically, in Mesopotamian art in general, masters are paired with servants of the same sex (Albenda 1976, 67). Therefore, in the banquet scene of Ashurbanipal, it is exceedingly unusual that the servants around the royal couple are all female. Albenda’s interpretation of this is that the banquet on the relief was located inside the queen’s quarters, in the queen’s garden (1976, 67). This seems reasonable, especially because of the seclusion of the location of the relief within the palace complex. Possibly the relief was mounted in the area in which such a banquet would have taken place, and therefore these lower rooms (S,T,V,W) were the queen’s quarters. Even if this were the case, it would still leave unanswered the question of why Ashurbanipal was celebrating his military victory, complete with the male Assyrian and Elamite dignitaries, in the queen’s quarters in the company of women.

The strange and unique nature of the reclined banquet on this relief has prompted scholars to account for the development of this motif in Assyria in the 7th century BCE. A common interpretation of Ashurbanipal’s banquet is that it depicts a sacred marriage associated with a new year’s festival, but, as Dentzer points out, while this may partially account for the presence of the couch it does not account for the reclined banquet, since other depictions of sacred marriage involve a seated banquet (1982, 61-2). Albenda’s interpretation is furthest from the mark. She argues that since Ashurbanipal is recorded to
have had an unidentified illness, and reclining individuals are interpreted as being sick in the rare examples of Neo-Assyrian art on which they appear, the king’s use of the sickbed changed courtly behaviour and the way he was depicted on reliefs (Albenda 1976, 65). Even if the king was chronically ill, it is highly unlikely that he would have allowed himself to be depicted in a way that suggests weakness. The illness interpretation also fails to account for the obvious power and control displayed by the king in the relief. He is victorious, his enemies dead or in servitude, his household stable, and he relaxes not as a sign of illness but as a sign of health and success. The idea of the king’s illness likewise does not fit with the location of this relief in relation to others. The reliefs in the room directly below depict a very robust Ashurbanipal destroying Elamite cities and hunting lions. If we take all the reliefs in Room S as a narrative continuum, we see that the king successfully hunts lions, he destroys the cities of his enemies, and later, he relaxes with the queen accompanied by female servants. He is fanned, takes food and drink, listens to music, and observes symbols of his victory in the severed head of his opposite number and suppliant foreign captives. We do not detect any element of illness or weakness.

These observations accord with Dentzer’s interpretation of the reclined banquet, which is admirable for its simplicity. All the luxuries of the banquet, of which the reclining is one, are symbols of the king’s power (Dentzer 1982, 63, 68). He adduces a text from the Annals of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh, in which the king accounts for his happiness in terms of his victories, the extent of his empire, the favour of the gods and “la douceur de ses rêves sur le lit de repos nocturne et la clarté de ses idées sur le lit de repos matinal” (Dentzer 1982, 69). This text recalls the semantics of Hebrew words for couch-bed, and Amos’ disapproval of the Samarians’ excessive use of this type of furniture, i.e. even for waking activities.
Here, Dentzer cogently and elegantly elucidates the symbolism of the reclined banquet and accounts for the presence of a day-bed among Assyrian royal accoutrements.

More recently, scholars have supported Dentzer’s interpretation of the existence and meaning of the reclined banquet in Ashurbanipal’s Assyria, but since it accounts only for the practice in its Neo-Assyrian context and not how the practice appeared there, they have attempted to account for its appearance in terms of foreign influence. Barnett argues that the presence of a Phoenician-style ivory bed in the relief (1985, 1), which is of the type suitable for the West Semitic marzēah (1985, 3), the evidence of the popularity of this kind of ivory-inlay furniture, and the presence of Phoenician or Syrian bronze bowls at Nimrud, leads to the conclusion that the banquet scene “depicts the king celebrating a marzeah ritual (or some form of it), of which a ritual marriage with his queen forms a part,” and that this ritual “seems to have spread to Assyria by the late 8th century BC and to have been performed in the temples and royal palaces” (1985, 5). Thus Barnett, perhaps unwittingly, replaces Dentzer’s interpretation of the reclined banquet as an example of royal luxury, with an interpretation that requires us to look outside of Assyria for its significance.

Philip King, in assembling all the literary and archaeological evidence for the marzēah, dismisses Barnett’s suggestion, since there is no evidence for an actual marzēah ritual in Mesopotamia (1989, 105), but rather only the presence of some furniture, cups, and a dining posture that are appropriate for the ritual. I agree with King, especially since the ritual life of an Assyrian king was highly developed and traditional, and while surely the king could have introduced a foreign ritual, it is hard to imagine his motivation for doing so in a religious system so reliant on tradition and continuity. The introduction of a ritual that belongs to a foreign theology does not seem characteristic.
However, the presence of Phoenician and Syrian ivories and cups in Assyrian cities, beginning in the 9th century BCE (Winter 1977, 375), does attest a Neo-Assyrian interest in West Semitic luxury goods, and the appearance of a Neo-Assyrian king engaged in a behaviour very similar to the actions of one engaged in a marzēaḥ indicates a Neo-Assyrian interest in West Semitic elite behaviour. To adopt a behaviour such as a dining posture is not to adopt the ritual of which it is a part. In considering the impact of one artistic tradition upon another, Irene Winter states that the process can involve “at one extreme, the transfer of motifs or elements without any understanding, or the conscious rejection and complete remodelling of original meanings; at the other extreme, the acceptance of a visual theme along with its contextual significance and the integration of it into the fabric of the embracing culture” (1977, 379). The same is true for the adoption of an element of personal comportment, and in the case of Ashurbanipal’s banquet relief, we are dealing with a variation of the former extreme: the adoption of a foreign motif with a “complete remodelling of original meanings” (Winter 1977, 379).

I suggest a progressive intensification of Neo-Assyrian involvement with Phoenician and Syrian luxury goods and elite behaviour, in concert with their “aggressive policy of military conquest and subjugation” that begins in the ninth century (Gunter 2009, 28). In the reigns of Ashurnasirpal (r.883-859) and Shalmaneser III (r.858-824), large amounts of tribute from Syrian and Phoenician cities appear in Assyria and are consumed by the Assyrian elite, including banqueting equipment such as klinai (Reade 1995, fig. 18, tribute from Phoenicia, ca. 700 BCE) [Fig. 34]. As Assyria comes in more direct control over Syria, Phoenicia, and Cyprus after the campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser III (r.746-727), Shalmaneser V (r.726-722), and Sargon II (r.721-705), the Assyrian governors, now installed in Damascus,
have ample opportunities to observe the elite behaviour of the nobles over whom they have control, and the activity of reclined dining in the company of women achieves a level of popularity that causes it to appear in a relief of a victory celebration of Ashurbanipal (r.668-627) sometime after 653 BCE. As I will describe further in the historical summary at the end of this chapter, Neo-Assyrian experience with the cultures of the Levant and Cyprus in the eighth century caused them to take an imperialist interest in the luxuries of the peoples from whom they extracted tribute, and to adapt some of the conquered peoples’ symbols of power and nobility.

**Corinth**

After the appearance of reclined banqueting in Assyria in the middle of the seventh century, the motif appears next in the art of Corinth. Taking the evidence of reclined banqueting from Corinth chronologically, the first attestation may be the larnax of Kypselos, tyrant of Corinth from 657-627. The larnax, attested only by Pausanias in a description of monuments at Olympia, was made of cedar, gold, and ivory, and was elaborately decorated with narrative scenes. The passage of Pausanias’ *Descriptio Graecae* begins at 5.17.5 and continues to 5.19.10, with the *klínē* mentioned at 5.19.7:

> ἡ δὲ ἀνωτάτω χώρᾳ—πέντε γὰρ ἄριθμον εἰσὶ—παρέχεται μὲν ἐπίγραμμα οὐδέν, λείπεται δὲ εἰκάζειν ἐς τά ἐπειραγμένα. εἰσίν οὖν ἐν σπηλαίῳ γυνὴ καθεύδουσα σὺν ἀνδρὶ ἐπὶ κλίνῃ, καὶ σφᾶς Ὀδυσσέα εἶναι καὶ Κίρκην ἐδοξάζομεν ἀριθμῷ τῶν θεραπαινῶν, αἱ εἰσὶ πρὸ τοῦ σπηλαίου, καὶ τοῖς ποιουμένοις ὑπ’ αὐτῶν· τέσσαρες τε γὰρ εἰσὶν αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ ἐργάζονται τὰ ἔργα, ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσιν Ὁμηρος εἶρηκε.
The highest field, for they are five in number, provides no inscriptions, and so it remains to interpret it through comparisons. So then, in a cave a woman is lying down with a man on a *klinē*, and I conjecture that these are Odysseus and Circe because of the number of serving-girls, who are in front of the cave, and because of what they are doing amongst themselves: for the women are four and they are performing tasks that Homer spoke of in his poetry.

Pausanias’ description of the larnax, then, provides us an example of a *klinē* used for reclining by a man and a woman together, but there is no mention of a banquet and this may simple be the use of a *klinē* as a bed for sleeping or love-making. Comparing it to the passage in the *Odyssey* Pausanias refers to (*Od*. 10.345-87), we see that this event is in concert with a banquet, and with bathing and anointing for that matter. Homer’s description of Odysseus going to the bed and bedchamber of Circe involves a number of pieces of furniture, such as a bed, tables for food, and chairs. The serving-girls prepare food and mix wine. The narrative has Odysseus receive the food and drink while seated in a chair, but he has already been in Circe’s bed, and we probably should not draw too fine of a distinction between the action in the chairs and on the *klinē*. In either case, food and drink are nearby.

Rudiger Splitter (2000) devoted a monograph to it, and produced a wonderful image of Pausanias’ description [*Fig. 35*]. If this object really dates to the time of Kypselos’ forebearers, as Pausanias says (5.18.7), eight hundred years before Pausanias, it is our earliest attestation of reclined banqueting from Mainland Greece. This requires coordinating the evidence for the larnax with evidence from the *Odyssey*, as Pausanias indicates that the servants attending the couple on the *klinē* were carrying out the activities of the servants attending Odysseus and Circe in the *Odyssey*, which include preparing food and serving wine. At any rate, the larnax postdates the Idaean fragments, being about 100 years after
them, and, if authentically Kypselid, attests the spread of reclined banqueting in the Dorian Greek world, from Knossos and other centres on Crete to Corinth in the seventh century.

The Greek art traditionally considered to be the earliest Greek representations of reclined banqueting are three Corinthian Column kraters from the Early and Middle Corinthian periods, ca. 620-570 BCE (Dentzer 1982). I consider them to have been decisively displaced in this regard by the Idaean fragments and the North Syrian-style silver bowl with the Cypriot syllabic inscription, which date to the first half of the eighth century and late eighth or early seventh century, respectively. These kraters, being roughly contemporary with Sparta’s Alcman, witness the spread of the practice of reclined banqueting through the Dorian Greek world. There are four preliminary remarks I wish to provide before dealing with the vases individually. The first is that these objects were functional accoutrements of banqueting, that is, reclined banqueting was depicted on objects designed for the distribution of wine at banquets. The second is that none of them may realistically depict actual banqueting practices, but are more likely to depict an aspirational banquet – the banquet as certain Greeks would like to see it or the banquet as it appears in a traditional story. The third is that none of them was found in the Balkan peninsula. These kraters, all of them now in the Louvre, are from Cerveteri (Caere) in Etruria, and they therefore cannot be presumed a priori to have been used by the Etruscans in exactly the way the Greeks would have used such vessels, but they nevertheless attest the practice of reclined banqueting among the Corinthians, who manufactured the kraters. The fourth is that with these Corinthian kraters we have moved into a very well-researched area of Classical scholarship, and we therefore benefit both from relatively secure provenance information and a secure relative chronology that has a quite uncontroversial relationship with
approximate absolute chronology (Amyx 1988, 428-9), although this chronology is being challenged by its coordination with Hallstatt C dendrochronology, which has the potential to add fifty to one hundred years to the age of Corinthian Craters (Nijboer 2006). For my purposes these objects require a briefer discussion, since it is quite clear when these Greeks started manufacturing wine-mixing bowls with depictions of reclined banqueting on them. The brevity of the discussion does not relate to the material’s lack of importance, but rather to its uncontroversial nature.

The earliest of the kraters is Louvre E 635, the Eurytios krater [Fig. 36], dated ca. 610-600 BCE, on which Herakles is depicted at a reclined banquet in the palace of Eurytos (written Eurytios on the vase) with Eurytos and his sons and daughter. Accompanying this main scene are a cavalcade of horsemen moving to the right beneath it, a hoplite battle-scene on the reverse, an animal frieze on the rim, a depiction of the suicide of Ajax with Odysseus and Diomedes under a handle-plate, a hunter attacking a stag and doe on one handle plate, and a pair of horsemen on the other handle plate (Amyx 1988, 378). In the banqueting scene, the men recline on klínai, rest on their left elbows, and most of them hold small drinking bowls in their left hands (of comparable shape and size to the North Syrian- and Phoenician-style metal bowls in the MMA). The only woman present, Iolē, stands and seems to be in conversation with her brother, Fiphitos, who turns his head to look at her over his shoulder. The woman is completely, even heavily, clothed in a peplos and chiton, while the men wear cloaks that exposes their chests. Each klínē is equipped with a dog on a leash tied to the left front leg of the klínē, and a small table containing a larger drinking vessel (skyphos) and a plate with two cone-shaped foodstuffs, which I consider to be breads, as suggested by the Archaic poetic descriptions of symposia. Each klínē has an elaborate cushion, itself
reminiscent of a krater, and a fringed textile bedspread. A krater is on a stand to the right behind Herakles, and he holds a cut of meat, prepared by the butchers depicted behind him [Fig. 37]. The important elements of this earliest vase for the development of reclined banqueting are:

1) Only men recline on klínai.

2) The event features both food and wine, with each man getting an equal distribution of food.

3) The event is a mythological banquet, featuring heroic persons each named in an inscription, all of whom fulfill the role either of host or guest.

4) Heracles, the guest, is given the place of honour, next to the krater.

5) The banqueters use small phialai, larger skyphoi, plates, and a krater as their banqueting service.

The next two kraters with such depictions are both dated to the Middle Corinthian period, ca. 595-570. On Louvre E 634 [Fig. 38], unnamed male banqueters recline on klínai, before which are footstools, and tables similar to those present on Louvre E 635. The men are depicted similarly to the men on Louvre E 635, their chests seem to be bare, but the area of their chests on the vase shows significant wear. They recline on klínai without visible cushions, and with an elaborately decorated, polka-dot textile bedspread. The table is more elaborate and decorated than on the Eurytios krater, and on it are the same conical foodstuffs placed on a plate, but accompanied on this vase with another type of food, shaped like clog-shoes. These latter may be cuts of meat (roasted, stewed, or smoked), bread, or some type of fruit. On one of the tables is a skyphos, while another man’s table seems to hold a large hemispherical bowl. The phiale is absent. Hanging on the wall to the left and behind each
man is a stylized set of equipment, which seems to be intended to represent a quiver, a bow, and a sword in a scabbard. The greater variety of food displayed, combined with the assemblage of weapons and the absence of women, indicates that this event takes place in the aftermath of a hunt, although it could also depict a meal in a war-camp. The latter is unlikely due to the more elaborate furniture and wider variety of food on Louvre E 634 than is depicted on the Eurytios krater, which is a meal in a wealthy man’s house. The depiction, of course, does not have to be a realistic depiction of an actual event, and is more likely to be an aspirational or mythical one. The important aspects of this vase for the development of reclined banqueting are the following:

1) Only men participate, and they recline.
2) Each man gets an equal distribution of food.
3) The drinking vessels used differ from man to man.
4) With this and the other Middle Corinthian vase, we see the introduction of the footstool.
5) No man is identified as symposiarch, or honoured guest.

The last of the vases which constitute the earliest depictions of reclined banqueting in Corinthian art is a Middle Corinthian column krater by the Athana painter (Amyx 1988, 386), Louvre E 629 [Fig. 39]. This is a remarkable vase, and among depictions of reclined banqueting, is the first but one, the Phoenician-style bronze bowl from Salamis BM 1892/5-19/1, which depicts women reclining on klínai with men. Here, each klínē is occupied by a man and a woman, both resting on their left elbows on cushions similar to those on the Eurytios vase. Sometimes the man is fully clothed, sometimes his chest is exposed. All the women expose their chests, and some make a gesture with their right hands which covers
their breasts. They recline on a thick, undecorated mattress, atop klínai with highly ornate carved legs with a combination of geometric and lotus designs, or with a lion-head design. Such designs may be carved or painted on actual klínai, and may be intended to mimic ivory inlay, but I think the images are too large to be depictions of actual ivory inlay. Some of the men hold what seem to be metal hemispherical bowls with radiating petal design like the one held by the seated queen in the Ashurbanipal relief. Before the klínai are simple tables and ornate footstools with textile coverings, and each table holds one of these bowls with radiating petal design on the right-hand side. Each table contains a plate with three conical foodstuffs, to the left of which are two pieces of the clog-shoe shaped food. To the left and behind each couple are items hanging on the wall: a chelys-lyra and either a crested military helmet, an ornate shield, or a combined breastplate and cuirass. This krater therefore combines militarism, musical performance, food and wine, sexuality, and a banqueting ethos that insists on equality among the men and among the women, but not equality between the men and women. The important aspects of this vase for the history of reclined banqueting are the following:

1. Men and women recline together on couches.
2. Each couple gets an equal distribution of food.
3. Both men and women may hold drinking vessels, and the vessels do not differ.
4. With this and the other Middle Corinthian vase, we see the introduction of the footstool.
5. Music accompanies the banquet, and only men are depicted holding lyres.

This set of Early and Middle Corinthian kraters are the earliest objects manufactured on the Greek Mainland that depict reclined banqueting, but, as I have demonstrated above,
they are far from the earliest representations that survive in the Greek-speaking world. They appear about 100 years after the Phoenician-style Cypriot bowl MMA 71.54.4555, and about 150 years later than the likely manufacture of the Syrian-style Cypriot bowl MMA 71.54.4557, with the Cypriot syllabic inscription, and the Idaean fragments depicting klínai. It is clear for stylistic reasons that these kraters were made by Corinthian artists, but they were found in Cerveteri in Etruria. This fact places them in a category with many other Greek vases that were better preserved in Etruria because of the way they were used by the Etruscans; they were buried in graves. The difference in the treatment of kraters such as these in Greece and Etruria, which led to their preservation in Etruria, requires analysis. They were better preserved in Etruria because the Etruscans treated the kraters differently than the Greeks, and this means that the assumptions we can make about the vessel shape and its function among the Greeks (a wine-mixing bowl) can only be applied tentatively to its use among the Etruscans. The Etruscans could have put the kraters to a much different use while they were above ground, as they did when they buried them in graves. I think that they very likely were used for banqueting, because of their shape and the depictions on them, but the krater as the companion of the symposion where wine was mixed and distributed according to certain sensibilities does not apply to the Etruscan context. They may have drunk the wine unmixed, or may each have kept a krater at their table, and may not have served all banqueters from the same bowl, despite what we see on the Eurytios krater.
Etruria

A discussion of the Corinthian kraters found at Cerveteri is a fitting prelude to an account of the earliest depictions of reclined banqueting in Etruria. It was long thought that the architectural terra-cotta frieze plaque found in Poggio Civitate, Murlo, just a decade after the Eurytios krater, and at the same time as the Middle Corinthian kraters, was the earliest depiction of reclined banqueting in Italy. The Corinthian kraters indicated that the Etruscans were interested in foreign objects with depictions of reclined banqueting, and the plaque from Murlo indicated that local Etruscan artists, drawing on a complex mixture of influences from local, Greek, and Levantine traditions (Haynes 2000, 120), began to represent themselves reclined at the banquet around 600 BCE.

The date of the advent of reclined banqueting into Etruscan art has recently been raised by twenty to thirty years by the lid of a funerary urn, published in 2005 (Maggiani and Paolucci), found in a grave at Tolle, near Chiusi, securely dated to 630-620 BCE [Fig. 40]. It is very fragmentary, but clearly shows the image of a banqueter reclining alone, as was to become popular on Etruscan sarcophagi much later. It has been interpreted by Annette Rathje as part of the process whereby the Etruscans adopted “[m]aterial objects and perishable goods, as well as foreign customs and new ideas” from Greece, the Near East, and Egypt (2013, 824). This object highlights the importance of Etruria in the development of reclined banqueting: not only is the earliest Etruscan representation of the practice earlier than the first surviving representation produced in mainland Greece, but those Corinthian craters were preserved because of their deposition in Etruscan tombs. Considering the early dates of Greek and Phoenician activity in Italy and the Tyrrhenian (at the latest, late ninth
century for the Phoenicians, early eighth century for the Greeks), we should not imagine the
Greek adaptation of reclined banqueting as a bilateral exchange with a West Semitic
population, but rather situate it in a cultural milieu where Greeks (including Cypriots,
Euboeans and Cretans), Phoenicians, and Etruscans were open to exchange with one another
(Malkin 1998, 167), and in which Etruscan enthusiasm for foreign banqueting customs
could have played a role in the adaptation of reclined banqueting by certain Greeks.

The object that used to be considered the earliest Etruscan representation of reclined
banqueting, before the publication of the Tolle urn, is one of four terra-cotta frieze plaques
that decorated the Archaic Building Complex at Poggio Civitate, Murlo, which was built
between 650-575, to use conventional dates which have not been correlated to Hallstatt C
dendrochronology, on the site of an Orientalizing building which had burned down (Haynes
2000, 120). It is currently in Murlo, Antiquarium Comunale, and is most completely
published in Stopponi 1985 (Tav. 3-407; 3-413; 3-414) [Fig. 41]. On the frieze plaque, we
see male and female banqueters reclining two-to-a- klinē as they do on Louvre E 629, while
servants bring drinks and attend to the banqueters. Two klínai are depicted, therefore four
banqueters. The klínai have a thick textile or animal skin draped over one side to serve as a
cushion, whereas the second banqueter on the klinē rests on a smaller cushion and partly on
the legs of the first, creating an intimate association between the two. Before the klínai stand
tables holding spheroid food on plates and drinking vessels, both hemispherical bowls and
skyphoi. As on the Eurytios krater, there are no footstools but rather dogs tied by leashes
beneath the klínai. The banqueter on the far right of the plaque plays a lyre, which is
difficult to see, and some of the details of the instrument must have been painted on. To his
or her left, a man drinks from a hemispherical bowl, of a type well know from the Levant
(Rathje 2013, 824; Rathje 1994, 97). Between the two klínai, two female servants stand on either side of a tripod holding a krater, and seem to be serving the banqueters from the krater. On the left extreme of the plaque, a male servant brings a hemispherical bowl and a pouring jug. This plaque was mounted on a building, in some sort of association with three others, which depicted a mounted horse race, a group of men seated in chairs holding staffs of authority and being attended by servants, and a couple seated in a cart being pulled by horses quite like the image on the Phoenician-style silver bowl MMA 74.51.4555. All of the plaques seem to be part of the same narrative scene related to a festive event.

The Murlo frieze is a remarkable object, interesting for its interpretation of the reclined banqueting motif in an architectural way in the central Mediterranean, because we have no evidence that the Greeks or Phoenicians were doing this at the time. The Greek and Phoenician representations tended to be on small objects associated with the banquet, or otherwise in poetry, which, in its way, is also associated with reclined banqueting in the Greek and West Semitic cultural spheres (Morris 2000, 166-8, 182; Kistler 1998, 129-41). To dedicate a portion of a finely sculpted, architectural relief, to the reclined banquet signifies both the importance of the banquet and the importance of the building which the frieze adorned. Almost certainly, the celebration depicted on the frieze-plaques were related to the building (Rathje 2013, 825-6). The most remarkable thing about reclined banqueting in Etruria, however, is not the Murlo frieze, but the immense popularity the practice achieved in the art of Etruria. The impressive wall-paintings in Etruscan tombs, which make their first appearance in 680 BCE, incorporated reclined banqueting shortly after the date of the Murlo frieze, and later, in the Hellenistic period, hundreds of sarcophagi were manufactured that featured a single reclined banqueter on their lids, in what can now be
viewed as an aggrandizement of the iconographical practice seen on the urn from Tolle. Beginning in Tolle and Murlo, the reclined banquet appeared in the art, especially tomb-paintings, of most major Etruscan centres by 500 BCE, notably Veii and Chiusi.

As a number of scholars have pointed out, Etruscan interest in Greek and Levantine practices and objects did not result from a random selection of items based on what foreigners had to offer, but rather is the result of some ideas and objects appealing to the Etruscans’ preexisting notions about themselves and their culture (Rathje 2013, 824; Izzet 2007, 212; Spivey 1992; Arafat and Morgan 1994), and therefore, the appearance of reclined banqueting on a cinerary urn from Tolle, on Corinthian pots in Cerveteri, or on an architectural frieze from Murlo does not represent an Etruscan adoption of the Greek symposion, the Phoenician marzēah, or Assyrian royal ritual (Rathje 2010, 23-4; Izzet 2007, 213; Small 1994). We must permit the Etruscans to have their own banqueting traditions beyond the notions of Hellenization and Orientalization. Nevertheless, the appearance of reclined banqueting in Etruria in the second half of the seventh century is the result of influence from Greeks and Phoenicians and its creative adaptation by Etruscans (Nijboer 2013), but it is not possible to determine whether Greeks or Phoenicians provided the model of reclined banqueting which the Etruscans followed, since both the Greeks and Phoenicians were active in the areas just South and West of Etruria for more than 100 years before the first Etruscan depiction of a reclined banquet appears in Tolle, and the fuller depiction on the Murlo frieze replicates exactly neither Greek nor Phoenician banqueting practice, but is an amalgam of Greek, Phoenician, and local features.
Sicily

The last of the areas to be considered in this study of the emergence of the reclined banquet is the island of Sicily. Further West, the earliest evidence for the practice appears well into the Classical period, or in the Hellenistic period, and they are therefore outside of the chronological boundaries of my study, which focuses on multicultural banqueting at a time when convivial behaviour may have influenced the shape and development of Archaic Greek society, and evidence of multicultural banqueting from the fifth century onwards cannot be used in such argumentation.

Greeks founded settlements on Sicily in the eighth century, notably Syracuse and Megara Hyblaia, and the Phoenicians did likewise, notably Motya and Panormus, and this creates a difficult situation for the interpretation of Sicilian evidence for reclined banqueting, because it is very likely that the Greeks and Phoenicians settling Sicily already practised some form of it. In this section, I focus on the appearance of the motif among the non-Greek, non-Phoenician population of the island – the Sikels, Sikans, and Elymians – because I have already accounted for its earliest appearances among Greeks and Phoenicians. Both of these latter groups brought some form of the practice with them to Sicily, and, as Franco De Angelis has pointed out, the native Sicilian populations integrated quickly with the newcomers on the coasts, through both cooperation and coercion (2010, 36-8).

The earliest appearance of the reclined banqueting motif among the non-Greek, non-Phoenician populations of Sicily appears probably at the end of the sixth century BCE, fifty years after its appearance on Corinthian kraters and on the Murlo frieze, and immediately before the chronological boundary of this study. In the indigenous settlement at Castellazzo
di Poggioreale in Elymian territory, whose ancient name we do not know, two ceramic figurines were deposited in a tomb dating to the end of the sixth century, with the cemetery dating to the seventh and sixth centuries. Both are of Greek manufacture, but deposited in an indigenous tomb in an indigenous settlement, in which the influence of Greek terracotta figurines is limited to these two objects (Gaspari 2009, 165). We can therefore say that this population was hardly “Hellenized” and that the figurines were put to indigenous use. But, this evidence must be treated with caution, because it is not so qualitatively different from Corinthian kraters in Cerveteri, and I did not consider those as evidence for the adoption of reclined banqueting among the Etruscans, although they may well be. The figure depicting reclined banqueting is in the Museo Archeologico Regionale di Palermo, 21920/2 [Fig. 42] (Gasparri 2009, 162, n. 61, Fig. 3). It depicts a man reclining alone on a klinē or on a mattress meant to lay on the ground, since the piece of furniture on which the man reclines has no legs, but this may be related to the expediencies of manufacture. He rests his left elbow on a cushion and faces to the front, instead of the standard representation where the men face to the left or look behind themselves to the right. He therefore does not rest on his buttocks but on his left hip, and his knees face to the front. In his left hand he holds what is probably a drinking bowl, and at any rate his left hand is in the posture appropriate for holding such a vessel. The second figure found in the tomb does not depict reclining but is nevertheless relevant for the practice of reclined banqueting. This figure is female, cloaked in a mantle and fixed on a rectangular base, in the Museo Archeologico Regionale di Palermo, 21920/1. What is important here is that these two Greek figurines were deposited together and should bear some relation to one another; thus, in a way, the man does not banquet alone, but in the company of a female who does not recline.
The most important thing to keep in mind about these figurines is that, although of Greek manufacture, the stimulus which caused the Elymian to acquire them may have been in no way Greek. He may have become interested in reclined banqueting from the Phoenicians/Carthaginians who were his closer, and more closely allied neighbours. He, if indeed the inhabitant of the tomb is male, may then have acquired the terra cottas on travels he made to other, more Greek, Sicilian cities, or the objects could have been brought as trade items to Castellazzo di Poggioreale, although I think this is not very likely, since these two are the only Greek terra cottas found at the site.

The practice of reclined banqueting among the indigenous population of Sicily appears also at Morgantina, in eastern Central Sicily. Here, two objects were found which strongly suggest that Sikels were participating in such banquets in the mid-late sixth century. A fine Attic red figured volute krater [Fig. 43], attributed by Beazley to Euthymides, decorated with the Amazonomachy of Heracles and a symposium scene (Neils 1995, 427), with some figures bearing inscriptions, was found by the Princeton University team on Serra Orlando in the 1958 season in a destruction fill dated to the middle of the fifth century (Stillwell 1959, 172) at Cittadella, the site of the Archaic settlement (Neils 1995, 427). The krater is dated by style to 515 BCE (Neils 1995, 437). The sympotic image depicts a bearded man reclined on a pillow accompanied by a beardless youth playing the auloi. Everyone in this scene reclines but the specificities of the klínaí are never depicted. We never see the legs of the furniture. Both men wear laurel crowns. The bearded man rests his left arm on a pillow, but turns his body to angle his head toward the floor, holding his left shoulder with his right hand, in a posture of extreme drunkenness and sickness. A basket hangs between him and the youth. A bearded man to the left of the aforementioned couple turns toward the
flute-playing youth behind him. A basket hangs above and to the left of him. To the left of this man is a bearded lyre-player, who reclines with his lyre and faces left towards two men who recline and drink from kylikes. Behind the lyre-player is the inscription Sosia, and behind each of the two symposiasts to his left is an inscription Chaire.

Morgantina was founded as a continuous settlement by a mixed Italian and Sicilian population in the tenth century (Antonaccio 1997, 168), and Greek influence appears at the site in the seventh century, and steadily increases until the city’s destruction, probably by Duketios, in 459 BCE. An Attic krater depicting reclined banqueting is not out of place in late sixth century Morgantina, and it is certainly evidence that the native Sikels were aware of this banqueting practice. The second object which demonstrates awareness of the symposion, but not explicitly of reclining, is the grafitto on a sherd of a Laconian krater found at Morgantina and published by Antonaccio and Neils (1995). The type of krater from which the sherd comes is dated from 550-500 BCE, therefore contemporary with the Attic krater described above and the terracotta from Castellazzo di Poggioreale. This sherd was found on the surface, and bears an inscription reading kuparas emi. The name is native Sikel, not Greek, and likely in the genitive case. The verb is likely Greek, but may even be a Sikel form of ‘to be’ (Antonaccio and Neils 1995, 268). The important thing about this object is that it demonstrates native Sikel adaptation of a Greek and Phoenician practice that is characteristic of events which involve reclined banqueting, that is, some vessels designed for the consumption and distribution of wine are marked with inscriptions of their ownership or to whom they are dedicated. The fact that the inscription appears on a krater has obvious significance, and Antonaccio and Neils say that the location of other vessels of this type indicate that convivial rituals were an important part of civic life at Morgantina, since the
kraters are found “in close proximity to the major buildings in the center of the archaic city” (1995, 266).

It is clear from the evidence presented above that, in the sixth century, the native populations of Sicily adapted the reclined banquet to their use after having encountered the practice among the Greek and Phoenicians who were settling the coasts of the island. This is, of course, not the first appearance of the reclined banquet on Sicily; both the Greek and Phoenician populations who settled Sicily in the eighth century already had this form of conviviality as an important aspect of their social, political, and religious lives, and they would have continued the practice wherever they built their settlements.

**Historical Synthesis of the Development of Reclined Banqueting in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia from the Eighth to the Sixth Century BCE**

The story of the spread of the practice of reclined banqueting through areas of the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia begins with the Phoenician expansion and with Assyria, not because Assyria provides the origin of the practice, but rather because it provides stimulus for the movement of peoples around the Mediterranean, and was itself an avid instigator of cultural contact, both friendly and hostile. I am not interested in the ultimate origins of the practice of reclined banqueting since this will likely tell us nothing about multicultural banqueting in the first half of the first millennium BCE. Hypothesized by Fehr (1971) to have originated with Near Eastern nomads, and rightly updated by Baughan’s
observation (2013) that the practice is at home among the royalty of Near Eastern city states, my study focuses on how this practice was adapted by cultures around the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia in the formative period of Archaic Greek culture and society, in the eighth and seventh centuries BCE. The Phoenician expansion begins in the twelfth century, in the wake of the Late Bronze Age collapse, with journeys near and far, to Cyprus and Spain, followed by visits to Sardinia and Crete in the tenth century (Gubel 2006, 87; Negbi 1992, 607-10; 1 Kings 10:22, of Hiram and Solomon; 1 Kings 22:49-50, 2 Chronicles 20:35-7, of ninth century Judahite kings). It is possible that already at this early date, Phoenician royals were marking their elite status with the expression of ease and luxury that is reclined banqueting, as suggested by Nijboer (2013) based on the evidence of warrior feasting funerary equipment uncovered in Lebanon. However, the explicit evidence for this practice begins in the first half of the eighth century, almost simultaneously, with the Cretan votive shields from Mt. Ida and the prophecy of Amos relating to the elites of Samaria, followed by its appearance in the second half of the eighth century on metalwork in the North Syrian style (MMA 74.51.4557) and in the Phoenician style (MMA 74.51.4555), consumed by a Cypriot (either Phoenician-speaking or Greek-speaking) clientele. Unlike the votive shields and the text of Amos, these objects from the second half of the eighth century were likely intended for use at banquets similar to those depicted on them, where individuals are shown drinking from bowls (paterae or phialae) of the same shape as the decorated bowls. Therefore, leaving aside origins and the possibility that the practice existed in Phoenicia long before clear evidence for it, the historical window for the adaptation of reclined banqueting by various elite groups in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia opens at the
beginning of the eighth century [Fig. 44] and is therefore entwined with the geopolitical expansion of Assyria.

Maria Aubet, in *The Phoenicians and the West*, states that it has been a commonplace in scholarship to ascribe most of the credit for the Phoenician expansion to the pressure placed on the coastal cities by the Assyrians, as they expanded their empire under Ashurnasirpal (r.883-859), Shalmaneser III (r.858-824), and Adad-nirari III (r. 810-783) (1993, 50), before advancing her own multivalent theory for the expansion that ascribes only partial credit to the Assyrians (1993, 68-74). We have seen that the Phoenician expansion begins at the end of the Late Bronze Age, and is therefore not motivated by an expanding Assyria. However, for the adaptation of the reclined banquet in the eighth century, the pressures of Assyria on the coastal Mediterranean are relevant. In the ninth-seventh centuries BCE, tribute from Syrian and Phoenician cities appears in Assyria and is consumed by the Assyrian elite. Adad-nirari III even resided in Damascus, for the purpose of receiving tribute from the subject Phoenician cities (Aubet 1993, 70). With the reigns and military campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser III (r.746-727), Shalmaneser V (r.726-722), and Sargon II (r.721-705), the Assyrians come into more direct control over Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, and Cyprus. This control would have provided the Assyrian officials in the conquered territories ample opportunities to observe the elite behaviour of the nobles over whom they had some control. I argue that it was in this context that the practice of reclined banqueting achieved a level of popularity that caused it to appear on a relief depicting a victory celebration in a private area of Ashurbanipal’s (r. 668-627) palace at Nineveh sometime after 653 BCE. At the same time, at Tell Sukas in Phoenicia, there is definite evidence for Greek habitation after 675 BCE (Hodos 2006, 43), and it is well known that
since the twelfth century there have been Greek and Phoenician communities located quite closely together on Cyprus. The campaigns of the Neo-Assyrian kings in the ninth and eighth centuries therefore gave them and their generals, officials, and soldiers some experience with the social practices of West Semitic and Greek people living around the shores and islands of the eastern Mediterranean.

In their desire for tribute, it is remarkable that the Assyrians did not appear to want anything distinctly Cypro-Greek, for the tribute that appears in Assyria, at Nimrud especially, is mostly from Syria and Phoenicia, or Phoenician communities on Cyprus, and nothing of Greek manufacture appears there. Thus, it is obvious that the target of Assyrian expansion toward the Mediterranean, among the many ethnic groups located in the area, were the peoples of Syria-Palestine – the Aramaeans, Phoenicians, Israelites/Samarians, and Judaeans. Some very small minority of the population in the Levant in the eighth and seventh centuries were Greek-speaking, located within Syrian and Phoenician ports and cities, and probably more than half the population of Cyprus at this time were Greek-speakers or were ruled by them. Some of these Greek-speakers would have had opportunities to witness Phoenician and other West Semitic elite behaviour, to feel threatened by the Assyrians, and to witness Assyrian elite behaviour as well, possibly even as mercenaries in Assyrian armies. At this time of intense contact between Assyria and Phoenicia, there was no absolute absence of Greek-speakers in the areas of that contact, and on Cyprus, the Assyrians would likely have found a large population of Greek-speakers, although it was not necessarily they who interested the Assyrians.

The reason the story of the development of reclined banqueting begins with Assyria is that it was through their expansionary and acquisitive action that they came into direct
contact with West Semitic elite behaviour, and at the time that they did, Greek-speakers were already in the area, having similar opportunities to learn about the social practices of Aramaeans, Phoenicians, Israelites/Samarians, and Judaeans, etc. Therefore, in eighth century Syria-Palestine and Cyprus, each of the three cultures who were the earliest practitioners of reclined banqueting had opportunities to encounter one another.

In terms of multicultural banqueting, this contact situation becomes much more complex, because the fact that an Assyrian, a Phoenician, and a Greek are within one kilometer of each other does not mean that they will have dinner together. As described above for the Amarna period, Assyrian and Phoenician kings required an approximation of their own status for them to provide the kind of hospitality which would have featured the most sumptuous displays. A Phoenician did not bring out the silver, gold, ivory, lyre-players, and bevies of servants for a mercenary, or a potter. On the other hand, if Adad-nirari III was in Damascus and he sent a message to a Phoenician king saying something along the lines of ‘I am coming with my army to pick up the gold and silver you most generously offered me,’ the Assyrian could expect the gates of that city to be thrown wide for him, and to be feted as if he were their saviour. In this context, the king or the king’s representative would arrive and be invited into the room with the ivory furniture, the silver drinking bowls, the musicians and servants, and asked to join the Phoenician king and his entourage as an equal, or as a superior. Here, if the Assyrian did not already know about reclined banqueting, he would soon catch on, as the other men, and maybe women, took their places on the couches.

How a Greek gained access to a West Semitic elite dinner party is different, but no harder to imagine. No Greek in the eighth century so vastly outranked a Phoenician
nobleman the way the Assyrian king did. In this time, some of the kingdoms of Cyprus were
ruled by Greek kings, and some by Phoenician kings, and I believe that it is in the relations
of these men that we would find a Greek participating in a typically West Semitic reclined
banquet. Using the information presented about the relation between banqueting and
diplomacy in the Amarna period as a model for diplomatic interactions, these kings likely
maintained peace and good relations by hosting one another or one another’s
representatives, and it would be in everyone’s interest to flatter the guest with fine luxuries
and entertainments. On Cyprus, there is also the opportunity for this behaviour to filter
through society and be emulated by poorer people, since, in the first place, it was not only
the kings who practiced reclined banqueting in West Semitic societies, but other nobility and
the high ranking members of guilds such as vintners, farmers, and craftsmen did so also.
Their banquets were not as luxurious as the royal ones, but nevertheless, certain behaviours
of the elite were reproduced there, and I assume that reclined banqueting was one of them.
There is, however, no evidence for this beyond the word marzēaḥ, and how it is used, and I
reject the idea that everywhere we find the word marzēaḥ, a reclined banquet is involved. I
nevertheless believe that at the festivities of non-elite Phoenicians, Phoenician Cypriots, and
Carthaginians, one could sometimes find people participating in a reclined banquet, and in
each of these places, but especially on Cyprus, a ranking Greek-speaker, whether it be a
economic, social, or professional rank he possesses, may be invited to participate in the
banquet in certain special circumstances, in accordance with the readiness with which
people of the same status or profession interacted and integrated throughout the ancient
Mediterranean world (De Angelis 2010, 40).
At the same time as our first evidence of reclined banqueting appears in Amos, and just decades before it appears on North Syrian- and Phoenician-style silver drinking bowls from Greek cities of Cyprus, similar evidence appears on Crete in the form of the Idaean fragments of bronze votive shields, two of which depict the furniture type that is characteristic of reclined banqueting on the Cypriot bowls. Therefore, we can identify no lag between the time when the Assyrians take over more direct control of the Levantine coast in the mid-eighth century and the appearance of the unmistakeable accoutrements of the reclined banquet in a cult context on Crete. The appearance of the klínai on the Idaean fragments is contemporary with Amos and the Cypriot silver bowls, and I think this should cause us to consider Phoenician expansion as far as Crete to be part of internally driven processes; they were active there before the increased pressure from Assyria was brought to bear, as the evidence from Kommos suggests (Shaw 1989).

The current consensus on Phoenician-Cretan interaction in the ninth and eighth centuries is that the population of Crete was generally the passive recipient of influence from the West Semitic world, and I agree with this insofar as it was Phoenicians who were travelling to Crete, while we have no evidence of Cretans overseas at this time (Duplouy 2006, 166). However, I would describe the accounts of cultural contact on Crete as quite simplistic, in that it has become traditional to account for Phoenician and North Syrian-style metalwork at Knossos as the result of resident foreign craftsmen, and to account for a Phoenician-style shrine at Kommos as the work of foreign visitors. In both cases, the objects could have been made by locals with some foreign input, and the Idaean bronze shields provide substantial grounds for reinterpreting metalwork from Knossos as possibly being the products of locals educated in a foreign style, which raises the question of how they came
upon this education. Cretan cities were precocious in their development in the EIA, and this was likely the cause, not the result, of West Semitic engagement with them. During the Phoenician expansion, it was not only Levantine initiative that brought Phoenicians to Crete, but the ability and interest of Cretan cities to engage with their foreign visitors. The Phoenicians may not have found so many Greek cities with this interest and ability in the eleventh and tenth centuries, when the expansion reached the Aegean. On Crete, in places like Knossos and Phaistos, the Phoenicians would have found successful political communities with aggrandizing elites who were interested in foreign goods, techniques, and ideas. This interest can be attributed to the principle articulated by Mary Helms, where elites seek out external systems of status-marking and esoteric knowledge to differentiate themselves at home (1988, 262-4), demonstrate that they are the sort of people who maintain international contacts (Duplouy 2006, 177), and thus be recognized as elite by foreigners.

Quite like language learning or learning the alphabet, learning the techniques of filigree in gold and silver or of hammered bronze in the case of the Idaean shields would have required the sustained and/or repeated contact and communication with a teacher. This teacher-student relationship would have been structured by political relationships. Phoenician and North Syrian-style metalwork at Knossos demonstrate, above all, that Cretans in the ninth and eighth centuries had an interest in acquiring this material, and the Idaean bronzes demonstrate that, in a relatively short time, they were keen to adapt foreign styles to their own needs. These objects belonging to the sphere of the aristocratic classes, it would have been they who arranged for the techniques to be learned by local craftsmen, and this likely involved establishing a long-term relationship not with foreign craftsmen, but with the aristocrats whom they served. Such a relationship between Cretan and West Semitic
elites may not have been founded for this purpose, and thus the bonds of friendship and mutual recognition may have already been established before the Cretans developed an interest in Levantine metalwork. Certainly, the amounts of foreign metalwork recovered on Crete in the tenth and ninth centuries can be accounted for by the notion of gift-exchange, and thus a relationship may have existed before such gifts were given.

Within the context of guest-friendship, which can entail in modern terms political and economic alliances, if one partner desires the technical labour employed by the other partner, a short-term loan of a skilled labourer, or possibly even a gift of a skilled slave, could be arranged. Alternatively, a Cretan aristocrat might send one of his retainers or slaves to Cyprus or to the Levant to learn a skill in a foreign court. This latter situation presupposes the same type of allied relationship between the rulers. In any case, the idea of a resident itinerant foreign craftsman favoured by very many scholars requires a good deal of explaining, since it was not very easy for people to move around the Mediterranean in the ninth and eighth centuries BCE at will and without a wealthy sponsor. For the Cretans to learn their metalworking skill, contact and communication between them and Phoenicians or North Syrians must have occurred, more likely on Crete than elsewhere, and the master craftsman sent to educate local craftsmen was probably not allowed to stay more than one year, since he would be a highly valued commodity to the elites at home. There must have been Phoenician and North Syrian craftsmen at Knossos, but they need not have been there for long. They must not have arrived of their own accord and were required to return to their homelands. They could possibly have stayed for life, but we have no evidence of this. Importantly, these craftsmen may not have arrived directly from the Levant, but rather could have been residents of Cyprus, and their presence on Crete could be evidence for the
relationship of Cretan elites with the Greek and Phoenician rulers of Cypriot kingdoms. Whether it was through relationships with other Greeks who had already adapted Levantine crafts to their needs, or it was through relationships with Levantines directly, either from the Near East or Cyprus, Cretan elites at Knossos caused their craftsmen to manufacture extremely valuable votives for the cult of Zeus on Mt. Ida which depicted processions, dances, and the unmistakeable equipment of the reclined banquet. I argue that the same elite relationships that allowed the Cretan craftsmen to acquire the techniques of Levantine metalwork gave the Cretan elites the opportunity to host and be hosted by their Greek Cypriot, Phoenician Cypriot, Syrian, and Phoenician counterparts, but as mentioned above, it was more likely that the Cretans did the hosting, as we have little evidence that they travelled overseas. In this context, sometime in the ninth or early eighth century, a guest from the East brought the equipment of the reclined banquet as a gift to the Knossian elites and demonstrated it at an appropriate time, perhaps closely associated with a ritual, and sometime later, the Cretan elites began reclining at some of their banquets and representing the behaviour on bronze objects dedicated to Idaean Zeus. This multicultural banquet is the likely context of the adaptation of reclined banqueting on Crete.

The banqueting may not have had trade as its primary goal; carrying forward what we know of diplomatic processes in the Late Bronze Age, sending letters and envoys to foreign kingdoms seems to reflect a desire not to acquire trade goods or wealth. It represents a desire to be and remain in contact, to establish and fortify the kind of relations which may prove economically profitable, but may also satisfy a community’s physical need for security, and surely satisfy the needs of elites to rearticulate their elevated status, and be
recognized as peers by foreigners of high rank. As the Archaic Greeks knew, it is valuable to have friends in foreign lands (Solon frag. 23 West).

By the middle of the eighth century BCE, Phoenicians, Phoenician Cypriots, Greek Cypriots, and Greek Cretans were reclining at some of their banquets, and at this time, people from other Greek cities such as Chalcis on Euboia, Corinth, and Miletus began their colonising ventures, which increased the level of contact of these colonising Greeks with Phoenician and native populations in the areas they chose to settle, and also with other Greeks through the contemporary emergence of Panhellenic sanctuaries such as at Olympia and Delphi. In the middle of the eighth century, Greeks were getting to know the Mediterranean world better, and this included becoming more familiar with the cultures of other Greek communities. There was no appreciable lag between the time when the practice of reclined banqueting was adopted in Crete and when it was adopted in Sparta and Corinth, since the *terminus ante quem* for reclined banqueting in each of the latter is in the seventh century (Alcman and the Eurytios krater), and these areas are linked with Crete by geography, language, and Dorian cultural affinity. It follows therefore that Spartan and Corinthian colonisers brought the practice with them to their new cities, and that representatives from all Dorian Greek cities brought the practice to the games at the sanctuaries of Zeus and Apollo, also located in Dorian-speaking areas, where the wealthy displayed their means.

The adoption of the reclined banquet may be traceable in the development of the warrior feasting grave goods discussed above (Chapter 1), as argued by Nijboer (2013). This grave-complex, in the tombs at Salamis, Cyprus, contained our best example of a Phoenician style bed with ivory panel inlay, although, as with Tumulus MM at Gordion, the bed is not
in the form of a *klinē*, but was likely used as a bier. There are enough geographic and chronological correlations between the spread of the warrior feasting equipment (Cyprus by the eleventh century, Euboia by the tenth, Crete and Argos in the eighth century, Cerveteri in the seventh) and the spread of objects which depict the reclined banquet (Cyprus and Crete in the eighth century, Sparta, Corinth, Tolle, Murlo, Cerveteri in the seventh) as to allow the possibility that the grave complex in the eighth century is an index of the reclined banquet. That is, a funerary ritual used some of the same equipment as a reclined banquet among the living, as could be argued for Tumulus MM at Gordion. Considering the grave goods as being tied to a reclined banquet extends the geographical range of the practice beyond the confines of this study, which focuses on how such practices influenced the development of Archaic Greece, into central Europe and beyond. In the seventh century the warrior feasting equipment is found in Spain, Germany, and Etruria. Some of these tombs of the European Iron Age include enormous iron *klinai* with engraved decoration. For my purposes, the importance of the warrior feasting equipment is that it may allow us to trace the adaptation of reclined banqueting without visual representations of it, and that reclined banqueting, like the distinctive grave goods, developed in the context of elite interaction and gift-exchange involving players from the Levant, the Aegean islands, the Peloponnese, and the Greek colonies of Italy in the eighth century. This remains only a possibility, and there are distinctions between the celebratory reclined banquet expressing the luxurious enjoyment of life and the funerary banquets in evidence in the warrior-feasting grave complex. Nevertheless, the grave goods remain an index of processes of elite exchange similar to the development of reclined banqueting. The warrior-feasting grave goods are important evidence of elite exchange, and they need not be coordinated with evidence of reclined
banqueting to make a point about multicultural banqueting. Whether the banquets were reclined or not, the banqueting services deposited in tombs along with horses, chariots, and weapons are analogous in Lebanon, Cyprus, Crete, Euboea, the Peloponnesus, Magna Grecia, Etruria, and further north in Europe, and they provide evidence of local elite emulation of foreign elites following the principle outlined by Mary Helms (1988). The knowledge of foreign banqueting customs this presupposes is likely to have been gained at self-same events, i.e. banquets at which representatives of more than one population attended, initially for the purpose of diplomacy and establishing relations, and then as corequisite of trade, alliances, and negotiations, even in a hostile context.

In all these areas, there were local feasting traditions before the adaptation of eastern Mediterranean feasting equipment and reclined banqueting, and in each area the adaptation took a different form. This has recently been highlighted for Etruria in the work of Annette Rathje (2010; 2013). The Etruscan kings were some of the wealthiest elites in the Mediterranean with their unequalled access to metals and excellent agricultural opportunities, a situation not replicated in Greece or the Levant. The eagerness with which they adapted the practice of reclined banqueting, making it a prevalent part of their own culture in a way it never became in the Levant, must reflect a pre-existing cultural focus on commensality in Etruria.

Etruscan elites became aware of the Phoenicians during the first years of the Phoenician expansion, in the twelfth and eleventh centuries. They became aware of the Greeks again after LBA contact probably in the ninth century, with the Greek pre-colonial exploration of the Mediterranean, partly in the wake of Phoenician traffic. Neither Greeks nor Phoenicians ever established a settlement in Etruria, but in the nearby regions of
Campania (Greek), Sardinia (Phoenician), and Sicily (both). This must mean that the Etruscans did not welcome them as settlers, because the better access to Etruscan metals that a coastal settlement in Etruria would have allowed would be very attractive to both Greeks and Phoenicians. Somehow, they were prevented from doing this. There does not seem to have been many Greek or Phoenician residents in Etruscan communities. On the other hand, in the early Greek settlement of Pithekoussai, Greek, Phoenician, and Etruscan drinking vessels were deposited together in tombs, such as the famous tomb of Nestor’s cup, so there is some evidence of Etruscan presence in the newfound communities established by Greeks and Phoenicians.

The Greeks and Phoenicians found in northern Italy a well-established, wealthy, and powerful civilization based around city-kingdoms. They were powerful enough to define the terms of their relationships with the East Mediterranean seafarers. The arrangement that was made had the characteristic that Etruscans were more welcome in Greek and Phoenician cities, and in their surrounding areas, than Greeks and Phoenicians were in Etruscan cities and their environs. Etruscans were avid consumers of Greek and Levantine products, including drinking vessels such as Phoenician metal bowls and Greek ceramic kraters and other painted pottery. These items may originally have been offered as trade goods or elite gifts, but it was in the context of banquets in the new Phoenician and Greek communities of Campania and Sicily that the Etruscans learned the dynamics of reclined banqueting. Kraters and drinking bowls as mere trade goods do not allow their purchasers to know the details of the complicated reclined banquet, and if the Etruscans did not already know about it, it is hard to imagine how, in a banquet hosted by Etruscans, the practice could have been fully expressed and then adapted. In an extravagant banquet hosted by a Greek or Phoenician
settler of Italy or Sicily, however, an Etruscan guest would have the opportunity to witness the ritual in full. It was in this context that the Etruscans developed their profound interest in reclined banqueting, which they expressed on a funerary urn (Tolle) and an architectural frieze (Murlo) in the seventh century, and beginning in the sixth century on tomb paintings [Fig. 45] and later on sarcophagi (Haynes 2000, 298, Fig. 240). This theory accords with the likely power relations between the parties outlined above, since Greeks and Phoenicians would have been at pains to impress and flatter the Etruscans in an effort to secure favourable arrangements for trade, cooperation, etc., whereas the Etruscans had much less need for the items the East Mediterraneans had to offer, although they certainly had an interest.

In addition to the necessary pre-existing interest in banqueting rituals in Etruscan society, the Etruscan elites would have been attracted to Greek and Phoenician banqueting equipment and styles because of the widespread elite interest in external symbols of status-marking, as I discussed at length above for LBA cultural exchange. This interest, combined with newly-arrived populations of eastern Mediterraneans courting the interest and attention of the Etruscan elites, probably sometimes by hosting them at Greek- or Phoenician-style banquets, led to the dynamic adaptation of reclined banqueting in Etruria by the beginning of the seventh century BCE, but it could have happened earlier, considering that the Tolle urn is a terminus ante quem for the adoption of reclined banqueting in Etruria, and that Hallstatt C dendrochronology has the potential to raise the date of what was once early seventh century (Tomba Regolini-Galassi, Cerveteri) to a date in the mid-eighth century in our historical accounts.
On the matter of the adaptation of the reclined banquet in Sicily, as I explained above, there is strong evidence that Greeks and Phoenicians already practiced some form of reclined banqueting when they founded their settlements on the island in the eighth century. Although there is strong evidence, presented in De Angelis 2010, that there was a Sikel element in the populations of the new Greek communities almost as soon as they were founded, we do not have specific evidence of the Sikel or Elymian adaptation of reclined banqueting until the beginning of the sixth century. It is highly likely that the Sikel and Elymian populations in Greek and Phoenician settlements would have been exposed to the practice and adopted some form of it, but we do not have evidence for this since these populations likely integrated into the culture of the new communities quickly, and it is therefore hard to tell whether the owner of a specific grave or object was Greek or Sikel, Phoenician or Elymian. Considering the cultural make-up of these new communities, it was very likely that Sikels and Elymians who lived in the new communities but nevertheless had greater mobility than the settlers did, in and out of the inland native settlements, introduced the practice of reclined banqueting and its equipment to the indigenous settlements. Soon after this occurred, however, Sicily was culturally dominated by the Greeks and to a lesser extent by the Phoenicians, so there was not sufficient time after the adoption of some specialty practices and paraphernalia to see the reclined banquet represented in native Sicilian art; the closest we come to this is the graffito of the Sikel name Kuparas on the Laconian krater.
Women at the Banquet

I agree with Daniel Noel (1999) that scholarship that denies or downplays the role of women in the consumption of wine does not do justice to the evidence that survives. In none of the cultures that came to practice reclined banqueting is there an absolute absence of women at the banquet. In some, such as Assyria and Phoenicia, women do not recline alone on klínai, but they nevertheless participate in the banquet seated in chairs, drink wine, and sometimes accompany the men on the klínai for musical or erotic purposes. Besides the female banqueters in Assyria and Phoenicia, there are usually female servants attending to the banquet, dancing, and playing music.

As famously reported by Livy and throughout ancient discussions of banqueting practices, aristocratic Etruscan women reclined with their husbands at banquets. There is no controversy about this, and on the Etruscan depiction from Murlo we see men and women on the klínai, being served by servants of both sexes, without any noticeable distinction in status or role between them.

In the earliest Greek representations of reclined banqueting where the human or heroic figures are preserved, the Corinthian kraters, women participate both as attendants, like Iolē on the Eurytios krater, and as reclined banqueters sharing klínai with the men, as on the vase by the Athana Painter. Like in the Near East, women do not recline alone on klínai the way men do, except on the earliest Cypriot bowl (74.51.4557). In this sense, when a modern interpreter writes something like the following, he must be partially correct:

The sympotic group banded together in pursuance of its own collective image and prestige – all in sharp distinction from the slave attendants and professional performers, all of whom were forbidden to
share in the wine or recline unless they were temporarily engaged as sexual partners or instrumental accompanists to one or other symposiast (Griffith 2009, 90).

But, it is not at all clear how sharp of a distinction was created between male banqueters and female servants, companions, or performers in the actual ritual of the banquet. It is patently false that the performers and companions did not share in the wine, and it is dubious how temporary these cohabitations on klina were, according to all the earliest archaeological and literary evidence available, from the eighth and seventh century.

A Greek symposion was for elite men, and through the pattern of normal emulation of elite behaviour within a society, it spread throughout the popular culture of some Greek cities (Hammer 2004), and was employed by social climbers as a means of claiming elite status (Duplouy 2006, 146). It is hard to know how much the higher-status female participants, later known as hetairai, i.e. the feminine grammatical equivalent of what the male symposiasts called themselves, enjoyed the proceedings, and were happy to attend. The scholarly perspective on this issue seems preoccupied with the idea that herairai were coerced and were not free, but this begs the question about elite Greek women somehow being uncoerced and free, which is hard to believe about these women locked up in the gynaikeia. The wives of Greek aristocrats were called free, in that they were not slaves, but it is problematic to apply the analogy that free is to not free as Greek citizen women are to hetairai. Free, but in what sense? As part of the sociology of male-dominated societies, women were in equal parts elevated and denigrated in the dynamics of male control over them. In Classical Athens, as in Wahabi Islam, citizen women were too precious to be allowed to go outside alone. We know from pseudo-Demosthenes’ Against Neaira that hetairai were not always slaves, but could be free. They were not supposed to be citizens,
but the majority of the population in many Greek cities were not citizens. As sometimes free, non-citizen women, their acceptable range of movement and behaviour more closely matched that of their male companions, who made of them, in the context of the symposion behind closed doors, quasi-equals to themselves, rendering Griffith’s recent analysis misleading.

Besides these problems, much of what we know about these women is from the more or less moralistic writings of Greek men, who may either not understand or purposefully misrepresent the nature of these people and the lives they led. I cannot solve that problem, but I can confidently say that in all the earliest Greek representations of reclined banqueting, women do not consistently have a significantly lower status or lesser role than the men. Sometimes they serve, sometimes they recline with men, but only once does a woman lie on a banqueting-couch by herself, and that is on the North Syrian-style silver bowl from Cyprus with the Cypriot Syllabic inscription [Fig. 25]. From the inscription, we know that this woman was either a queen or a goddess, and this separates this bowl from the later Greek depictions which manifest an ideology of equality among the male banqueting participants. As we see with the North Syrian-style silver bowl, artists did not always deploy the iconic image of banqueters reclining on their backs, but sometimes a slight variation, which may indicate some kind of difference in the occasion being represented, but probably is simply another visual perspective on, or another moment of this elite banqueting behaviour that captured the imaginations of aristocrats from Assyria to Sicily and beyond in the Iron Age.
Chapter 3: Multicultural Banqueting in the *Iliad*

Introduction

Having analyzed the best archaeological evidence for multicultural banqueting in the Iron Age and Archaic Period, I turn to the role of multicultural banqueting in the Homeric poems. Although the development of reclined banqueting in parts of the Greek-speaking world is contemporary with the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and the poems of Hesiod, I make no attempt to find this practice in the Homeric poems. My target in the previous chapters was not reclined banqueting *per se*, but reclined banqueting as evidence of multicultural banqueting, and I now turn to multicultural banqueting in Homer.

My interpretation of social practices in Homer relies on a theory commonly expressed in scholarship on traditional literature: a traditional story must accord with the prospective adopter’s cultural values and norms and the prospective adopter must perceive that there is an audience for this tradition; if they do not, the tradition will be rejected or transformed so that it does accord with those values and the adopter’s perception of the available audience (Smith 1981, 25, 27). This transformation of traditional literature is called in Jack Goody’s parlance “the homeostatic transformation” (2000, 42-46; Finkelberg 2005, 10). Based on this theory, the relations between a traditional story and a living culture are to be found by identifying its audiences, since, as proven adopters of the material, they

---

6 All passages of the *Iliad* are reprinted from T. Allen’s *Homeri Ilias* (1931). For scholarship associating reclined banqueting and the symposium with Homeric banqueting, see García Soler 2010, 41-2. In the course of the Archaic Period, Greek audiences of the *Iliad* began to conceive of the Homeric banquet as reclined [Fig. 46].
found the traditional story to be in accordance with their cultural values, norms, and perceptions of available future audiences. The primary cultural relevance of a work of traditional literature is its audiences, even if the work purports to tell of long ago (Finkelberg 2005, 10).

The earliest identifiable audience of the Homeric poems is the Greeks of the late eighth and early seventh centuries, though we know that the oral tradition of which the poems are a part existed long before this. As Ian Morris states, the Homeric poems were “a poetic creation, what some eighth-century Greeks thought the heroic world ought to have been like” (1997, 558). The target of my analysis is not Homeric society per se, but Homeric society as a reflection of the interests and concerns of Greeks in the eighth and seventh centuries. In the Archaic Greek imagining of themselves, their past, and their relations to others in the Mediterranean, banqueting with non-Greeks (including supernatural creatures) plays an important role.

The theory of oral tradition, which predicts that we should find in many aspects of the Homeric poems reflections of the concerns of its audiences, is confirmed for the subject of multicultural banqueting by the evidence presented in the previous chapters. Oral theory predicts that traditional poetry should be socially relevant for its audience, and the development of reclined banqueting proves that it is, since some Greek-speakers obviously participated in West Semitic-style banquets in the eighth and seventh centuries. Multicultural banqueting in epic bears witness to an Archaic Greek idea that banqueting was a suitable way to interact with non-Greeks, and that such occasions came with opportunities for injury or reward. Expressed another way, feasting in epic shows that Archaic Greeks were concerned about and interested in the social dynamics of multicultural banqueting, and
how it could be successful or dangerously unsuccessful (Bakker 2013, 43, 54-6; García Soler 2010, 40; Bakker 2005, 12-13; Hartog 2001, 25; cf. Od. 6.119-26; 9.175-6; 13.200-2).

This coexistence in the eighth and seventh centuries of Greeks participating in banquets with non-Greeks and imagining banquets with non-Greeks in traditional poetry demonstrates that the ideas expressed in the Homeric poems do not only relate to the idealized past, but do, in part, reflect concerns of the Archaic present. Although multicultural banqueting is the primary mode of cultural contact and exchange in the Homeric poems, as I argue in this and the following chapter, it has not received much attention in Classical scholarship apart from the idea of xenía, ‘guest-friendship’ (cf. Herman 1987). The research presented in this chapter shows that events involving multicultural banqueting do not always involve the concept xenía, and so my work on the Homeric poems is a more nuanced attempt to recover what the Archaic Greeks thought about the relations between Greeks and others in the Iron Age and Archaic period. As discussed in the Introduction, certain modern theories, or lack of theoretical attention, have dominated scholarly thinking about the relations between Greeks and others, and this chapter, in part, concerns itself with the Homeric models of cultural contact, i.e., how did the poet think Achaeans related to others in the Mediterranean?

The focus of this chapter will be to analyse the multicultural banqueting in the Iliad in terms of the much more frequent banqueting and meal-taking among the Greeks themselves and among the gods. Does the social function of a multicultural banquet differ from that of a banquet among Greeks? Do the poetic diction, the actions, or the types of speech differ? The next chapter will address the same questions in the Odyssey, where multicultural banqueting is much more common and plays a somewhat different role.
beginning the analysis of the *Iliad*, I offer introductory material about the Homeric poems in general which will pertain also to the chapter on the *Odyssey*.

**Theory and Methodology**

Homer can be analysed in many ways according to the discourses of several sub-disciplines within Classics. My own approach is anthropological or ethnographic, reading Homer as an indirect informant on the sociocultural conditions of Early Archaic Greece. As such, anthropological theories about feasting (Dietler 2001, 73-85) are important in my analysis. Dietler’s categories of feasting based on ethnographic observation in Africa, the empowering feast, the diacritical feast, and the patron-role feast, relate to the identifiable types of Homeric feasting without matching exactly. Two of Dietler’s categories are especially important in Homeric society. The patron-role feast, which “involves the formalized use of commensal hospitality to symbolically reiterate and legitimize institutionalized relations of asymmetrical social power” (Dietler 2001, 82) more or less describes every meal taken in the shelters of Agamemnon. The empowering feast, in which the host musters a group of people towards a particular task, treats them to a meal once it is completed, while the host remains the owner and beneficiary of the work (Dietler 2001, 79), is closely related to the food and drink provided by the brothers Atreides and Hector to their respective armies in the *Iliad* (17.225-8; 17.248-51), in promotion of and in recompense for the war effort.

My focus on social practices is related to anthropological developments since the 1960s spurred on by the students of Claude Lévi-Strauss, in particular Pierre Bourdieu.
(1990). My work on Homer is an ethnography of how Archaic Greeks conceived of contact with non-Greeks based on a microanalysis of a context where the Greeks thought such contact took place—the banquet—without, in the first place, situating the contact in a broad context such as warfare, trade (Tandy 1997 and Herodotus 1.1.2-4), religious networks of cult sites (Demetriou 2012), or pan-Mediterraneanism (Papakonstantinou 2012, 5; Purcell 1990; Horden and Purcell 2000). It has been noted that positing broad forces driving cultural developments or practices leads to teleological analyses of the individual phenomena, or, as Bourdieu states, “objectivist discourse tends to constitute the model constructed to account for practices as a power really capable of determining them” (1990, 37). Therefore, I begin with the banquet, a concrete and circumscribed cultural phenomenon, without making assumptions about where it fits among the great forces driving cultural contact in Archaic Greek society.

The passages involving the taking of food that I read from an anthropological perspective are susceptible to several other discourses, the most important being their analysis as narrative. The Homeric poems are, first and foremost, traditional stories (Lord 2000, 68), and are naturally analysed with the tools of narratology, and the study of motif, theme, and plot. As such, banqueting passages are analysed as type-scenes—scenes which recur in broad outline several times in an epic, usually involving both repetition of formulaic diction and variation of it, with each iteration of a scene serving some narrative purpose that may be the same or different from other iterations. Far from being extraneous to an anthropological analysis, the work done on the narrative content of banqueting passages (Bettenworth 2004, 112-3; Reece 1993, 6-7; Arend 1933, 35-50, 58, 64-70) is very informative in terms of the types of actions undertaken by the participants in the banquet,
such as sacrifice, butchering, prayer, and libation, and in terms of the social function of the feast, such as providing a venue for debate, decision-making, negotiation (Elmer 2013, 113; García Soler 2010, 42; Sissa and Detienne 2000, 89; see Nestor at 9.74-7), reconciliation, entertainment (Reece 1993, 7, XIII; see Odysseus at 19.179), and above all in Homer, for bestowing honour (Bakker 2005, 7, 10; Hainsworth 1993, s.v. 12.311; Griffin 1980, 19). Several authors have pointed out that feasting in Homer has an important narrative function (Bakker 2013, 53; Bakker 2005, 4, 10; Bettenworth 2004, 9), and these analyses are likewise very informative; banquet scenes function in the narrative as events where future action is recommended and planned, where the reasons for prior or future action are explained. They take on this function so often that it is apparent that Archaic Greeks considered the banquet an appropriate venue for planning, advice, and the sharing of ideas, as Nestor states. This is a function that the symposion would assume in the Archaic and Classical Greek city. Archaic Greeks considered the banquet socially consequential, and it is my goal to analyse the social consequences of banquets undertaken between Greeks and non-Greeks in traditional literature, and to address this analysis to the development of Archaic Greek society at large. Since my concern is with the sociocultural correlatives of the banquet, the constraints placed on the length of a banquet scene in this study are looser than in Reece 1993 or in Bettenworth 2004 where it is conceived as part of the hospitality scene. For our purposes, a banquet scene lasts until its participants have concluded whatever socially consequential business might be handled at the banquet.

Another approach to the text of Homer related to the narratological is analysis according to oral formulaic theory. This theory identifies repeating features of the epic on the level of word, phrase, and poetic line. Like narratological analyses, it also addresses the
larger narrative unit of the type-scene (Bettenworth 2004; Reece 1993; Arend 1933) or theme (Lord 2000, 68-9). Oral formulaic research is indispensable for anthropological analysis because of its focus on the hypothesized indigenous Greek method of composition in performance and its close philological analysis of the native terms. In my reading of the banqueting passages in Homer, the terms chosen, whether deïpnon, dórpon, daís, etc., taken together with the attendant actions of each meal, allow for a fairly precise distinction between types of banqueting and their social consequences, and these philologically distinct types of Homeric feasting manifest distinctions similar to those that separate Dietler’s categories of feasting. Work on oral formulae allows the identification of different types of banqueting scene determined by diction, and with these native terms we discover Archaic Greek distinctions between types of banqueting, which have a bearing on the social consequences and function of a multicultural banquet.

Homer’s *Iliad* contains fifty-three events which feature one or more of the following: eating, drinking, references to eating, references to drinking, references to banqueters, or references to hospitality. Thirty-two of these events are meals or drinking sessions which occur in the narrative time of the epic,7 and twenty-one are references to food, drink, hospitality, or banqueting without being accompanied by the consumption of food or drink

---

in the narrative. Several of these events contain multiple references to food, drink, hospitality, and banqueting, such as the debate between Achilles and Odysseus about the need for nourishment (19.160-237), or the banquet of Nestor that spreads between four books in the middle of the poem, beginning at 11.617 and not coming to an end until 14.8, during which he recalls two prior instances of banqueting (11.726-30; 11.768-89). All of these events do not relate to the same kind of feasting, and there are variations in their formality, ceremonial qualities, and social consequences. For now, I do not wish to artificially limit the number of events under consideration, so we will leave our discussion of the type of feasting involved to subsequent sections where the poetic diction of meal-taking and the anthropology of feasting are discussed.

To begin with my central concern, seven of the fifty-three events can be categorized as multicultural banquets. Following an initial discussion of precisely what is multicultural about these passages, I address the ethics and ideology of the banquet, the sociology of

---


9 This produces an effect of compression and immediacy for the concurrent action, the battle up to the Achaean wall, with the content of books 12 and 13 occurring in the duration of a single recuperative banquet shared by Nestor and Machaon. Even occupying these four books and therefore appearing to be the most protracted feast in the Iliad, the banquet nevertheless ends with Nestor bidding Machaon to continue drinking until the maidservant gives him a bath, whenever that might be (14.5-8).

10 The Aithiopes host the gods, 1.421-7; Trojan Antenor hosts Achaean Menelaus and Odysseus, 3.205-8; Achaean Menelaus hosts Trojan Paris, 3.351-4; The king of Lykia hosts Argive Bellerophon, 6.173-7; Argive Oineus hosted Lykian Bellerophon, 6.215-25; The Aithiopes host the gods, 23.205-7; Achaean Achilles hosts Trojan Priam, 24.468-676.
banqueting, the dynamics of divine banqueting, and how these issues relate to multicultural banqueting in the *Iliad* with a look towards the role of such events in Archaic Greek society.

**Cultural Homogeneity and Cultural Difference in the *Iliad***

My analysis identifies as multicultural instances of banqueting between Achaeans and Trojans, between Achaeans and Lykians, and between the gods and the Aithiopes. Some may object initially that Achaeans and Trojans cannot be considered different cultures, and my position that they are represented in the epic as belonging to different cultures requires explanation, not least since my primary determinant of culture is a shared language, and the epic represents all speech and action in Homeric Greek. It is a striking feature of the epic that all its characters are culturally homogeneous, with their almost uniformly Greek names and shared religious culture. I argue that the monolingualism of the epic is a necessary conceit in a narrative that portrays multiple cultures. Like Douglas Adams’ “Babel fish” or Gene Roddenberry’s “Universal Translator” consistently Englishing all alien speech, the use of the Homeric Greek *Kunstsprache* for all speech and narrative in the epic is necessary for the advancement of the narrative, especially a traditional one that was intended to be enjoyed by individuals of varying social status, and not only by a cosmopolitan, multilingual elite, as could be argued for Roman epic.

This interpretation of the monolingualism of the epic gives us the clues necessary to understand how Homer represents multiple cultures. The constraints of the intended audiences and of the poetic tradition in which the epic developed explain not only why a
consistent language is used throughout, but also why nearly all names are interpretable as Greek: to tell a story about conflict between two peoples, the poet saw fit to reduce the natural boundaries preventing communication and understanding, rendering all interpretable to a Greek audience, and leaving nothing inscrutable. The Archaic Greeks saw themselves reflected in the Achaean heroes, whom they made their ancestors, and they understood the cause of the war to be something orchestrated by their gods. As such, the narrative should only acknowledge and feature those gods familiar to the Greeks, who are the cause of all, and just as there are no foreign speeches and few foreign names, no foreign gods are admitted,\textsuperscript{11} who might generate a bewildering, alienating effect on the audience.

The cultural homogeneity of the Achaeans, Trojans, and their allies is a product of the constraints of the Archaic Greek oral poetic tradition and not the result of a position taken by the poet to the effect that, in fact, the Trojans are Greek.\textsuperscript{12} The poet takes the position that Achaeans and Trojans are different peoples of different cultures, and this can be amply demonstrated by internal evidence from the text of the \textit{Iliad}. On one of the

\textsuperscript{11} It should be noted that the Greeks considered their gods to be at home in many parts of the known world, even those inhabited by non-Greek peoples, such as the Aithiopes and the Hyperboreans.

\textsuperscript{12} I do not wish to ignore one of the important effects of the cultural homogeneity of the Achaeans and Trojans, which is that it serves to highlight the similarities in the concerns and humanity of the two sides, to create sympathy for both and sustain an ambivalence about which side is in the right. Part of the great beauty of the \textit{Iliad} is that the audience sympathizes with both sides, and views each as humane, moral, and correct on its own terms. One of the central themes of the epic is dispute resolution between two parties who are at odds, but are both in the right according to the heroic code of behaviour. The mitigation of cultural difference is part of the literary strategy to create these effects.
occasions that Hector finds Paris not on the battlefield but in his bedchamber, Paris’ natural habitat in the epic, he characterizes his brother’s destructive actions in this way:

\[ \text{μιχθεὶς ἀλλοδαποῖσι γυναῖκ’ εὐειδέ’ ἀνῆγες} \quad 3.48 \\
\text{ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης νυὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰχμητάων} \]

After mixing with foreigners you brought in a beautiful woman

from a far-off land, a daughter-in-law of spear-fighting men.

The two terms of interest here are the adjectives *allodapós* and *apíos*. In a statement focalized in the voice of Hector, the Trojan prince designates the Achaeans as being *allodapós* ‘foreign, alien’ and coming from a region that is *apíos* ‘far away’. Being from far away is no sure indication of cultural difference, but as we shall see in the following section, being from far away does often coincide with expressions of linguistic difference (2.804; 4.438). The term *allodapós* indicates difference in itself and not by correlation with other information. The Trojans mourn the death of Sarpedon, who, although he was a Lykian *allodapós*, nevertheless fought bravely for Troy (16.550). Achilles characterises the location of the war as an *allodapós dἐmos* ‘foreign land’ (19.324). Hermes asks Priam, as he is leading Hector’s ransom to the shelters of Achilles, if he intends to keep the treasure safe by sending it abroad to ἀνδρὲς alldapoi ‘foreign men’ (24.382), not referring to the Achaeans, but to some third party who could safely store Priam’s wealth. In the *Iliad*, the term *allodapós* is used only four times, comprising the examples presented above. It is used by Achaeans to indicate the area around Troy, by the gods to indicate some unidentified people neither Trojan nor Achaean, by Trojans to indicate their foreign allies, and by Trojans to indicate Achaeans. The term thus divides various cultural groups: Achaeans from Trojans (in the voice of Achilles), Trojans from Achaeans (in the voice of Hector), Trojans from
allied Lykians (in the voice of the narrator), Trojans from an unidentified hypothetical allied group (in the voice of Hermes). The term would be unnecessary if it were not intended to indicate difference in terms of people (ándres) and geography (dème). It is more often applied to people than it is to places, and even its reference to a place (19.324) can be construed as a reference to a population (LSJ s.v. dème). Coordinated with apións ‘far away’ in Hector’s speech (3.48-9), allodápos ‘foreign’ should refer to something about the nature of the people, and not merely their origin in a foreign land. Despite the shared culture the epic manifests in terms of values and practices, the term allodápos identifies the Trojans, Achaeans and Lykians as being different from one another, and I think the primary difference expressed is one of culture, or what some might call ethnicity, and possibly also of language, regardless of the monolingual narrative conceit.

Expressions of linguistic difference do exist in the epic, and they have semantic boundaries similar to uses of the term allodápos when it distinguishes between Trojans and their allies. Expressions of linguistic difference occur only in reference to the Trojan allies, never to the Achaeans (Ross 2005, 299), and they are not uniform or formulaic expressions, but each instance expresses the concept differently. The first occurs when the goddess Iris is giving instructions to Hector about organising the army in the introduction to the catalogue of Trojan allies.

πολλοί γὰρ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι, 2.803
allest δ’ ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων·
τοῖσιν ἐκείστος ἄνηρ σημαίνετο ὁδί περ ἄρχει, 2.805
τῶν δ’ ἐξηγεῖσθε κοσμησάμενος πολιήτας.

There are many allies throughout the great city of Priam 2.803
But the speech of the different, widely-scattered peoples, differs:

Let each man give commands to those he in particular rules, 2.805

And after putting his countrymen in ranks, let him be their general.

The line in question is 2.804 and its attestations of the adjective ἄλλος, used to modify both ἐλλην 'speech, language' and ἄνθρωποί 'human beings'. The passage tells us that there are many Trojan allies at Troy (πολλοὶ ἐπικουροὶ), these people are different from one another and from widely separated areas of the world (ἄλλοι πολυσπερεῖοι ἄνθρωποι), and one of their differences is linguistic (ἄλλη ἐλλην). With this passage we are introduced to a difference not only between members of the allied Trojan force, but also between the Achaeans and Trojan forces, since the issue of linguistic difference is never raised among the Achaeans.

The second expression of linguistic difference comes likewise in the catalogue of Trojan allies, near the end.

Νάστης αὖ Καρῶν ἡγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων, 2.867
οἱ Μίλητον ἔχον Φθιρῶν τ′ ὄρος ἀκριτώφυλλον
Μαιάνδρου τε ῥοὰς Μυκάλης τ’ αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα·
Nastes in turn led the foreign-speaking Karians 2.867
who rule Miletus and the canopied mountain of Phthires,
the streams of Maeander and the steep peaks of Mykale.

The term barbarophōnos would become an unmarked word for speakers of other languages in the Classical period, as bárbaros would be for foreigners, but the word and compounds appear in Homer only here. The notion of Miletus as being inhabited by non-Greek Karians can only reflect a post-Bronze Age, pre-Archaic, Iron Age perception, since the city was a centre of Mycenaean and Archaic Greek culture. For audiences in the late eighth and early
seventh centuries, the presentation of the most powerful of the Ionian Greek cities as Karian must have been striking, and may reflect a tradition about the foundation of Miletus.

The third expression of linguistic difference to be found in the *Iliad* refers again to the Trojan army. It occurs in a simile referring to the great noise produced by the speech of the Trojan allies in contrast to the noise rising from the unspeaking, natural momentum of the Achaean force, which came on like waves driven by wind.

ǥῶς Τρώων ἀλαλητὸς ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν ὀρώρει: 4.436

οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς θρόος οὐδ’ ἴα γῆρυς,

ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ’ ἔσαν ἄνδρες.

Thus rises the babble along the wide ranks of the Trojans. 4.436

For they have neither the same dialect nor one speech,

but their language is mixed, since they are men summoned from far away.

This passage rehearses much of the Homeric vocabulary for language, and is demanding for the translator who can hardly be sure what exact distinctions are intended by *thróos, gérus,* and *glôssa.* As in Iris’ advice about the organization of the army (2.804) the notion of linguistic difference is associated here with geographic distance. The most interesting clause in this passage from the standpoint of a study of multiculturalism is *glôssa mêmikto* (4.438), which must not mean that the army uses a mixed language because of the statements to the contrary in 4.337. It means that the group is of mixed language, i.e. multilingual, not that there is a single mixed language used by the army, nor that individuals within the group are proficient in more than one language, two possibilities obviated by 4.337. An Archaic Greek reference to a mixed language, such as Chinook Jargon, a trade language used on the Pacific Northwest Coast (Brown 1996), would be very stimulating for the study of cultural contact in the Mediterranean, but this is not such a reference. This passage is consistent with the
other expressions of linguistic difference in the *Iliad* in that it represents the Trojan force as composed of different linguistic and cultural groups, differences that correspond to geographic distance, and differences that draw a stark contrast between the Trojan and Achaean forces, since the Achaeans are never described as being culturally or linguistically mixed. The point of the two similes at 4.422-32 and 4.433-38 is to draw a stark contrast between the two forces – the unspeaking Achaeans silently following their commanders’ orders, making a sound in their clanging armour like a force of nature, while the Trojans require the flapping of a thousand tongues to get organized, making noise like a herd of food-animals. This distinction between monolingual silence and multilingual commotion is reinforced not only by the natural and animal similes but by the gods of war who accompany each side; bloody Ares god of the war-din leads the Trojans, and the Achaeans are led by crafty Athena (4.439).

The only linguistic distinctions drawn in the *Iliad* are those among the Trojan allies, but the resulting contrast between the monolingual Achaean force and the multilingual Trojan force has a broader valence in distinguishing the Achaeans from the Trojans culturally. There are no linguistic barriers for the Achaeans in the epic (Ross 2005, 299), and this is both because of the monolingual narrative conceit, and because of the epic’s presentation of cultural difference. The Achaeans, although originating from places spread over a large geographical area, are linguistically uniform, while the Trojans and their allies, while originating from a geographical range no greater than that of the Achaeans, are linguistically mixed. For the audience of the *Iliad*, this draws a strong contrast between self and other, with “self” being harmonious and organized, and “other” being confused and disorderly. Because of the narrative necessity that the protagonists must be able to
communicate freely with all characters, what I call the monolingual narrative conceit, the poem does not draw linguistic distinctions between the Achaeans and others, but the linguistic distinctions draws among the Trojan force have a valence in the area of cultural distinction; these linguistic differences serve to separate “self” from “other” for the Iliadic audience.

The text of the *Iliad* draws clear cultural distinctions between the Achaeans and Trojans. As we have just seen, one of these distinctions is that the Trojan force is culturally and linguistically mixed, while the Achaean is not. Hector and Achilles, the main characters of the narrative, both point out the alien nature of the other side. If more indications of cultural difference between Trojans and Achaeans are needed, I point to the terms for the collectives to which the Trojans and Achaeans belong. They are consistently distinguished by these collectivizing terms (Ulf 2009, 84): Achaeans, Danaeans, and Argives for the Achaean force, and Trojans and Dardanians for the Trojan force. The only group to which both belong is that of humanity (6.123, 49), and thus the different terms used to designate the groups can plausibly be correlated to culture. For the reasons stated above, occasions that involve representatives of the Trojan and Achaean sides can be described as multicultural events.

**The Ethics and Ideology of the Banquet**

The *Iliad* bears witness to a network of powerfully held beliefs about food, drink, and feasting, and social practices that include them. Before analysing the special cases of
multicultural banqueting, we must outline this system of beliefs and practices, so that multicultural banqueting can be seen in its proper social and ideological context.

The most salient aspect of the ideology of the banquet in the *Iliad* is that receiving food or drink creates in the recipient a responsibility to the provider (García Soler 2010, 39; Ulf 2009, 87). This idea is expressed many times in reference to the responsibilities of powerful leaders,\(^\text{13}\) of the army at large,\(^\text{14}\) and even of horses.\(^\text{15}\) The provision of food and wine is thus a kind of gift in a system of reciprocal gift-exchange (Papakonstantinou 2009, 15, 19; Dietler 2001, 73; Scheid-Tissinier 1994, 138), and it is a gift that can be seen to operate on two registers.

In the first place, the provision of food is a gift of honour from the giver to the recipient (García Soler 2010, 39; Bakker 2005, 7, 10; Hainsworth 1993, s.v. 12.311; Griffin 1980, 19). A feast where the symbolic capital of honour is distributed can be described as a patron-role feast, involving “the formalized use of commensal hospitality to symbolically reiterate and legitimize institutionalized relations of asymmetrical social power” (Dietler 2001, 82). The host of such a feast, whether Agamemnon (2.402-440; 7.313-25; 9.65-94) or Achilles (9.197-231; 23.28-60; 24.468-676), is the most honoured person involved, and the other participants gain honour by being invited and by social proximity to the host, while

---

\(^{13}\) Agamemnon states the responsibility of Idomeneus, 4.257-71; Agamemnon states the responsibility of Odysseus and Menestheus, 4.343-6; Hector states, in jest, the relationship of Diomedes’ military prowess to his honoured place at the feast, 8.161-3; Sarpedon states the responsibility of Glaucus and himself, 12.307-21; Menelaus states the responsibility of the leaders of the Danaeans, 17.248-51.

\(^{14}\) Hector states the responsibility of his allies, 17.225-8.

\(^{15}\) Hector states the responsibility of his horses, who enjoyed a special mixture of wheat and wine, 8.185-90.
retaining their subordinate social position. The Homeric banquet manifests an ideology of equality (2.431; 9.225-6; etc.) but serves to reinforce asymmetrical social relations, which demonstrates the “complex political polysemy of feasts,” which “both unite and divide at the same time” (Dietler 2001, 77). At the same time as reiterating the social superiority of the host, the Homeric banquet also insists on the equivalence of the achievements of the participants (Ulf 1990, 210-12), who are all entitled to a share in the equal feast.

The second register is visible in the function of a feast as “a symbolic practice that encourages collective misrecognition of the self-interested nature of the process” (Dietler 2001, 73). While the Homeric feast as it unfolds may manifest “the sincere fiction of a disinterested exchange” (Bourdieu 1990, 112), in its recollection by an interested party, such as Agamemnon (4.257-71; 4.343-6), Menelaus (17.248-51), or Hector (17.225-8), the feast is transformed into a gift that expects specific recompense, in these cases bravery in military service. In its recollection by the hosts, the feast is not a patron-role feast, but an empowering feast where the hosts have gathered people together for a particular task, and provided meals in exchange for its completion (Dietler 2001, 79).

The collective misrecognition of the exchange of feast for work is embodied in the concept of honour, *timē*. The feasts hosted by the most prominent men distribute the symbolic capital of honour to the participants, as the meat and wine are distributed. The participants recognize the primary benefit of the banquet to be the honour received. When the host is subsequently disappointed with the military performance of his prior guests, he rouses them to action by recalling their honoured positions, which is also evident in the feast. It is the honour bestowed which creates the responsibility to carry out brave military exploits, and it is the honour received which causes the prior guests to respond affirmatively
to the pressure applied by the host. Only in moments of high tension in the midst of battle, such as the fight for Patroclus’ corpse, is the intermediary of honour neglected, and food and drink are identified as the direct motivations for martial bravery (Hector at 17.225-8). While Hector can dispense with the mention of honour, Menelaus, in a statement coordinated with Hector’s, cannot. He calls on the leaders, those who drink communal wine beside the brothers Atreides and are attended with respect and honour that comes from Zeus, to press on and retrieve the corpse (17.248-55). Whether food and drink, or the honour that accompanies them is conceived of as the benefit the guest receives from the host, the result is a responsibility to act in accordance with the host’s wishes, to measure up to his expectations. When the recipient falls short, the host will rebuke him, reminding him of his responsibilities in terms of feasting and honour. This is the most important aspect of the ideology of the banquet expressed in the *Iliad*.

Related to the idea of the honour of the feast creating a reciprocal responsibility are the ideas expressed about the nature of food and drink. When not being misrecognized according to the symbolic capital that accompanies foodstuffs, food and wine are sometimes mentioned in their primary alimentary function (Papakonstantinou 2012, 4, 7; Davies 1997, 98). The idea of food and drink as nourishment is secondary to the notion of food and drink as bestowing honour, but it is nevertheless an important part of the ideology of food in the *Iliad*. The embassy to Achilles returns unsuccessful to Agamemnon’s shelter and Diomedes advises sleep, since the men have had their fill of food and wine.

νῦν μὲν κοιμήσασθε τεταρπόμενοι φίλον ἢτορ
σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο· τὸ γὰρ μένος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀλκή·

Now go to sleep, you who have satisfied your own hearts
with bread and wine. For those are courage and prowess.

Here food and drink are associated with certain human physical and psychological qualities, and rightly so, since the human body cannot live or fight for long without food and drink. We encounter here an intersection of nature and culture. While the association of food with honour, and of banqueting with social status, are artificial cultural constructions, they rest on the facts of the matter pointed out here by Diomedes with only a slight veneer of culture. Without bread and wine, the human body has no strength, and as a result, the human mind has no drive to work or fight, and so has no courage. The poet may be saying slightly more than this in the construction of 9.706. The position of σῖτος ‘bread, food’ and ἀλκή ‘defence, courage, prowess’, line-initial and line-final respectively, encourages a reading that connects these nouns, as the close collocation of οἶνος ‘wine’ and μένος ‘passion, courage, rage, might’ encourages a reading that connects them. But, this can only go so far, since ἀλκή, and especially μένος, are semantically rich, and it is hard to know exactly which meaning of each is intended. It is clear that ἀλκή has a more physical relevance, while μένος has a more psychological one, and so it is safe to say that the poet associates bread with the physical qualities necessary for war, and wine with the psychological qualities. However, there is sufficient semantic overlap between μένος and ἀλκή to say that the two may be paired as rhetorical amplification, which would amount to saying the same thing twice, for emphasis, about the value of food and wine together. They bring strength and courage.

The same formula appears again at 19.161, at the beginning of the debate between Odysseus and Achilles about the value of food. After using the same proverbial description as Diomedes, Odysseus elaborates his point by clearly stating the alimentary qualities of food and drink.
οὐ γὰρ ἄνηρ πρόπαν ἡμὰρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα
19.162
ἄκμηνος σίτοι δυνήσεται ἄντα μάχεσθαι:
eἴ περ γάρ θυμὸ γε μενοινάᾳ πολεμίζειν,
19.162
ἄλλα τε λάθρη γυία βαρύνεται, ἣδε κιχάνει
διψά τε καὶ λιμός, βλάβεται δὲ τε γούνατ’ ἱόντι.
19.165
δι possesses καὶ ἐδωδῆς ἀνθρώποι καὶ ἠδὲ κιχάνει
ἄνδρας δυσμενέσσι πανημέρος πολεμίζῃ,
ἄνδρας δυσμενέσσι πανημέρος πολεμίζῃ,
θαρσείσι νοὸι ἤτορ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, οὐδὲ τι γυία
πρὶν κάμνει πρὶν πάντας ἐρωῆσαι πολέμοιο.
19.170
For a man will not be able, all day long until sunset,
to fight face to face fasting from food.
Even if in his heart he really is eager to make war,
nevertheless his limbs imperceptibly become heavy,
both thirst and hunger overtake him, and his knees fail as he goes.
But any man who has filled up on wine and food
can make daylong war on his enemies—
the heart within him truly confident in its energy—and his limbs
do not get weary at all before everyone withdraws from the battle.
19.170
After Achilles’ ill-advised rejoinder, Odysseus reiterates the point.

After Achilles’ ill-advised rejoinder, Odysseus reiterates the point.
In no way can the Achaeans mourn a dead man with an empty stomach.  
For too many are dying, piled in heaps all day long:  
When can anyone take a breather from this toil?  
What is necessary is to bury the man who has died  
keeping a steady heart, and weeping today.  
But however many survive beyond the hellish battle  
should remember drink and food, so that we,  
unceasing always, may fight our enemies still more,  
wearing the unyielding bronze on our flesh.

These passages illustrate the direct connection made in the *Iliad* between nourishment from food and wine and physical and mental performance in battle. This shows an awareness of the physical necessity of food apart from its elaboration as a symbol of honour and status. This awareness is seen more clearly against the background of Achilles’ culturally-determined response to the death of Patroclus—fasting and defilement (Davies 1997, 98; Edwards 1991, s.v. 19.145-237; Schadewaldt 1938, 133). Because of his strong feelings, Achilles mourns in an extreme way (Davies 1997, 100), and he wishes the rest of the Achaeans to do likewise, not only to fast but to kill at the same time. Odysseus knows this is impossible; if the army is to be successful in war, and not add to the heap of dead Achaeans, they must eat and drink. This fact pertains to Achilles as well, though he cannot see it, and so the gods in their favour nourish him with divine food (19.347-54). The gods know that he cannot do what he intends to do without nourishment, and know that beyond his culturally-determined inclination to fast exists an undeniable physical reality. Through his extreme grief, his inability to understand the need for food, and the intervention of the
gods, Achilles is presented as not yet fully human. The prerogative of food, which Odysseus explains at length and even the gods recognize, is a symbol of civilization and the community of human beings to which Achilles only marginally belongs (Ulf, pers. comm., 15.11.2013).

**The Sociology of the Banquet**

Food and drink as symbols of honour, understood as gifts of honour which must be reciprocated with counter-gifts, and as substances which impart the necessities of human existence, instilling physical and mental abilities, are the main features of the ideology of food and drink in the *Iliad*. They must be seen as the ideological context of the social practices of banqueting, and of all drinking and taking of meals. My project is about the social corollaries of banqueting, or the social opportunities banqueting provides. In social and cultural terms, what happens at a banquet? Or, what does a banquet do?

The meals that occur in the narrative fall naturally into two types, one that is explicitly socially consequential and one that is not. These sociological differences correspond to ceremonial ones, with the socially consequential meals involving more accounts of sacrifice, complicated preparation of the food, prayers, and libations. The differences between the socially consequential and inconsequential meals are, in large part, signaled by diction, with *deīpnon* and *dórpon* serving most of the time as the unmarked terms for relatively inconsequential meal-taking, while *daís* and words related to *xeĩnos* and *xeníē* indicate socially consequential meals or socially consequential hospitality that involves meals. The terms *deīpnon* and *dórpon* are used only for human meals, while *daís*
and words related to *xeĩnos* refer to both human and divine meals. It has long been noted that the *daís* highlights the aspect of distribution involved in the meal, being related, as it is, to *dasmós* and *datéomai*. The meals designated by *daís* and words related to *xeĩnos* clearly correspond to the definition of banqueting followed in this study: “events essentially constituted by the communal consumption of food and/or drink [distinct] from both everyday domestic meals and from the simple exchange of food without communal consumption” (Dietler and Hayden 2001, 3). Sometimes, *deĩpnon* or *dórpon* is used to refer to a socially consequential banquet, but rarely, and such instances deserve special attention as they may reveal subtle differences between banqueting types. In this section the sociological, ceremonial/religious, and linguistic aspects will be discussed together, since they are so closely related.

A socially consequential meal is one that has an effect beyond the nourishment of the human body. It serves as a venue for discussion, social cohesion, strategizing, reconciliation, or any number of other social uses. To begin with very clear examples, let us look at the banquets hosted by Agamemnon, king of kings. After the drama of the restoration of Chryseis and the seizure of Briseis in Book 1, Agamemnon calls all the preeminent councillors, *gérontas arístēs panachaiôn* (2.404), to his shelters for a feast. He designates a sacrificial ox (2.402-3), the gathered men assure its consent by sprinkling barley-groats (2.410), he prays to Zeus for victory over Troy on that very day (2.413-18), and the men sacrifice the ox to Zeus according to specific ritual provisions (2.421-9) that are nearly identical to the sacrifice of the hecatomb to Apollo (1.458-69). Then they eat (2.430-1). The feast is thrice marked as a *daís* by the noun (*daīta*, 2.430; *daitós*, 2.431) and the verb (*daĩnunto*, 2.431).
This highly ceremonial feast has specific social consequences. After they have finished eating (2.432), Nestor initiates a political and military discussion, in which he advocates the immediate mustering of the troops by the group of commanders at the feast; they should go in person and rouse the troops to battle (2.433-440). The feast of Agamemnon functions, in part, to provide a venue for this discussion, to gather principals together and allow them to decide on collective action. One can see here the importance of the feast for the narrative; by being socially consequential for the characters in the poem, it foreshadows and explains future action, establishing expectations that will be either met or confounded. We will see that the feast reappears several times in the narrative serving a similar function, and it will become clear that banqueting scenes are salient structural elements of the narrative.

Nestor’s advice does not only state his opinion, but reveals other options available to the gathered commanders. Nestor focuses on immediacy in his speech (eggualizō, 2.436; thāsson, 2.440), but acknowledges that the banquet may have encouraged a different, more reflective, approach to the situation. He says that they should not converse for a long time (dēth’ aũthi legṓmetha, 2.435) or postpone their work for too long (dēròn amballómetha ērgon, 2.435-6). This brings to mind other possible results of this meeting; they might have decided to discuss matters for a long time or decided that battle would best be joined sometime later.

In contrast to this socially consequential meal is the concurrent meal taken by the army. It is a deípnon (2.399), not a daís. It still contains elements of ceremony, with each man sacrificing to the gods (2.400). However, it does not play the social role of the daís of the kings. This deípnon emphasizes the individuality of the proceedings (állos d’allō,
2.400), and is not a venue for social communication among human beings, although it
remains a venue for human communication with the divine. The distinction between deîpnon
and daís is asserted by Odysseus in his discussion with Achilles about the value of food;
Achilles’ men take a deîpnon (19.171) while Achilles himself should be treated to a daís by
Agamemnon, so that the two men can be reconciled (19.179). However, Achilles never
attends a daís hosted by Agamemnon in the entire poem, despite Odysseus’ suggestion. He
receives goods from Agamemnon, and becomes host himself at the funerary feast and
funeral games of Patroclus.

Similar socially consequential meals hosted by Agamemnon occur at 7.313-43 and
9.65-178, always referred to as a daís (Elmer 2013, 113, 119). In the earlier of the two,
Nestor advises a break in the fighting to cremate the fallen soldiers and build a defensive
wall atop the burial mound, and thus this banquet repeats the function of the one at 2.402-
440. It is often Nestor, oldest and wisest of the Achaeans, whose advice is featured in
the banquet, and then followed.

The latter example, the last banquet in the Iliad to be hosted in the shelters of
Agamemnon, deserves special attention because of Nestor’s explicit statement of the
function of the banquet. Nestor advises the following course of action:

άλλ’ ἕτοι νῦν μὲν πειθόμεθα νυκτὶ μελαίνη 9.65
δόρπα τ’ ἐφοπλισόμεσθα· φυλακτήρες δὲ ἑκαστοι
λεξάσθων παρὰ τάφρον ὀρυκτὴν τείχεος ἕκτος.
κούροισι μὲν ταῦτ’ ἐπιτέλλομαι· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Ἀτρεΐδη σὺ μὲν ἄρχε· σὺ γὰρ βασιλεύτατος ἐσσι.
daɪνυ δαίτα γέρουσιν· ἐοικέ τοι, οὐ τοι ἀεικές.
πλεῖαί τοι οἶνου κλισίαι, τὸν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν

188
ἡμάτιαι Ὀρῆκηθεν ἐπ’ εὐρέα πόντον ἄγουσι·
πᾶσα τοὶ ἐσθ’ ὑποδεξίη, πολέεσσι δ’ ἀνάσσεις.
pολλόν δ’ ἄγρομένων τῷ πείσει δς κεν ἄριστην
βουλήν βουλεύσῃ μάλα δὲ χρεών πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς
ἐσθλῆς καὶ πυκινῆς, ὅτι δήϊοι ἐγγύθι νηῶν
καίουσιν πυρὰ πολλά· τίς ἂν τάδε γηθήσει;
νῦξ δ’ ἧδ’ ἠὲ διαρραίσει στρατὸν ἠὲ σαώσει.

But really now, let’s be persuaded by the dark night
and prepare our meals. Let each of the guards
take their places along the dug-out trench outside the wall.
I will set the men to these tasks. But afterwards
you, son of Atreus, take command; since you are the greatest king.
Host a banquet for the councillors; it is proper for you, not inappropriate.
Your shelters are full of wine, which the Achaean ships
bring daily from Thrace upon the broad sea;
all generosity is yours, since you rule over many.
But when all are gathered together, be persuaded by him who advises
the best counsel. All the Achaeans are especially needful
of good and considered advice, since our enemies burn many fires
very close to the ships; who could rejoice at these things?
This night will either destroy our army or save it.

Nestor advises Agamemnon to host a banquet for the explicit reason that the Achaeans are
all in great danger and require the best advice from their commanders. The banquet (daís,
doubly marked by noun and verb, 9.70) will be the venue that allows the presentation of this
advice. Agamemnon must follow the advice that seems best. He is also reminded by Nestor
of his responsibilities in relation to feasting. Complementary to the responsibilities of the
guest at the empowering feast outlined above, as the most powerful king (*basileútatos*, 9.69), he has the responsibility to host banquets, and Nestor reminds him why this is; he is most powerful, he has an abundant supply of wine which the Achaeans at large have provided him, and thus every kind of entertainment and hospitality is his. It is for him to host such banquets, and he has a responsibility to do so. As Agamemnon and Menelaus often remind the troops of their military responsibilities in terms of feasting, so Nestor reminds Agamemnon of his responsibility to provide such feasts; this responsibility is particularly poignant since the banquets have the desirable social consequence of being a forum for discussion and decision making, what the Achaeans need most at this point in the narrative.

Agamemnon’s consequential *daís* is contrasted to the generalizing *dórpa*, ‘meals’, taken by all (9.66, 88). Like the *deīpnon* (2.399), *dórpa* are meals taken by the army at large, and are attended by little ceremony or consequence. However, *dórpa* as the object of the first person plural hortatory subjunctive spoken by Nestor at 9.66, *ephoplisómestha*, ‘let’s equip, make ready’, presumes that everyone, commanders and the army at large, will be taking *dórpa*, but the one taken by the commanders will be a special kind, that can be described as a *daís* because of its distributive principles, its ability to bestow honour, and its other social consequences.

There is another situation where the terms for taking meals seem to semantically overlap or bear an interlinked relationship with one another—where a *dórpon* becomes a *daís*. In Book 7, once the Achaeans have buried their dead and built a wall, they slaughter cattle and take a meal, *dórpon* (7.466). Several ships from Lemnos, captained by the Argonaut Jason’s son Euneos, stood by as the Achaeans enjoyed their work-feast. The ships
were carrying wine, and Euneos gave 1000 measures of it to Agamemnon and Menelaus. The other Achaeans had to purchase it with bronze, silver, animal skins, cattle, or slaves (7.472-5). That Agamemnon and Menelaus were given wine is significant for both the real and symbolic economies of feasting. A portion of this wine, which is otherwise a commodity of trade, is given to the sons of Atreus, since one of them is the most powerful king among the Achaeans, and the other is the reason for the conflict and a major sponsor of the effort. Thus, trade goods operate as war booty. As a portion of any spoils must accrue to Agamemnon since he is the most powerful king, so must a portion of all valuable goods which arrive in the Achaean camp. The spoils which accrue to Menelaus get less attention in the poem, but it is he, above all, who must be compensated for the loss of his wife and dignity, and so it is acceptable to the Achaeans that the war end with the restoration to Menelaus of Helen and her dowry (3.72, 91). Received as a gift of honour to the most powerful, the wine becomes an object of public interest, since the brothers Atreides have a responsibility to host banquets where these gifts of honour are distributed.\(^\text{16}\) This is the wine which fills Agamemnon’s many shelters, brought to him by the ships of the Achaeans (9.71-2), and it is the wine Menelaus cites when calling for bravery from the men who drink at public expense, *dēmia pīnousin* (17.250-1). This wine belongs to the brothers Atreides, but they have a responsibility to distribute it at feasts that function both as patron-role feasts and empowering feasts.

Once the wine has been acquired by the men who have built the wall and are currently enjoying their work-feast, the feast transforms from a *dórpon* to a *daís*, doubly marked by noun and verb (7.475-77). They took a *dórpon* of beef at 7.466, and, with the

\(^{16}\) For the close association of Menelaus with the banquets hosted by Agamemnon, see 2.408.
addition of wine, set out a pleasing *daís* at 7.475, and they feasted all night long. Here again we see that a *dórpon* can be further specified as a *daís*. It is not the simple addition of wine that alters the nature of the meal, but, I argue, the introduction of the Atreides’ wine, which, in its distribution among the Achaeans, can be called communal (*dêmía*, 17.250). As all the Achaeans have stocked up on their supplies of wine, which would be for daily use, it was probably not only the Atreides’ wine that was consumed, but some of these freely given 1000 measures must have been set out as part of the *daís*.

During this Achaean banquet, and the banquet among the Trojans occurring at the same time (7.477), Zeus thundered and plotted cunning evils. The Achaean banquet was a venue for celebration of the completion of work and the creation of social cohesion. Zeus loomed over this banquet, being, in a sense, present, and while the Achaeans poured libations to him in fear, he plotted.¹⁷

### The Banquets of the Gods

Having discussed everyday, unmarked meal-taking among the army of Achaeans, and the special socially consequential meal designated as *daís*, it remains to discuss banqueting among the gods before proceeding to the analysis of multicultural banquets. The concurrent banquets among the Achaeans and Trojans mark a break in the patterns of feasting and sacrifice that had prevailed since the beginning of the *Iliad*. The reciprocal relationship between humans and gods implicit in sacrifice manifests itself in an alternating pattern of human and divine feasting for the first seven books of the *Iliad*, where humans feast, then gods feast, then humans feast again and so on, but the pattern is disrupted at the end of Book 7 with the complaint of Poseidon about the lack of sacrifice and is not restored again until after Achilles reconciles with Agamemnon in Book 19.

¹⁷ These concurrent banquets among the Achaeans and Trojans mark a break in the patterns of feasting and sacrifice that had prevailed since the beginning of the *Iliad*. The reciprocal relationship between humans and gods implicit in sacrifice manifests itself in an alternating pattern of human and divine feasting for the first seven books of the *Iliad*, where humans feast, then gods feast, then humans feast again and so on, but the pattern is disrupted at the end of Book 7 with the complaint of Poseidon about the lack of sacrifice and is not restored again until after Achilles reconciles with Agamemnon in Book 19.
term daís links the meals of heroes with those of the gods. Every banquet where divine beings are the only participants is referred to either as a daís or as a xeînia. Every banquet on Olympus is a daís, while Thetis hosted in the glittering palace of Hephaestus enjoys xeînia (18.387).

Seven of the thirty-two meals that occur in the narrative time of the epic are divine banquets. Six of them involve only divine beings, and one involves the gods and the Aithiopes (1.421-7). The six that involve only the gods are extremely consequential. Among the gods, the terms daís and xeînia retain their semantic range of designating banquets that are venues for debate, decision-making, negotiation, planning, and reconciliation, and, like the human daïtes, explain the past action and determine the future action of the narrative, establishing expectations that will be either met or thwarted.

The sociology of divine banqueting should inform our understanding of a multicultural banquet in the same way as the monocultural banquets among Achaeans and Trojans; that is, to understand how special cases of banqueting operate, it is important to observe the dynamics of normative banquets. However, it is important to ask what sort of normative banquet a divine banquet is. For the Archaic Greeks, a divine banquet is an idealized, aspirational image of carefree life, on the one hand; the gods are imagined to be forever enjoying their banquets in deathless grandeur (ThesCRA, 2: 220; Sissa and Detienne 2000, 80-1). On the other hand, they are a venue for the opprobrium, shock, condemnation, and violence that arise from the meetings of powerful beings with very different interests.

18 1.421-7; 1.531-604; 4.1-72; 15.78-150; 18.387-409; 23.200-1; 24.97-119. For all thirty-two passages, see n.1.
All the Homeric gods have homes on Olympus, but they are often more at home in their special domains in the far-flung regions of the earth, and they are gathered together on Olympus, not altogether happily, where they scoff at the affrontery of the others. ‘What have you just said?’ viz. ‘How dare you?’ is often heard at a divine banquet (1.552, 4.25, etc.). This stands in contrast to human banquets, where strongly conflicting opinions are rarely expressed, or they are expressed with far more politesse. The divine banquet seems to be, for the Archaic Greeks, a model of conflict resolution and of social intercourse between conflicting parties, with interests as vastly separated as are their favoured haunts among the Hyperboreans, on Cyprus, Lemnos, or in the depths of the sea, and it is this characteristic which makes the divine banquet particularly relevant for an analysis of multicultural banqueting. In some limited sense, divine banquets are multicultural, but this cannot be the final analysis, as the gods are also a family, related by sexual generation.

The divine banquet has this special characteristic of uniting beings often widely separated in geography and opinion, and displaying their conflicts, negotiations, and mutual pleasure. Certain facts of their procedure contribute significantly to the sociology of the banquet as conceived by the Archaic Greeks.

The offering and receipt of a drinking cup appears to carry a secondary, social meaning, beyond the offer of a drink. Hera and Zeus have come into conflict over the progress of the Trojan War (1.536-70) at a banquet (daíś, 1.575, 579, 602), and Zeus has threatened her with violence for meddling in affairs that are his to decide (1.562-7). Hephaestus is concerned that this threat will be carried out, and that Zeus will corrupt the pleasant nature of the divine banquet, literally overturning it (daīta taráxēi, 1.579). Hephaestus negotiates with his mother Hera, and before he makes his final proposition that
she should submit to Zeus, he raises a two-handled drinking cup to her (\textit{anaḯxas dépas amphikúpellon}, 1.584) and places it in her hand (\textit{en cheiri títhei}, 1.585). For nine lines he speaks about Zeus’ strength and his wish not to see his mother harmed. Without speaking, Hera accepts Hephaestus’ proposition by smiling and receiving the cup he had offered (\textit{edéxato cheiri kúpellon}, 1.596). The offer and receipt of a cup is functional in negotiations at the divine banquet. Somehow, the cup and its contents become an embodiment of the advice of the one offering the cup, and in taking the cup, the recipient accepts the advice. The offer and receipt of a cup can also signal commiseration (Themis to Hera, 15.88) or consolation (Hera to Thetis, 24.100-2). The rejection of the offered wine occurs only between Hector and Hecuba (6.258-270), when Hector rejects Hecuba’s premise that wine and libations to Zeus will help him; he thinks it will weaken him and that he should not libate to Zeus while covered in blood.

In modelling modes of conflict resolution, the divine banquet represents an Archaic Greek concern that banquets between people with different interests progress peacefully, and an anxiety that they may become violent. Hephaestus worries that Zeus will disrupt the pleasant banquet. Zeus has become angry and impatient with Hera’s desire to know all his plans and her concerns about the Achaeans, and he reminds her that violence is one of his options to change her behaviour.

\begin{verbatim}
ei δ’ οὕτω τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν ἐμοὶ μέλλει φίλον εἶναι: 1.564
ἀλλ’ ἀκέουσα κάθησο, ἐμῷ δ’ ἐπιπείθεο μύθῳ, 1.565
μὴ νῦ τοι οὐ χραίσμωσιν ὅσοι θεοὶ εἰσ’ ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
ἀσσον ἰόνθ’, ὅτε κέν τοι ἅτατος χεῖρας ἑρείω.
If something is thus, it was my desire that it be so; 1.564
\end{verbatim}
But sit down quietly, and heed my word,

for however many gods are on Olympus, they will be of no use to you

when I lay my invincible hands on you, since they are weaker.

Zeus does not want to harm Hera or disturb the banquet, but he asserts the right to do so. The alternative to violence is to sit, listen, and obey (1.565), rather than questioning and intervening as she had been doing. Zeus desires a restoration of the pleasantries of the banquet, absent Hera’s queries, and to achieve this, he resorts to the realities of violent power that the ‘equal banquet’ (1.602) partially effaces. He does not achieve his end, since the mere mention of Kronidian violence has disquieted the other gods (нные, 1.570). The peace is only restored by Hephaestus’ counselling of Hera and his humorous performance as wine-steward (1.597-600). After this, the banquet is back in full swing, with daylong feasting and musical performances by Apollo and the Muses, after which the gods retire to their homes, and Zeus and Hera go to bed together.

Banquets among the gods, as those among heroes, are patron-role feasts that involve the fiction of equality among the participants (Papakonstantinou 2009, 10-12; 1.602). Despite this, they nevertheless “symbolically reiterate and legitimize institutionalized relations of asymmetrical social power” (Dietler 2001, 82), and this is apparent above in the location of the divine banquet (dôma Diòs, 1.570) and Zeus’ prerogative of power over the banquet; it exists at his pleasure. The fiction of equality and the pleasantries of the feast remain so long as the patron is unperturbed, but if strained by unpleasant questions or undesirable responses the patron may refer to the sociopolitical realities that exist outside the commensal exercise in equality, such as the violent domination Zeus exerts over the universe.
In terms of narrative analysis, the above banquet partially explains prior action, Zeus’ granting of Thetis’ request, and partially serves to demonstrate that some gods are opposed to Zeus’ decisions. Subsequent divine banquets in Books 4 and 15 feature the king and queen of the gods working in concert to determine the future action of the narrative. In Book 4, Zeus wishes, partly in jest, for Menelaus to be declared winner of the duel between him and Paris, and for Menelaus to leave Troy with the Achaean army once Helen has been restored to him (4.13-9); Zeus wishes, in a certain sense, for the narrative of the Iliad to come to an end. Hera wants the Achaeans to win the greater reward of sacking Troy, and prevails over Zeus in the final decision to reinitiate battle between the two armies. Book 15 finds Zeus and Hera working together again, executing Zeus’ plan that determines the rest of the action of the narrative and beyond (15.49-71). It is generally the case that divine banquets occur at crucial points in the narrative and initiate plot developments that last for several books, until the next divine banquet. The last two that occur in the narrative time of the Iliad are when Iris is sent to ask the winds to raise a breeze so Patroclus’ pyre will light (23.200-1), a brief scene of little consequence, and when Thetis comes to Olympus and the gods arrange for Achilles to return Hector’s corpse (24.97-119), a negotiation that ordains the reconciliation with which the Iliad ends.

As an event which announces part of Zeus’ plan for the rest of the Trojan War, the divine banquet at 15.78-150 is exceedingly consequential. Hera announces that the other gods’ plans are confounded and that they cannot deceive Zeus (15.104-9). This banquet features political and military negotiation between conflicting parties, and the negotiations become more physical than any between mortal participants, and border on violence. The complementary deities of war, Athena and Ares, come into conflict because Ares desires to
avenge his son after Zeus has forbidden the gods to participate in the war; Ares storms out of the banquet and is readying himself and his horses for battle, when Athena strips him of his arms (15.125-6), rebukes him (15.128-41), and sets him back in his seat (15.142). Here is an example of the kind of action with which Zeus threatened Hera (1.567), but Athena gives no warning before she manhandles her brother. The result of the actions, Zeus’ threat and Athena’s disarming, are the same, the offending deity is restored to his or her seat, and the banquet can continue (15.150).

Divine banquets in the *Iliad* are, above all, venues for the negotiation of competing interests in a power context where one participant has more power than all the others combined. In this context, a number of styles of communication and negotiation are deployed, from gentle suggestions that come with offers of pleasant drink, to polite expressions indicating that a course of action will not generate agreement among the gods (Elmer 2013, 6), to threats of violence and its realisation in physical compulsion. The sociology of these banquets reflect Archaic Greek ideas about how the commensal context can be leveraged to various ends and how it can mitigate separation and difference between groups with diverse interests. It is naturally a venue for the exercise of symbolic power, particularly by means of hosting, but may involve the exercise of violent, physical power, which is nonetheless real even though the social context of the banquet is seen to disintegrate when it is brought to bear. A banquet is only a banquet when violence is sublimated, and Archaic Greeks have observable anxieties about banquets devolving into deadly violence, focalized in the words of Hephaestus (1.586-94) and Athena (15.132-7).
Multicultural Banqueting in the *Iliad*

Multicultural banqueting is a particularly compelling category in analysing the *Iliad*. Not only are there a number of meaningful references to it in the narrative, but the human story of the Trojan War begins at a multicultural banquet gone wrong. \(^{19}\) This banquet occurs outside the action of the *Iliad* but is the inescapable background of this action. The banquet is briefly described in Proclus’ epitome of the Cyclic epic known as the *Cypria* (Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 85-105, in Severyns 1963).

---

\(^{19}\) A number of causes are adduced for the Trojan War, among them Zeus’ agreement to Gaea’s request that the human population of the earth be reduced (Martin 2011, 9), his insistence that Thetis marry a mortal man (and the events at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis), and the Judgement of Paris (Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 85-105). The cause of the war from the mortal perspective, i.e. the thing that motivated the brothers Atreides to muster the Achaeans and make war on Troy, was Paris’ elopement with Helen from a banquet hosted by Menelaus in Sparta, and the resulting violation of Menelaus’ hospitality (3.351-4).
Zeus plots with Themis [Thetis, Ms.] about the Trojan War. Eris was among the gods feasting at the wedding of Peleus and sets up a beauty contest between Athena, Hera, and Aphrodite, who, according to the command of Zeus, are led by Hermes to Alexander on Mt. Ida for the decision; Alexander decides in favour of Aphrodite since he was enticed by marriage to Helen. Afterwards, he builds a ship after Aphrodite encouraged him, and Helenus prophesies to them about the future, and Aphrodite commands Aeneas to sail with Alexandros. Kassandra predicts the future. Disembarking in Lakedaimonia Alexandros is hosted by the sons of Tyndareus, and afterwards in Sparta by Menelaus. Alexandros gives gifts to Helen at the feast. After this, Menelaus sails away to Crete, ordering Helen to provide for the needs of the guests until they depart. At this point Aphrodite unites Helen with Alexandros, and after they have sex, they sail away in the night having loaded the ship with most of her possessions. Hera raises a storm against them. Blown off course to Sidon, Alexandros raids the city. Having sailed away to Ilion, Alexandros brought to pass his marriage to Helen.

With the xenēzin of Paris by Menelaus in Sparta and Achilles hosting Priam in his shelters on the Trojan coast in Iliad 24, multicultural banquets between Achaeans and Trojans serve as the motivation for the action of the Iliad and the resolution of the last conflict that the Iliad narrates—the conflict between Achilles and Hector. This type of banquet would be worth study even if it played a much smaller role in the epic, but considering these basic facts about the Iliad, we are dealing with a cultural practice Homer and the poets of the Epic Cycle placed at the heart of relations between self and other, between the venerated ancestor heroes of the past and their opposite numbers, sharing so much in terms of culture and religion, but still regarded as different, as I demonstrated above.

One of the reasons banqueting features in the narratives of cultural contact in Archaic Greece is that it was an essential element in the institution of xenía, ‘guest-friendship,
hospitality’, a historically extant, legally prescribed way of establishing and maintaining relations with outsiders (Köster 2011, 137-40; Robert 1969, 1052). Put simply, a xénos was a friend from another city, with no specification whether this should be a Greek-speaking city (Herman 1987), and xenía was the bond of friendship, sealed with gifts, that ensured mutual help and hospitality between the partners (Köster 2011, 139-40). This hospitality is defined as room and board as sumptuous as the host can afford, necessarily including my definition of banqueting, and often, xenía refers primarily to banqueting (Scheid-Tissinier 1994, 138). A friend from one’s own city could not be a xénos, but was rather a phiłos, while a particularly dear friend from abroad could be a phiłos xénos, as Diomedes refers to Glaukos (6.224-5). Thus, xenía was a codified way of relating to those from abroad both in the Homeric poems and in the Archaic Greek city, and banqueting was an essential aspect of the institution. In order to avoid the kind of tautological analyses I warn of in the introduction, it is important not to conceive of xenía as the institution which causes all the multicultural banqueting in Homer, since some of these banquets clearly are not referred to as xeníai, while others are; thus, it is important to keep banqueting as our category of analysis to account for all the relevant examples, and to note that some multicultural banquets are further specified as xeníai.

One aspect of xenía that is especially relevant for a discussion of multicultural banqueting is the way the institution conceives of the foreigner. The institution is, in the first place, an extension of the ritual of the distributive sacrificial feast to include someone or a group that was not beforehand part of the group that the feast constitutes. As participation in sacrificial feasts defines the social group (Gernet 1982, 294-6), the institution of xenía redefines the social group to include the foreigner, by using the same tokens of inclusion, i.e.
the distributive sacrificial feast (Cerqueira Lima 2013, 392; Bruit 1989, 15). In this sense, as
the banquet serves to mitigate conflict and encourage misrecognition of power relations, it
mitigates cultural difference and encourages the misrecognition of the foreigner as a part of
the home group. It seems that part of the mentality that underpins the institution of xenía is
the difficulty in recognizing the gods when they come among human communities. In
ancient Greek thought, normative human communities do not banquet with the gods; this is
reserved for the remote past and for quasi-humans who live in the remote regions of the
earth (Bruit 1989, 14). A perfect stranger may be a member of one of these groups, these
semi-divine remote human beings, or it may be a god in disguise (Bruit 1989, 15, 17). In the
Archaic period, and it should not be necessary to mention that I am not discussing the post-
Persian Wars chauvinism the Greeks developed, a perfect stranger had the status of a
potential divinity while remaining a potential danger to the community (Cerqueira Lima
2013, 392; Bruit 1989, 17). This helps explain the sumptuous receptions strangers received,
receptions which recalled both the banquets of the elite and the banquets of the gods, which,
in turn, were reflections of one another (ThesCRA, 2: 220).

Because of the institution of xenía, overseen by Zeus, multicultural banqueting in the
Homerian poems or Epic Cycle should cause no surprise. Achaeans and Trojans sharing
meals and hosting one another would have made sense to the Iliad’s audiences, since xenía
was an aspect of their communities and of their understanding of how the world worked.
While not all the multicultural banquets in the Iliad are designated with words related to
xénos, the institution of xenía provided the audience one frame of reference for this type of
event.
The primary frame of reference for multicultural banqueting in the *Iliad* is not *xenía*, but banqueting, as I mentioned above. The sociology and ideology of banqueting reviewed earlier in this chapter provide the critical tools to analyze multicultural banquets, and provide the primary context in which the *Iliad*’s audience would have viewed these events.

We have established that an important part of the background of the *Iliad*’s narrative is a multicultural banquet gone wrong when Menelaus hosted Paris in Sparta, a banquet designated as *euōchía* ‘feast, good cheer’ in the context of guest-friendship, *xenizein* (Proclus *Chrestomathia*, 95-7). There is a reference to this same event in Book 3 of the *Iliad*, when Menelaus prays to Zeus that the man who violated his hospitality be punished.

> Ζεῦ ἀνα δῶς τίσασθαι ὅ με πρότερος κάκ’ ἔοργε
> δῖον Ἀλέξανδρον, καὶ ἐμῇς ὑπὸ χερσὶ δάμασσον,
> ὅφρα τις ἔρρίγῃσι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἄνθρωπων
> ξεινοδόκον κακὰ ῥέξαι, ὅ κεν φιλότητα παράσχῃ.

Zeus above, grant that godlike Alexandros be punished,

who earlier did me harm, that he be brought down by my hand,

so that anyone, even of future generations, should shudder

to do harm to a host that offered friendship.

The reference to hospitality in this prayer is significant in that it comes at a moment of crisis in the narrative. The war has raged on for ten years and in their frustration both sides have agreed that the conflict should be settled by a duel between the two principals: Menelaus and Paris. During their duel, in a prayer to the god of justice and kings who oversees hospitality, Menelaus states his grievance against his enemy—he violated the strictures of hospitality. In the duel, the massive conflict between the Achaeans and Trojans is reduced to the conflict of two men, and this personal conflict is defined by the wounded party in terms of hospitality.
Menelaus’ complaint is not that Paris stole his wife, it is that Paris behaved badly at a banquet; he violated Menelaus’ hospitality and corrupted the institution of *xenía*, according to which Paris’ visit should have inaugurated peaceful relations between Sparta and Troy, and presupposed a reciprocal visit, when Menelaus would be hosted by Paris. Thus, in Menelaus’ prayer, we witness a distillation of the conflict to an essential offence that occurred at a multicultural banquet.

We can see in Menelaus’ grief an exploration of the anxiety of alterity. Meetings with foreigners can be profitable if all parties respect the strictures of hospitality, but if they do not there is no limit to the damage that can be done. Menelaus’ prayer reminds us how a private offence can expand into a kind of world war, and as this is a central issue in the *Iliad* we should see reflected in it Archaic Greek concerns about their relations with others. This is one of several examples of multicultural banqueting in the *Iliad*, and we must see such banqueting in its proper context, as the primary mode of contact between peoples of different cultures.

Multicultural banquets seem to have the same general social functions as banquets among Achaeans. There is an exchange of honour between host and guest and symbolic capital both in being hosted and in hosting. They are thus patron-role feasts complete with fictions of equality and disinterested exchange. They are a venue for communication. Certain rules of distribution and reciprocality govern the proceedings. There is a general provision that peace must exist between the parties beforehand for such an event to take place, and that peace must prevail during the proceedings. However, multicultural banquets are used as venues of conflict resolution even after hostilities have begun, and we must incorporate this fact into our understanding of the multicultural banquet. While it has as its
primary function the establishment and maintenance of peaceful relationships, this does not exclude its deployment between enemies in a military context, with the same end in mind, the establishment of peace or some other negotiated result. Also, like at the banquets of the gods, the veneer of peace and equality prevails only so long as the host is unperturbed, and if offended the peaceful relations the banquet inaugurated are replaced with threats and hostility, as in the case of Menelaus and the Achaean campaign against Troy. It is this kind of total war because of offence at the banquet that Hephaestus and Athena warn the other gods about (1.586-94; 15.132-7).

An example of multicultural banqueting between conflicting parties occurs in the same book, with Antenor’s reference to hosting Menelaus and Odysseus when they came to Troy before the war to negotiate the return of Helen.

> ἥδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ’ ἠλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
> σεῦ ἕνεκ’ ἀγγελίης σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ·
> τοὺς δὲ ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα,
> ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν ἐδάην καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.

For godlike Odysseus also came here once

> ἠδὴ γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ’ ἠλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
> σεῦ ἕνεκ’ ἀγγελίης σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ·
> τοὺς δὲ ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα,
> ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν ἐδάην καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.

with Menelaus beloved of Ares to make an announcement concerning you.

I hosted them and entertained them in my halls,

And I came to know the nature and considered thoughts of both.

From this event we learn that Paris’ elopement with Helen could be treated as a private matter between Menelaus and Paris, there being no general hostility between Menelaus’ people broadly conceived and the city and kingdom of Paris. However, the evidence from the *Cypria* suggests that this hospitality was offered only after a large force of Achaean arrive at Troy (Proclus *Chrestomathia*, 151-156), and the content of the communication at
the banquet was an ultimatum to return Helen and her possessions or face assault. This meeting is also attested on a Corinthian column krater dated to ca. 560 BCE, which depicts the initial reception of Menelaus and Odysseus by Antenor’s family at the altar of Athena in Troy [Fig. 47].

While the hospitality itself was peaceful, Menelaus and Odysseus came to address the private dispute as ambassadors of an army that was present in force. In the context of this private dispute, it was appropriate for Odysseus and Menelaus to visit Troy and be hosted by one of Paris’ kinsmen, even as an army of Achaeans waited on the shore. The purpose and social consequence of this visit was to negotiate a resolution to the dispute without the need for violence, but there was a threat of violence both with the presence of the Achaean army and in the ultimatum delivered at the banquet. Such threats disrupt the normative banquet, and indeed, banquets among gods and among humans obscure power differentials and sublimate violence. This multicultural banquet hosted by Antenor, then, was of a different nature from what we have seen thus far. Its primary purpose was a threat delivered in response to an offence. The issuance of the threat does not seem to have ended the banquet, but the banquet served as the context of communication throughout this perilous negotiation, which ultimately proved unsuccessful.

Antenor’s multicultural banquet between conflicting parties has a sociology different from the banquets we have considered thus far; it was a banquet held to negotiate surrender with all the attendant compulsion implied by such an event. Threats of violence at divine

---

20 The Astarita krater in the Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco I. Menelaus, Odysseus, and the herald Talthybius are greeted at the altar of Athena by the wife and sons of Antenor and their attendants. Very few documents attest this diplomatic meeting between Achaeans and Trojans before the war.
banquets transform the banquet into something else; they corrupt it and threaten to bring it to an end. Nevertheless, we must admit that divine banquets contain threats of violence similar to Antenor’s multicultural banquet, even as they state that such threats disrupt the banquet. Monocultural banquets among Achaeans and Trojans never contain such threats; threats of violence within a community are confined to the assembly, another institution that participates in fictions of equality and is partly intended to obscure power differentials. At Antenor’s banquet we encounter the first essential difference between a multicultural banquet and a monocultural one; threats of violence may occur at the banquet without essentially altering its nature. The proximity of the banquet to violence makes the multicultural banquet between conflicting parties more similar to the banquet of the gods than it is to monocultural banqueting among humans.

The next reference to a multicultural banquet in the *Iliad* is the most famous example of a *xenía*-relationship in Greek literature, the ancestral *xenía* of the Lykian Glaukos and Achaean Diomedes established when the Argive Oineus hosted the Lykian Bellerophon.

η ρά νύ μοι ξεῖνος πατρώϊός ἐσσι παλαιός·

Οἰνεὺς γὰρ ποτε δῖος ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην
ξείνισ’ ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐείκοσιν ἠματ’ ἐρύξας·
οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀλλήλοισι πόρον ξεινήϊα καλά·
Οἰνεὺς μὲν ζωστῆρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν,
Βελλεροφόντης δὲ χρύσεον δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον
καὶ μιν ἐγὼ κατέλειπον ἰὼν ἐν δώμασ’ ἐμοῖσι·

And so you are my *xénos* on my father’s side from long ago;
For once godlike Oineus hosted blameless Bellerophon,
They gave beautiful guest-gifts to one another; Oineus gave a war-belt shining with crimson and Bellerophon gave a golden two-handled goblet, which I left behind in my house when I came here.

In the long story of Bellerophon, we learn that he was also hosted by the king of Lykia, before joining his family (6.173-177), and this constitutes another multicultural banquet. In the recognition of Glaukos by Diomedes, we have an example of a successful, harmonious xenía-relationship that was inaugurated by weeks of entertainment at the host’s residence two generations prior. Banqueting would, of course, feature prominently in hospitality that lasted twenty days. The multicultural nature of the banquet referred to between Oineus and Bellerophon is debatable, since Bellerophon is originally from Ephyre in Argos, but the text is clear that Bellerophon and Glaukos are Lykians, whose family had been Argive before (6.210-11; 12.307-21).

The nature of these family relations is evidence for a mode of contact with non-Greeks that was prominent in the Archaic Greek imagination, i.e. intermarriage, which is quite popular in modern scholarly explanations of cultural exchange between Greece and the Near East (Hall 2009, 613; Finkelberg 2005, passim; Powell 2002, 46; West 1997, 624; Coldstream 1993, 100). Proitos, the most powerful man in Ephyre in Argos and Bellerophon’s antagonist, was married to the daughter of the king of Lykia, Anteia, who had a hand in Bellerophon’s banishment. Bellerophon was sent to Lykia with the famous folding tablet of σὲματα λυγρά ‘baneful signs’, and was hosted by the king of Lykia for nine days with the sacrifice of nine oxen (6.173-177), before the king sends him on missions that were meant to kill him. Bellerophon’s survival in conflicts against the Chimera, the Solymoi, and
the Amazons, convinced the king of Lykia to make Bellerophon part of the family by marrying one of his daughters to him. Through relations between families in Ephyre and Lykia, operations are performed on the identity of individuals. A Lykian woman becomes in some sense Greek by marrying an Argive and moving to Ephyre, and Bellerophon becomes Lykian by marrying her sister and ruling as co-regent with her father the king (6.192-3).

These two examples of xenía reveal important social aspects of these relationships. The first relates to the guest-gifts. There seem to be two options when considering the value and symbolism of gifts. The first is that the heroes recognize a certain limited set of goods as suitable for gifts, such as cups, kraters, wine, belts, breast-plates, and armour, and in each exchange the giver chooses something belonging to this group of items so that the gift will be acceptable to the recipient. The second is that the same group of acceptable items exists, but the gift carries a further significance of representing the terms and nature of the relationship between donor and recipient; it represents the status of the donor and recipient by being part of the group of valued items, but carries the further significance of recalling the specific relationship of the donor and recipient. Thus, gifts of wine, cups, and kraters, symbolize the commensal nature of the relationship, and gifts of belts, breast-plates, and armour signify a primarily military relationship. Therefore, Bellerophon’s gift of a cup recognized and honoured Oineus as a host of banquets, and Oineus’ gift of a war-belt to Bellerophon recognized and honoured him primarily as a warrior. The exchange of armour by Glaukos and Diomedes creates a war-bond in the context of xenía between them; they will not fight each other. This gift-exchange, then, represents the terms of their relationship as warriors on opposing sides who refuse hostilities, as it reifies the existing xenía. I think that in most cases, guest-gifts carry this kind of added social significance.
The second social aspect highlighted in the Argive-Lykian xenía is the duration of hospitality. In the context of travel by sea, foot, horse, donkey, or camel, once one reached one’s destination, stays of months or years would have been common. The purpose of the visit is all important here. Some hospitality would have been offered based on arrangements of residence or service between rulers of different territories, such as the Tyrian builders hired by King Solomon to build the temple in Jerusalem or the travels of Solon to the kings of Egypt, Cyprus, and Lydia after enacting his reforms in Athens. Bellerophon’s visit to the Lykian king was secretly intended to kill him, but was presented as a term of hospitality by the king and service by Bellerophon, codified by a letter of introduction, eventually resulting in his permanent residence and incorporation into the ruling family. Bellerophon’s visit to Oineus, on the other hand, does not bear the marks of a pre-arranged visit, but was simply one hero lavishly honouring another during a sojourn in the former’s territory.

The last human multicultural banquet in the Iliad is that between Achilles and Priam. Narratively, it explicitly represents the resolution of one of the main conflicts in the epic, that between Achilles and Hector. At the banquet, Achilles finally gives up his anger against him. It implicitly represents part of the resolution of the greater conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon. Since Patroclus died, Agamemnon’s power has been eclipsed by that of Achilles. Achilles is master of ceremonies at the funeral games of Patroclus, and Agamemnon defers to his judgement there. Agamemnon is also beneficiary of Achilles’ generosity in being acclaimed victor in the spear-fight, a reversal of roles established throughout the poem, with Agamemnon as putative giver of gifts to Achilles. Achilles would not accept Agamemnon’s gifts until 19.160-275, representing the reconciliation of the two men, after which Achilles is usually presented with greater honour and authority than
Agamemnon. This greater honour and authority is expressed in his banquet with Priam, since Achilles is supplicated by the enemy king in his request to ransom his son. If the climax of the poem is Book 22, with the battle of Hector and Achilles, Book 24 is the dénouement, where issues are resolved and scores settled. In the world of epic, it is hard to imagine an event more socially consequential than the banquet between Achilles and Priam, which the poet of the *Iliad* conceived as a fitting end to the poem.

The vocabulary of banqueting, which we have been considering thus far, becomes significant for defining the meal taken by Achilles and Priam. Words related to *xeînos* refer to monocultural hospitality, to multicultural hospitality between Achaean and Trojans (Paris by Menelaus, Menelaus by Antenor), and between Argives and Lykians (Bellerophon by Oineus, Bellerophon by the king of Lykia), and to hospitality between gods (Thetis by Hephaestus). Such words are not used in the meeting of Priam and Achilles. Neither is *daîs* used, the standard word for elite banquets among heroes and gods. It is the most unmarked, generic word for ‘meal’ that is used, *dórpon* (24.601), a word that can be further specified as an everyday meal, a *deîpnon*, or as a special distributive meal, a *daîs*, but no further specification appears at Achilles’ banquet with Priam.

The social dynamics of this banquet are complex. It is not a banquet set out for the purpose of negotiation. It is a surprise meeting arranged by the gods for the purpose of negotiation, which Achilles insists take the form of a banquet. Priam is not initially pleased with Achilles attempt to transform the proceedings into a banquet, and Achilles is so displeased with Priam’s reaction that he threatens violence.

ἄ δείλ’, ἢ δὴ πολλὰ κάκ’ ἄνσχεο σὸν κατὰ θυμόν.  

πῶς ἔτλης ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἐλθέμεν οἶος
ἀνδρὸς ἐς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὅς τοι πολέας τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς
υίςας ἐξενάριζα; σιδήρειόν νῦ τοι ἦτορ.

アルバム ἀγε δὴ κατ’ ἄρ’ ἐξευ ἐπὶ θρόνου, ἄλγεα δ’ ἐμπῆς
ἐν θυμῷ κατακείσθαι ἐάσομεν ἀχρύμενοι περ’
οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξες πέλεται κρυεροῦ γόοιον.

ὡς γὰρ ἔπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖς βροτοῖς
ζώειν ἀχρυμένοις· αὐτοὶ δὲ τ’ ἀκηδέες εἰσί.

οὐ γάρ τις πιθοὶ κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὖδ’
dόρον σὸν δίδωσι κακὸν, ἔτερος δὲ ἐὰν

ὁ μὲν κ’ ἀμμίζας δώῃ Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,

ἄλλοτε μὲν τὰ κακὰ ὅ ὅγε κῦρεται, ἄλλοτε δ’ ἐσθλῶ.

ὅ δέ κ’ ἐν τῶν λυγρῶν δώῃ, λιβητόν ἔθηκεν,
καὶ ἐκακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα διὰν ἐλαύνει,
φοιτᾷ δ’ οὔτε θεοὶ τετεμένοις οὔτε

ὡς μὲν καὶ Πηλῆὶ θεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δόρα

ἐκ γεννητῆς· πάντας γὰρ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώποις ἔκκαστο

ὁμοῖον τὰ πλούτω τε, ἄνασσε δὲ Μυρμιδόνεσσι,
καὶ οἱ δίκη ἐάντι θείαν ποίησαν ἁκοίμη.

ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ θῆκε θεὸς κακὸν, ὅτ’ οἱ οὔ τι

παῖδον ἐν μεγάροις γονῆς γενέσθαι

γηράσκοντα κομίζω, ἐπεὶ μάλα τὴν πάτρης

καὶ σὲ γέρων τὸ πρὶν μὲν ἄκοιμην ὀδύραν εἶναι·

τὸν σὲ γέρων πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἱώσις κεκάσθαι.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τοι πῆμα τὸδ’ ἤγαγον Οὐρανίωνες
αἰεί τοι περὶ ἄστυ μάχαι τ’ ἀνδροκτασίαι τε.

οὐ γάρ τι πρήξεις ἄκακος ὕλος ἢ ὕλος,
οὐδὲ μιν ἀνστῆσες. πρὸν καὶ κακον ἄλλο πάθησθα.

Τὸν δὲ ἡμείβετ’ ἔπειτα γέρων Πρίαμος θεοειδῆς;

μὴ πο μ’ ἐς θρόνον ἵζε διοτρεφές δορὰ κεν Ἐκτορ
κεῖται ἐνει ἐκκινήσιν ἀκρήδης, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα

λύσον ἵν’ ὑφαλμοίσιν ἰδὼ· σοὶ δὲ δέξαι ἀπονα
πολλά, τὰ τοι φέρομεν· σοὶ δὲ τῶνδ’ ἄπόναιο, καὶ ἐλθοις
σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαϊν, ἐπεὶ με πρῶτον ἐκασάς
αὐτὸν τε ἐς θρόνον καὶ ὅραν φάοις ἅμιοιο.

Τὸν δὲ ἀρ’ ὑπόδρα ἱδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὑκώς Χιλλεύς’

μηκέτι νῦν μ’ ἐρέθιζε γέρον· νοέω δὲ καὶ αὐτός

Ἐκτορά τοι λύσαι, Διόθεν δὲ μοι ἄγγελος ἧθε
μήτηρ, ἢ μ’ ἔτεκεν, θυγάτηρ ἅλιοι γέροντος.

καὶ δὲ σε γνησίου Πρίαμος φρεσίν, οὐδὲ με λήθεις,

οὐ γὰρ ἄρ’ ἐς στρατὸν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄρ’ ἐς στρατὸν· οὐδὲ κ’ ὀχῆα

τὸ νῦν μή μοι μᾶλλον ἐν ἕρεας καὶ ἱκέτην περ ἐόντα, Διὸς δ’ ἀλῖτομαι ἐφετμάς.

Ὣς ἔφατ’, ἔδεισεν δ’ ὁ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετ

"O miserable man, indeed you hold great pains in your heart;

How have you dared to come to the ships of the Achaeans, alone
before the eyes of a man who has killed many of your excellent sons? Indeed you have a heart like iron.

But come now, sit down upon a chair, and we will both alike let our pain sleep in the heart, though we are grieving.

For chilling lament is not of any use.

The gods have chosen for wretched mortals thus to live with grief, while they alone are without care.

You see, two jars sit in the palace of Zeus;

one that gives evil gifts, and another that gives good.

When Zeus who delights in thunder gives he’s gone into one jar or another;

Sometimes he lights on evil, and another time on good.

When he gives from the jar of pain, he makes a man miserable and evil hunger drives him over the holy earth.

He goes back and forth, honoured neither by gods nor men.

Thus did the gods give splendid gifts also to Peleus from birth; for he had exceeded all men in happiness and wealth, and was king of the Myrmidons and they made a goddess his wife, although he was mortal.

But even on him the god set evil, since no generation of kingly children was born to him in his halls, but he bore one son all out of season, nor do I now care for him as he grows old, since I am so far away from my homeland in Troy, harrying you and your children.

I hear that you, old man, were happy once,

As great a throne as Lesbos up from Makar holds inside And down to Phrygia and the boundless Hellespont,

they say that you, old man, excelled all these in wealth and sons.
But after that the heavenly gods brought this disaster on you—
endless battles and manslaughter around your city.

Hold them up, and do not lament the undeniable in your heart;
for there is not any use in mourning your good son,
nor can you rise him up before you suffer yet another evil.”

Then the old man Priam, built like a god, responded to him:
“Do not seat me in a chair, no,

since Hector, nurtured by Zeus,

lies uncared for in your shelters, but as soon as possible
release him so I may look on him with my eyes. And you, accept
this great ransom that I have brought you; may you enjoy these goods,
and may you go to your homeland once you have
allowed me to live safe and to see the light of the sun.”

Glowering Achilles, swift of foot, addressed him:
“Do not anger me now, old man; even I am minded
to release Hector to you, since a messenger came to me from Zeus,

my mother, who bore me, daughter of the old man of the sea.

And I understand you, Priam, in my wits, nor do you elude me,
how one of the gods led you to the fast ships of the Achaeans.

For no mortal man would dare to approach, nor could they pass
through the army; for he could not elude the sentries, nor

could he easily lift the bar of my doors.

Do not now rouse my heart in its pains thus further

lest I not allow you, old man, safe in my shelters,
even though you are a suppliant, and I thus violate the decrees of Zeus.”

Thus he spoke, and the old man was afraid and obeyed his word.

Here, lordly Achilles wishes to grant Priam’s request, but only in the context of the banquet
that will be offered after Priam takes a seat. This banquet, while participating in a fiction of
equality among the participants, really serves to increase the status of the host by having the enemy king as his guest and suppliant. Priam is not remotely interested in such a ritual, and only wishes to ransom his son. He has already supplicated to Achilles, and wishes that to be enough. However, commensality is the only acceptable mode of agreement for Achilles, and without it, Priam is merely an enemy to be killed, suppliant or not. Achilles presents Priam with a choice, banquet or death, and Priam chooses banquet. Once Priam and his herald have sat down (24.571-8) Achilles accepts the ransom and puts Hector in the wagon that had carried it (24.578-91). The seating of Priam and his herald seems to be an affirmation of the proposed agreement, similar to Hera accepting the cup from Hephaestus, and Hector rejecting the same from Hecuba. Accepting the offer of food, drink, or hospitality is an indication of one’s acceptance of the propositions made by the donor. Achilles says he will ransom Hector, but insists that the visitors stay and be entertained, and by sitting Priam accepts the proposal. Priam came to offer ransom, and once he accepts Achilles’ counter-offer of a seat, the deal is struck. Servants unload the ransom and lay the body in the wagon.

υἱὸς μὲν δὴ τοι λέλυται γέρον ὡς ἐκέλευες, 24.599
κεῖται δὲ ἐν λεχέεσσ'· ἅμα δὲ ἠοὶ φαινομένηφιν 24.600
ὁφεια αὐτὸς ἄγων· νῦν δὲ μησώμεθα δόρπου.

Now your son has been released to you, old man, as you requested,
and he lies on the bier. With the appearance of dawn
you will see him as you lead him away; now we must think of our meal.

In Achilles’ view, a Trojan is an enemy who can only be made into something different by a ritual of commensality which creates a kind of *ad hoc* socio-political community where negotiation, compromise, and agreement are possible and desirable. Without the creation of this new community, non-violent congress with enemy forces is not possible. Achilles’
newfound appreciation for food and drink is remarkable here, since he had been at pains to avoid them since the death of Patroclus, and suggests the arrival of a new, arguably political motivation. The banquet that ensues between him and Priam should be seen in terms of the other banquets hosted by Achilles, which are peculiar and distinct from those hosted by Agamemnon or the communal sacrificial meals.

And springing up Achilles, swift of foot, slaughtered a silvery sheep. His companions skinned it and busily set all the pieces in good order, and skillfully skewered the meat on spits, carefully roasted it, and drew all the meat off the spits. Picking up the bread, Automedon set it on the table in beautiful baskets; but Achilles served the meat. And they all put their hands to the good things laying before them. But after they had satisfied their desire for drinking and eating, Priam son of Dardanus marvelled at Achilles,
at his size and nature, for he seemed akin to the gods;  

but Achilles marvelled too at Priam son of Dardanus 
gazing at his good looks and listening to his speech.

The formulaic diction of this scene links it to previous instances of banqueting hosted by Agamemnon (24.623-4 = 7.317-8; 24.627-8 = 9.91-2) and Achilles (24.625-6 = 9.216-7 with Automedon replacing Patroclus; 24.627-8 = 9.221-2) (Richardson 1993, s.v. 24.621-32), all of which are referred to as daís (7.319-20, 9.90, 9.225). It combines these elements with others like the presence of tables and couches, which form part of the characteristic luxury that separates the banquets of Achilles from those of Agamemnon. Usually, elaborate banquets with special cuisine have explicit reference to a trápeza ‘table’ (9.216; 11.628, 636; 24.476, 625), and these are banquets hosted by Achilles in Book 9 and by Nestor in Book 11. Achilles’ banquet in Book 9 is called a daís, while Nestor’s goes without a designation. The dópron shared between Achilles and Priam is not elaborate, but nevertheless features a trápeza. Only the banquets of Achilles and Nestor and the halls of the gods feature the type of furniture known as a klismós ‘couch’ (9.200; 11.623; 24.597; 8.436 of seated goddesses). The food served at the banquets of Achilles and Nestor is more elaborate than usual; Achilles serves mutton, goat, pork, and bread along with wine (9.207-14), while Nestor serves onion, meat, honey, and barley meal alongside the special beverage kukeón, containing wine, goat’s cheese, and barley (11.630-40). Agamemnon is most likely to serve beef and wine (2.402, 7.314). However, the banquet between Achilles and Priam is certainly the simplest one to feature tables and couches, with Achilles serving mutton with bread and wine (24.623, 626, 641).
The correlations between the banquets of Nestor and Achilles characterises Achilles as a master of banquets the way Nestor is, as someone who fully appreciates the socio-political power of commensality the way Nestor does (9.70-76). As Nestor has a special cup (11.632-7), so does Achilles (16.225-32), which he purifies with sulphur. Achilles recognises that his ability to put on lavish banquets is inextricably linked to his high status, and he wishes to reify this status in the company of the enemy king, making of him a kind of subordinate.

The banquet affirms the empathetic relationship the two men establish, beginning with their mutual weeping (24.507-14). As the banquet is carried out, mutual admiration and respect characterises the proceedings, with the two men wondering at one another and enjoying each other’s company (Richardson 1993, s.v. 24.629-32). Since the banquet began, no disagreement arose between them, and they eat and talk in harmony. For both men, this is the first human food they have tasted since the loss of Patroclus and Hector (24.641-2).

After the meal, there is one more negotiation to carry out, and that is for a truce between the armies so the Trojans can hold a funeral for Hector, and the agreement is sealed by the grasping of right hands by the wrist (24.660-72).

The banquet between Achilles and Priam shares a feature with divine banquets in that the banquet is coextensive with peace. For Achilles, there must be a banquet between the two men or else they cannot establish the peace necessary for negotiation. For Hephaestus and Athena, peace must prevail for the banquet to continue since violence disrupts it. This multicultural banquet is thus different from the one hosted by Antenor when Menelaus and Odysseus came with an army to negotiate the return of Helen and deliver an ultimatum. That hospitality was established for the discussion of violent repercussions, but
the banquets of Achilles and of the gods should be free of such talk. The fact that threats by Zeus or Achilles do not in fact overturn banquets, but merely threaten to, demonstrates that banquets were venues for violent talk from a descriptive perspective, but the prescriptive ideology of the banquet demands the banishment of threats and violence. Every banquet hosted by Agamemnon and Nestor follows this prescription, and Achilles follows it as well, advising Priam not to anger him so that their meeting can be transformed into a peaceful banquet.

**Conclusion**

The multicultural banquet at the end of the *Iliad* looms large in the epic and serves all the functions of dénouement in plot structure. It resolves major conflicts, and, like many other banquets, organizes and ordains the action to follow, however little. The other multicultural banquets mentioned in this chapter are far less important, except for the one that stands outside the *Iliad* in the first stages of the Epic Cycle, when Paris was hosted by Menelaus. It is obvious that events of multicultural banqueting are prominent and consequential in the *Iliad*, and I wish to extend this relevance to the cultural history of Archaic Greece. The *Iliad* is fiction that imagines the exploits of the heroic ancestors of the great men of Archaic Greece, and its episodes and themes by the very nature of traditional literature must accord with the interests and concerns of this Archaic audience. I argue, based partly on the evidence from the *Iliad* presented here, that the Greek-speakers of the eighth and seventh centuries BCE configured elite feasting as an appropriate means of communicating and negotiating with non-Greeks. It was the primary context considered
appropriate for establishing and maintaining relations with outsiders. As Achilles implies in his meeting with Priam at the end of the epic, their relations shall be defined either by banqueting, in which case negotiation is possible, or by violence, in which case it is not possible.

In terms of the types of feast identified by Dietler, multicultural banquets in the *Iliad* follow the pattern of a patron-role feast, which “involves the formalized use of commensal hospitality to symbolically reiterate and legitimize institutionalized relations of asymmetrical social power” (Dietler 2001, 82). We might alter Dietler’s formulation to highlight the idea that multicultural banquets, as opposed to monocultural ones, do not reiterate and legitimize what is pre-existing, but serve to institute or inaugurate relations; thus Achilles’ banquet with Priam uses formalized commensal hospitality to inaugurate relations of asymmetrical social power. This only multicultural banquet described at length in the *Iliad* does not manifest the ideology of equality that monocultural banquets do, and it participates only partly in “the sincere fiction of disinterested exchange” (Bourdieu 1990, 112). Priam knows and openly states what he wishes to get from Achilles. Achilles in turn seems to desire the greater esteem that would come from hosting the king, and so for him, the banquet is “a symbolic practice that encourages collective misrecognition of the self-interested nature of the process” (Dietler 2001, 77). He does not say to Priam, ‘stay and eat so I may have greater honour’, but this is the result of the banquet, and it fits the pattern of increasing power and authority for Achilles after his reconciliation with Agamemnon. Priam would be happy with a quick exchange, but Achilles implies that if the exchange is to happen successfully, a banquet is required.
The notion of equality is not highlighted at the multicultural banquets I have examined so far and the term *daís* is never used. Only *dórpon*, *euōchía* and words related to *xeĩnos* describe these banquets. In the diction of the *Iliad*, *daís* cannot be used to describe a multicultural banquet among humans. It is used to describe the multicultural banquets of the Aithiopes attended by the gods (1.424, 23.207), but here, *daís* serves to signal the great difference between Achaeans and these strange people from the ends of the earth (*ThesCRA*, 2: 221); they banquet with the gods, something the Achaeans never do. The Aithiopes thus live in a kind of golden age when commensality with the gods has not yet been displaced due to human crimes as it has for the Achaeans (Bruit 1989, 15-17). The term *daís* connects the Achaean heroes to the gods by making an equation of their activities; both groups participate in their own *daĩtes*. However, they do not attend the same *daís*, as do the gods and the Aithiopes.

The lack of the phrase *dainós eḯśēs* ‘equal feast’ in any description of a human multicultural banquet, and the absence of the word *daís* with its redistributive overtones raises the question of whether this kind of feast really is conceived of differently from monocultural banquets between elites. In terms of Dietler’s three main categories, while the multicultural banquet is clearly different from the monocultural *daís*, it is still clearly a patron-role feast and not a diacritical one, since it does not employ “differentiated cuisine and styles of consumption as a diacritical symbolic device to naturalize and reify concepts of ranked differences in the status of social orders or classes” (Dietler 2001, 85). So, the multicultural banquet in the *Iliad* extends some of the formal aspects of the elite monocultural feast to the outsider, but not all, and it is not described in the same terms, although the social function of the feast is analogous—to negotiate, debate, and reconcile. In
extending formal commensality to outsiders, the host partly naturalizes them, making of them temporary or continuing members of the community. The diction of the *Iliad* puts limits on this inclusion, though, not explicitly allowing the outsider a share in the equal feast.

In summary, multicultural banqueting in the *Iliad* is employed towards similar social purposes as monocultural banquets between elite Achaeans, but multicultural banquets are distinguished from them by a simpler description of the proceedings, more basic cuisine and the absence of the term *daís*, even when distribution is highlighted (24.625-6). While monocultural banquets between elites never involve threats of violence, both multicultural banquets and divine banquets regularly do. Divine banquets and multicultural banquets are conceived of as meetings of conflicting parties, while banquets among the Achaeans are more harmonious, with differences in opinion never escalating to a state of conflict.
Chapter 4: Multicultural Banqueting in the Odyssey

Introduction

αὐτὰρ κεῖνος ἐελδόμενός που ἐδωδῆς
πλάζετ’ ἐπ’ ἀλλοθρόων ἀνδρῶν δῆμον τε πόλιν τε,
εἴ ποι έτι ζώει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἠελίοιο.

But that man longing, somewhere, for food,
wanders over the lands and cities of foreign-speaking men,
if indeed he still lives and looks on the light of the sun.

—Eumaeus of Odysseus at Od.14.42-4

Multicultural banqueting in the Odyssey is much more common and plays a different role than it does in the Iliad. Just how much more common it is can be expressed with the following statistic: multicultural encounters involving banqueting between Greeks and others occupy about 2800 lines out of a total of 12,110 in the Odyssey, and this is not including the long banquets involving Odysseus disguised as a foreigner on Ithaca (with Eumaeus, the suitors, and Penelope). The amount of narrated time that is situated at multicultural banquets in the Odyssey is just over 23% of the entire work. This is in contrast to about 250 lines of narrated time devoted to multicultural encounters involving banqueting in the Iliad, just over 1.5% of that epic.

21 All passages of the Odyssey are reprinted from P. von der Mühll’s Homeri Odyssea (1962).

22 Odysseus disguised as a Cretan refugee encountering the Ithacans does not meet the standards of cultural difference established in this study. However, in many ways this Odysseus is presented as especially foreign, with his knowledge or Phoenicians, Egyptians, and the multicultural nature of Crete. His fictional experiences of these “others” do meet the standard of cultural difference, and are analyzed as such.
The role played by multicultural banqueting in the *Odyssey* has recently been addressed by Egbert Bakker, who sees the Cyclops episode, the paradigm of a multicultural banquet gone awry in my reading, as the thematic centre of the *Odyssey* (2013). It motivates the action of the epic (through Polyphemus’ curse and Poseidon’s anger) and echoes and foreshadows other central events, such as the abusive banquets of the suitors on Ithaca and the problematic banquets with Circe and with the Laestrygonians (Bakker 2013). Bakker’s contribution orients the significance of the *Odyssey* towards the outside of the Achaean community, something that has been common since Hartog 2001 [1996], and reflects on how Odysseus’ encounters with outsiders inform his homecoming and his encounters on Ithaca. This is in contrast to Reece, who sees the adventures of Odysseus on Ithaca as “the central episode of the Odyssey” (1993, 116), and reads the echoes and foreshadowing Bakker sees, between banquets on Ithaca and banquets during Odysseus’ wanderings, as oral formulaic “influence” from one passage on another with no narrative significance, though he advises great caution in this kind of enterprise (1993, 115-18). We can see here that from a variety of scholarly perspectives the banquets in the *Odyssey*, both at home and abroad, have generated an extensive interpretive response, and are regarded as central to the plot of the epic.

As we see above, the importance of banqueting scenes in the *Odyssey* leads to another difference between studying the subject of multicultural banqueting in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey*; there is a fairly large bibliography on Odyssean banqueting in contrast to a more limited one for the *Iliad*. This chapter, therefore, takes a different shape, since it responds to several recent developments in the study of feasting and hospitality in the *Odyssey*. The touchstone here is Steve Reece’s 1993 work: *The stranger’s welcome: Oral
theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene. A major response to it was published by Anja Bettenworth in 2004 entitled *Gastmahlszenen in der antiken Epik von Homer bis Claudian: diachrone Untersuchungen zur Szenentypik*. Bettenworth made refinements on Reece’s definitions and delimitations of the Homeric hospitality scene, including the banqueting elements (2004, 112-13, 141). She also made strong statements that relate to the present study, writing that banquet scenes are at the very heart of Greco-Roman epic, that they are an important structural element of epic (2004, 9), and that the central point of the banquet is the progress of the epic story (2004, 14). The next major study focused on Odyssean banqueting is Bakker 2013, which examines the themes of feasting and meat-consumption as structural features in the epic that serve multiple narrative functions, in particular as the narrative context in which the tension between epic poet and Odysseus as *aoidós* plays out. Bakker’s study is based on the discourses of oral formulaic theory, folkloristics, and to a lesser extent anthropology, and he makes many observations that are relevant to the present study, but he does not see all this Odyssean banqueting he discusses as an Archaic Greek model of intercultural contact, and this is where I hope to make my significant intervention in the scholarship.

My work on the *Odyssey* attempts to contribute to the discourse on the relation of the epic to its society, and builds on the work of François Hartog, *Memories of Odysseus: Frontier tales of Ancient Greece* (2001 [1996]), in which Odysseus’ travels are interpreted as reflections of Archaic Greek delimitations of known geography and interests in
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23 One of Bakker’s theses is that meat consumption in the *Odyssey* responds to a prehistoric idea of a Master of Animals who returns and exacts vengeance (following Burkert 1979), connected to Shamanic beliefs observed by anthropologists (Bakker 2005), and I am not persuaded by this thesis.
exploration and colonisation, and on that of Irad Malkin, *The returns of Odysseus: Colonisation and ethnicity* (1998), in which the many stories of Odysseus’ adventures relate to the experiences of exploration and cultural contact experienced by various Mediterranean populations, not all of them Greek. Another important contribution in this particular area is Carol Dougherty’s *The raft of Odysseus: The ethnographic imagination of Homer’s Odyssey* (2001), which, again, relates the poem to the concerns of the society that produced it in terms of “oversea exploration and cross-cultural contact and settlement” (2001, 84). Erich Kistler made an important contribution with *Die “Opferrinne-Zeremonie.” Bankettideologie am Grab, Orientalisierung und Formierung einer Adelsgesellschaft in Athen* (1998), where he demonstrated that even in the pre-symphotic world of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the close relationship of Achaean elite banqueting with royal banqueting in LBA and IA Syria-Palestine is unmistakeable, making a strong argument that those shaping the Homeric tradition lived in a society that was eagerly adapting foreign styles of luxury. All four of these cultural historical works build on Moses Finley’s *The world of Odysseus*. These eight studies form the intellectual background of this chapter, and I hope to demonstrate that feasting is the primary way that the *Odyssey* conceives of intercultural contact, building especially on the work of Hartog, Malkin, and Kistler. Bakker puts various events of meat consumption at the structural and narrative heart of the epic, in unstated agreement with Bettenworth, and I wish to turn the focus onto Greek society and say that the imaginary world of the epic related to real world ideas of how to relate to non-Greek populations, and how such meetings offer opportunities and dangers, all of which are articulated at Odyssean
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24 Bakker cites neither Bettenworth 2004 nor Reece 1993 in his study.
banquets. Along the way, several new interpretations of the text and points about Homeric society will be made.

The anthropological or ethnographic perspective adopted here analyzes the instances of multicultural banqueting along the same lines as they were addressed in the preceding chapter, but with differences determined by the nature of the *Odyssey*. Does multicultural banqueting in the *Odyssey* differ from banqueting among the Greeks themselves, among the gods, or from Iliadic banqueting? Is there special poetic diction that distinguishes different types of banqueting? In terms of these questions, what relation does the multicultural banqueting in the *Odyssey* bear to that in the *Iliad*? How do these banquets function in the narrative?

I have emphasised the different role multicultural banqueting plays in the *Odyssey*, and some of these differences prompt a rearticulation of the concept of culture operative in this study. I have stated that the definition of a culture adopted here is essentially linguistic, but has extended (in the previous chapter) to a conception of the gods, who are of a different essential nature, and of the Aithiopes, who live at the ends of the earth, as belonging to cultures different from the Achaeans. These cultural distinctions between the Achaeans and patently “other” populations, applied to the gods and Aithiopes in the *Iliad*, are the prominent cultural distinctions of the *Odyssey*. Besides the other cultures distinguished by language, those individuals and groups I have identified as being culturally different live at great distances from the Achaeans; only someone hopelessly lost and off course might find them; they have relations with gods unlike that of Achaeans; and they have different senses of law, propriety, and community (Hartog 2001, 6-7; Dougherty 2001, 10). The people Odysseus finds on the other side of the banquet table in the *Odyssey* are divine women with
magical powers, Calypso and Circe, who live as hermits (Hartog 2001, 25); the lethargic, vegetarian Lotus-eaters; the Phaeacians, similar to the Achaean but living in a kind of Golden Age, again with certain magical powers; and Polyphemus, who corrupts the very notions of law, hospitality and the feast. The cultural distinctions between Odysseus and these “others” are expressed in a number of passages. A crucial one is Od. 7.199-206, in which the Phaeacian King Alcinous describes his people’s close relationship with the gods, explicitly connecting the Phaeacians to the Cyclopes and Giants.

εἰ δέ τις ἀθανάτων γε κατ’ οὐρανοῦ εἰλήλουθεν, 7.199
ἄλλο τι δὴ τόδ’ ἐπειτα θεοὶ περιμηχανόονται. 7.200
αἰεὶ γὰρ τὸ πάρος γε θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς
ἡμῖν, εὖθ’ ἐρδωμεν ἀγακλειτάς ἐκατόμβας,
δαίνυνται τε παρ’ ἤμμι καθήμενοι ἔνθα περ ἡμεῖς.
εἰ δ’ ἄρα τις καὶ μοῦνος ξύμβληται ὁδίτης,
οὔ τι κατακρύπτουσιν, ἐπεί σφισιν ἐγγύθεν εἰμέν,
ὥς περ Κύκλωπές τε καὶ ἄγρια φῦλα Γιγάντων.

But if indeed he is one of the immortals come down from heaven, 7.199
then this is really something different the gods are scheming. 7.200
For always in the past the gods have appeared openly

to us, whenever we sacrifice glorious hecatombs,
and they dine with us, seated right there by us.
If one meets us coming alone as a traveller,
they do not hide themselves at all, since we are close to them,
just as the Cyclopes and the wild race of Giants.

This close relationship between humans and gods, mediated at sacrificial banquets, is a feature of the Golden Age in Archaic Greek literature and a characteristic of those prominent
“others” in the *Iliad*, the Aithiopes. By one of the same tokens as the Aithiopes are different from the Achaeans in the *Iliad*, so are the Phaeacians different from Odysseus and his men (Heubeck, West, Hainsworth 1998, s.v. 7.201; Dougherty 2001, 89). Also, Odysseus and his crew differ from the Cyclopes, the paradigm of inhuman culture, who is somehow close to the Phaeacians. Little interpretation is required to understand that Alcinous’ statement indicates to the audience of the *Odyssey* that his Phaeacians are as different from Odysseus as are the Cyclops—different in some of the same terms. Looking at all the “others” I identified above, it is no stretch of logic to say that these people, who at some point all become Odysseus’ dinner companions, have different cultures than Odysseus; they all have significantly different ways of life, and are regarded by the characters of the text as strange, sometimes inhuman, foreigners. Therefore, there is no need in this chapter to review the *Odyssey*’s expressions of linguistic and cultural difference, which are many (e.g. *allothrōōn* in Eumaeus speech, p.1), as there was for Chapter 3 on the *Iliad*. For the *Odyssey* there is no minority of scholars who claim the “others” that Odysseus encounters as Greeks, and so the banquets that take place between Odysseus and these characters are plainly multicultural (Hobden 2013, 66).

This chapter proceeds from an assessment of Odysseus’ perspective on foreigners to an analysis of the motivations for cultural contact in the *Odyssey*. Then I will consider how Odyssean multicultural banqueting replicates and differs from such banquets in the *Iliad*. The Odyssean multicultural banquet is examined as an index of cultural similarity and difference, and as a structural-functional element in the narrative. New interpretations of the text and points about Homeric society are offered, and conclusions are drawn regarding how the *Odyssey* represents cultural contact and what multicultural banquets accomplish.
Odysseus’ Eye on the “Other”

Odysseus, for all his wiles and intelligence, is forever imperiled by his curiosity. When he sees a new land, he instantly wishes to discover the nature of its inhabitants, and their way of life. This is Odysseus as proto-anthropologist (Hartog 2001, 21-6). He is curious about their culture, which he expresses in certain terms (6.120-1; 9.175-6; 13.201-2):

6.120

Ἠ ῥ’ οἵ γ’ ύβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι,

Ἠς φιλόξεινοι καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής;

Is it that they are violent and wild, not just,

or do they honour strangers and have godly intelligence?

These are the alternatives Odysseus presents on a few occasions when he alone or he and his crew have arrived in a seemingly foreign land. He states it when he arrives alone in the land of the Phaeacians (Reece 1993, 102-6), when describing the actions of himself and his crew in the land of the Cyclopes, and, interestingly, when he has arrived home in Ithaca, which he does not recognize because Athena has made everything appear different, alloeidéa (13.194). The human world, or maybe better, the Mediterranean world is divided between those who honour the essential social rule of hospitality and are endowed with intelligence from the gods and those who are offensively violent, like animals, and do not know justice (Hartog 2001, 25; Dougherty 2001, 95-101). This dichotomy in part also distinguishes between self and other, same and foreign, as expressed throughout the Odyssey, which will be dealt with below. But, the relationship of savage to civilized is not absolutely coextensive with the relationship of foreign to same, because the terms of savagery are also applied to the suitors on Ithaca, who are not presented as foreign (24.282). Indeed, in the context of the
suitors of Penelope, it is Odysseus who is the foreigner, the Cretan with great knowledge of Egypt and the Phoenicians, a xénon of Odysseus.

The linking of Ithaca with the “other” worlds Odysseus encountered previously is done in two ways that are important for my broader argument.25 Firstly, when Odysseus arrives on Ithaca he utters the formula used previously to introduce the Phaeacians and the Cyclopes (13.201-2); through the intercession of Athena, Ithaca is as foreign to him at first as he is to Penelope and the suitors. Secondly, the adjective hubristai is used in the Odyssey only in the formula for encountering a new people, described in the previous paragraph, and in a speech by Laertes to the disguised Odysseus (Cretan xénon of Odysseus), where he calls the suitors hubristai. The use of the word in the Odyssey, therefore, is applied only when one does not know what kind of creatures will be encountered in a new land, and when people who should be governed by the positive qualities of civilization are behaving in an unacceptably abusive fashion. The Odyssey presents the home Odysseus is to return to as foreign in the first place, but as Odysseus learns more, he begins to recognize it, and then, it begins to recognize him through the eyes of Euryclea, Telemachus, Eumaeus, and Penelope. In Odysseus’ understanding of the types of creatures inhabiting the wider Mediterranean world, savagery and lack of civilization are not only the province of the foreign; home has become savage as well.

The concern about what sort of beings inhabit an unknown land has been interpreted by Malkin (1999) and Dougherty (2001) as a reflection of Archaic Greek concerns with
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25 For a full account of the oral formulaic and thematic echoes of the Cyclopes episode when Odysseus is disguised on Ithaca, see Bakker 2013, 53-73.
exploration, settlement, and trade. For Hartog (2001), it is a part of the Archaic Greek imagination that reflects an interest in foreigners as a way to define Greekness. The Achaeans, in Odysseus’ imagination, fall on the side of the intelligent beings who are kind to strangers, but the “others” can take a variety of forms, each of which provides an opportunity for contrast with what is acceptable, familiar, and same. Related to these earlier studies, I see Odysseus’ curiosity as an impulse to anthropology prominent in the text. Odysseus actively seeks knowledge of foreigners; he does not accidentally wind up in their company.

My understanding of Odysseus as a character eager to discover strangers is in contrast to the view of Hartog, who is ambivalent about Odysseus’ anthropological motive. Early in his book, Hartog states that Odysseus very rarely expresses “a desire to see or to learn” (Hartog 2001, 16), present only in the cases of the Cyclops (9.229) and the Sirens (12.192). Hartog nevertheless acknowledges that “whenever he is about to land on new shores, Odysseus wonders whether he will encounter people who are ‘violent savages without justice, or hospitable beings who fear the gods’” in Hartog’s (and Lloyd’s) rendering of 6.121-2. Why should this be, if not for an inherent desire on the part of the protagonist to ‘see the cities of many men and learn their thoughts’ (1.3)? Would a Homeric character who wished he might encounter no strangers on his journey home be unbelievable, or is this simply a special characteristic of Odysseus? From another point of view, would an Odysseus who did not seek strangers be simply non-Odyssean, or would such a character be, in fact, non-Greek from the perspective of an Archaic audience? The issue here is, were Odysseus’ many visitations in foreign lands accidental and unlooked-for or in some sense
purposeful, in order to satisfy the curiosity of the protagonist? And, was this curiosity special to him, or part of the culture to which he belonged?

**Motives of Intercultural Contact**

To begin answering this question I provide a complete list of the passages where foreigners (non-Achaeans) are encountered in the *Odyssey*, even if the encounters do not involve banqueting (most do).\(^{26}\) So as not to artificially reduce the passages under study, I will include references to meetings between foreigners and other Achaeans besides Odysseus. The important character here is Menelaus, who experiences his own odyssey of return. I will argue that Odysseus actively seeks out strangers in the hopes that they might help him, and he considers the banquet as the appropriate way to interact with the strangers, whence he might derive the benefits he seeks. Menelaus, by contrast, is more of a reluctant participant in cultural contact, who rarely seeks it out. This analysis of Odysseus’ impulse to anthropology reveals a problem in the *Odyssey*: Odysseus’ behaviour towards strangers is not understood by his companions, nor is it explained by the man himself. Odysseus is drawn to strangers, compelled to seek them out, and the poem does not always present us with a reason why this should be so. As observed by Erich Auerbach in *Mimesis* (1953, 5-13), the Homeric poems do not leave important details out. Everything necessary to
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\(^{26}\) Encounters with the Olympian gods are not included since no human motivation is detectable in any of these encounters. They are motivated by divine concern for their favorite Achaeans, not by the Achaeans seeking them out.
understand the actions of the characters is presented by the poet. In the case of Odysseus approaching strangers, this epic tendency breaks down. Odysseus’ impulse to anthropology is seen as a bane to his companions, and Odysseus does not explain his decisions to risk his life and that of his companions in this way. It is therefore important to consider the motivations to contact as well as the modalities of that contact when it occurs.

Table 1 presents the references to other cultures in the narrated time of the *Odyssey* in order. In this section we are looking at the purpose of a character’s decision to engage with “others;” details of the encounters will be largely preserved for another section. Here the question is: why did an Achaean approach one or more foreign people?

The adventures of Menelaus appear first in the narrated time of the *Odyssey*, and provide a useful foil to those of Odysseus. Menelaus spent eight years wandering the Mediterranean after the war, greatly enriching himself. The impetus for his wanderings was not in the first place profit, but lack of attention to the gods. His *nostos* being opposed by an angry Zeus (4.472-80), Menelaus visited much of the known world, particularly in the eastern and southern Mediterranean. These adventures, contained in a speech to Telemachus in Sparta, are not told in great detail (4.81-91). Where detail is given, we learn that his adventures were very profitable (4.90-1) and that the gods prevented his homecoming
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27 Auerbach 1953, 6: “[...] the basic impulse of the Homeric style: to represent phenomena in a fully
e externalized form, visible and palpable in all their parts, and completely fixed in their spatial and temporal
relations. Nor do psychological processes receive any other treatment: here too nothing must remain hidden or
unexpressed. With the utmost fullness, with an orderliness which even passion does not disturb, Homer’s
personages vent their inmost hearts in speech; what they do not say to others, they speak in their own minds,
so that the reader is informed of it.”
(4.351-3). It is unclear how much of this travelling Menelaus did willingly, and he certainly
does not have a penchant for pursuing contact with strangers.

An aspect of Menelaus’ adventures important for the interpretation of the journeys of
Odysseus and of cultural contact in Homer generally, is that his travel itinerary echoes that
of Paris, on his way from Sparta to Troy, and prefigures that of Cretan Odysseus. Menelaus
visits the Phoenicians, Cypriots, Libyans, Eremboi, and Egyptians, with his most extensive
visits being with the Phoenicians and the Egyptians; only with these people is cultural
contact narrated. After Paris made off with Helen, he stopped at Sidon where he acquired
female craftspeople, expert weavers, before arriving in Troy (Il. 6.289-92). Paris appeared in
Troy after his voyage to Sparta with several foreign women, Greek and Phoenician, as may
well befit the most handsome man in the world. Menelaus, victorious, on his way from Troy
to Sparta with Helen in tow, stopped in Sidon as Paris did, where he was hosted in by its
king, Phaidimos.\textsuperscript{28} The details of this hosting are unusual since the normal terms for
entertainment are not used, but Menelaus highlights his status as a reluctant wayfarer, in
need of protection (4.615-9).

\begin{verbatim}
dòσω τοι κρητήρα τετυγμένον· ἀργύρεος δὲ
ἔστιν ἅπας, χρυσῷ δὲ ἐπὶ χείλεα κεκράανται,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{28} Greek names for foreigners are always curious, especially when it comes to Phoenicians. We must take the
Greek names seriously as possible renderings of real names, for the simple reason that Phoinikes is a
transparent calque of KNʿN, the West Semitic word for Syro-Palestinians, also derived from the word for
‘purple,’ the dye of the murex shell. In the case of Phaidimos (‘shining, famous’), one would want to search
known names of Sidonian kings to see if any were light-bearing. An obvious comparandum is Isaiah 14:12
and the reference to Lucifer ‘Light-bringer’ (Hebr. hēylēl).
I will give to you a well-worked krater, silver in its entirety, but finished about the rim in gold; it is the work of Hephaestus. The hero Phaidimos gave it me, the King of the Sidonians, when his own house took me in its fold as I was making my return. I wish to send it along with you.

Menelaus was clearly hosted by Phaidimos, and given a guest-gift, but the normal terms for the relationship—derivatives of xénos—are not used. As we saw in the previous chapter, such a meal would have been designated in the Iliad either with dórpon, as the banquet of Achilles and Priam, or with xenē, as the banquet between Menelaus and Paris. Instead, Menelaus is literally brought into the fold of Phaidimos’ household, amphekálupse (4.618). This diction connects the action of being hosted to being wrapped in clothing, being enfolded in love or death, or being received into a city the way the Trojan Horse is received (LSJ s.v.). It is a word that connotes intimacy and acceptance. The reception of Menelaus presented this way accords with his earlier descriptions of his adventures; he was waylaid, blown off course, and in need of help. He may have greatly enriched himself, but it was not his intention to spend long in foreign lands.

Menelaus as reluctant traveller is evident in his story of Egypt, whence he wished a speedy journey home, but was held back by the gods on an offshore island (4.351-2, 376-8). There he met a semi-divine being, Eidothea, who told him that if he wanted to get home he must seek her father Proteus the Egyptian (4.384-6), catch hold of him and ask him which of the gods prevents his homecoming. These moments of contact between Achaean Menelaus
and Egyptian Eidothea and Proteus are motivated by Menelaus’ desire to return home, and his need of help to determine which of the gods is displeased. Proteus eventually tells Menelaus that he must return to Egypt proper, to the Nile to be exact, and sacrifice to all the gods (4.475-80). Only this secured his homecoming, which came quickly after the sacrifice on the Nile.

We have seen how Menelaus’ journey follows Paris’ in some details, and it also foreshadows the stories of the Cretan Odysseus in disguise on Ithaca. In a speech to Eumaeus, Odysseus outlines his itinerary from Troy, home to Crete, then to Egypt, Phoenicia, Libya, then back to Achaean territory in Thesprotia, and finally to Ithaca. Eight years are mentioned as the duration of his time in Egypt and Phoenicia (14.287), quite like Menelaus (4.82). This Odysseus was a restless man, and struck out for Egypt with companions on an expedition, presumably for profit (14.246-7). They battled the Egyptians after raiding the countryside, and Odysseus surrendered, supplicating the king, and remained in the care of this king for seven years (14.278-86). In the eighth year, Odysseus went to Phoenicia from Egypt for the purpose of trade, and he remained in the Phoenician man’s house for one year, before going on another trading expedition, which brought him from Phoenicia, past Crete, towards Libya when the Phoenicians attempted to sell him into slavery (14.293-304). Menelaus’ journey, also focused on the South and East Mediterranean, presents complimentary experiences, where Phoenicia is presented most favourably, but Egypt was hostile; for Odysseus, Egypt was friendly and Phoenicia hostile. Crucially, Menelaus was always trying to get home, even if he takes pride in all the guest-gifts he received, but this Cretan Odysseus could not stay at home because of his restless spirit, thumòs anógei (14.245-6). He continually sought out the opportunities presented by foreign
lands, whether Egypt, Phoenicia, or Libya, however many dangers may attend such opportunities. As we will see, this Cretan Odysseus does not differ much from the genuine article.

Later in the narrative, a somewhat different Cretan Odysseus tells his story to Penelope, explaining that he is a xénos of Odysseus (19.172-202). After this speech, the narrator intervenes before Penelope responds (19.203):

![Greek text]

This ability is a well-known Archaic Greek skill attributed to the Muses, who bestow their gifts on poets and kings, according to Hesiod. This travelling Cretan Odysseus is remarkably believable to his interlocutors, except when he speaks of the genuine Odysseus. Worthy of note is the narrator’s intervention to this effect; indeed, this lying Odysseus knows how to tell lies that are very like the truth.

The truth of Odysseus’ adventures and his engagement with “others” begins with Calypso in the narrated time of the Odyssey. The winds of a storm sent by Athena drove Odysseus to the island of Calypso (5.111), where he was held by force, anánkēi (4.557; 5.14). He is a reluctant wayfarer with Calypso, compelled to be her companion. It is once he leaves Calypso’s island that we see Odysseus eager to discover strangers. Poseidon and Athena drive Odysseus towards the Phaeacians (6.377-87) according to a plan of Zeus (5.29-42). When Odysseus awakes on their shore to the sounds of young women he wonders about the nature of the inhabitants, according to the formula discussed on page 6, then screws up his courage and seeks them out, saying:

![Greek text]

29 Theogony 27: ἰδεῖν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμωσιν ὁμοία
Odysseus wakes up naked on a foreign shore and expresses concern about whether the inhabitants are just or abusive. He decides to see for himself, urging himself on in the imperative, áge. He covers his genitals with some foliage and arranges his hair in order to present himself to the girls, and the narrator tells us more about his motivation for approaching them (6.135-6):

ὡς Ὀδυσσέας κούρῃσιν ἐϋπλοκάμοισιν ἔμελλε, γυμνός περ ἐών· χρειὼ γὰρ ἵκανε.

Thus Odysseus was about to mingle with the lovely-haired girls although he was naked, for the need had arrived.

Odysseus approaches the girls because of a need for food, as a lion approaches a flock of sheep according to the simile (6.130-34), which highlights the prerogative of the stomach (6.133). We have a clear expression of a motive for contact: hunger and the fulfilment of physical needs. We should not ignore the sexual overtones of this passage. Odysseus is not, like the lion, going to eat the young women, but will rather seek hospitality from them. Comparing Odysseus and the girls with a lion and sheep suggests an attack of some sort, and meizesthai connects Odysseus’ approach with sexual intercourse, as this is the unmarked verb for sex in Homer. The double entendre gets more support since Odysseus’ need, chreiō, is not specified as hunger. He wants to mingle with the lovely-haired girls because the need is upon him. It is the reference to his nudity which brings this encounter out of the erotic realm; the participle eōn with per suggests more a concessive than a causal meaning, but the latter is possible. The phrase is generally understood as ‘even though he was naked,’ and not
as ‘especially since he was naked,’ but one cannot combine young women, nudity, and the verb *meíxesthai* in Homeric Greek without connoting sex.

At the beginning of the Phaeacian episode, Odysseus’ contact with these “others” is motivated by his physical needs and his general impoverished condition; he is in need of all the trappings of humanity, including clothes, food, and shelter. This resourceful man is apprehensive about foreigners, but this does not cause him to try to satisfy his needs himself; he rather takes a chance on the anthropomorphic beings he perceives around him, though they may end up being abusive monsters. Notoriously clever and charming, he imagines that he will be able to win over the people he encounters, so long as they are not savages, and gain the help he requires. His salvation is to come in the form of rich hospitality from people close to the gods, according to the plans of Zeus and Athena (5.29-42, 6.377-87).

Once he has been counselled by Nausicaa, Odysseus gains acceptance by the Phaeacian royalty. When next we hear about his motivation toward contact with “others,” he is telling the story of his adventures at a banquet with Alcinous and Arete, the Phaeacian king and queen. The first people he encounters after leaving Troy are the Cicones, but nothing about these people establishes them as culturally different from the Achaeans. Odysseus’ motivation for encountering the Cicones is the profit to be gained from a raid. Next, Odysseus and his companions encounter the Lotus-eaters, who do have a different way of life from the Achaeans. Odysseus has been blown off course so that he could not navigate Cape Maleia, the strait between Kythera and the Peloponnese (9.80-1), which is the normal way to reach Ithaca. He is driven to the land of the Lotus-eaters, where his crew takes rest and nourishment (*deîpnon*, 9.86). Odysseus then decided, rather than setting sail for home, to investigate the inhabitants of the land:
Odysseus sent three men to investigate what sort of men lived in the land who were eaters of bread. This action, occurring when Odysseus’ crew have functional ships, repaired at a previous stop (9.76-8), is not explained by the text. The only explanation offered is that Odysseus chose to do this. This is not a man who rarely expresses “a desire to see or to learn,” as Hartog states (2001, 16). He is so curious that his striking out to make contact with foreign people is not seen by the Homeric narrator as requiring further information to explain the decision. Auerbach has influentially argued that the Homeric presentation of reality provides all the orienting information an audience requires (1953, 6). Is this true of Odysseus’ motivation to discover new peoples? If so, what is it in the text that makes these explorations natural? One answer is that striking out to find out what kind of people live in a territory is simply what Odysseus does, a consistent aspect of his character. It does not need explaining because it is essential to the protagonist’s identity, as presented in 1.3; the audience expects it of him. We shall see that while this trait is constant, the crew’s reaction
to Odysseus’ curiosity worsens over time, after several experiences of dangerous contact with “others.”

The next experience of intercultural contact in the text is motivated again by Odysseus’ curiosity. Having escaped the Lotus-eaters, whose food makes one forget all previous plans and goals, Odysseus tells of his experience with the Cyclopes. Here, as in the case of the Lotus-eaters, the crew is not hard pressed and in need of help. The ships are functional and the island they land on provides ample game for hunting (9.152-65); the men should therefore be nourished and ready to move on. Odysseus, however, calls a council and announces that he will investigate the inhabitants of the mainland (9.172-6):

‘ἄλλοι μὲν νῦν μίμνετ’, ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι· 9.172
αὐτάρ ἐγὼ σὺν νηΐ τ’ ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖσ’ ἑτάροισιν
ἔλθων τόνδ’ ἀνδρῶν παρήσομαι, οἳ πινές εἰσιν,
η ἕμ’ οἶ γ’ ύβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι,
ἠ φιλόξεινοι, καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής.’

You others now remain, who are my trusty companions. 9.172
But I, going with my ship and companions,
will test what kind of men these are,
whether they are violent and wild, not just, 9.175
or whether they honour strangers and have godly intelligence.

With no further explanation, Odysseus proceeds with his selected companions to the land of the Cyclopes. Following his pattern, he wonders which human beings, tīnes andrōn, inhabit the land. This question is his motive of contact.

His motive is further defined later in the episode, when he says that he hopes to receive a gift from the Cyclops (9.228). Once Odysseus and his chosen companions have
made their way to the Cyclops’ cave, the tension between Odysseus’ dangerous curiosity and his companions’ desire for a quick raid and escape is apparent. Odysseus has already acknowledged that he thinks he is about to encounter a dangerous creature (9.213-5), but his impulse for discovery and gain drives him on (9.224-30):

\[\text{ἔνθ’ ἐμὲ μὲν πρώτισθ’ ἐταροὶ λίσσοντ’ ἐπέέσσι} \quad 9.224\]
\[\text{τυρῶν αἰνυμένους ἵναι πάλιν, ἀοτάρ ἔπειτα} \quad 9.225\]
\[\text{καρπαλίμως ἐπὶ νῆα θοήν ἐρίφους τε καὶ ἄρνας} \quad 9.226\]
\[\text{σηκῶν ἐξελάσαντας ἐπιπλεῖν ἁλμυρὸν ὕδωρ·} \quad 9.227\]
\[\text{ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην, — ἢ τ’ ἄν πολύ κέρδιον ἦεν, —} \quad 9.228\]
\[\text{ὅφρ’ αὐτό νεὲ ἴδοιμι, καὶ εἴ μοι ξείνια δοίη.} \quad 9.230\]
\[\text{oὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἐμελλ’ φανεὶν ἐρατεινὸς ἔσεσθαι.} \quad 9.230\]

There from the start my companions beseeched me with words,

to go back once we had taken the cheeses, but come thereafter swiftly in a fast ship and, having driven the lambs and kids from their pens, sail away on the salt sea.

But I did not obey—more profit by far if I had—in order that I could see him, and that he might give me a gift.

But, when he appeared, he was not to be pleasant in the eyes of my companions.

Despite the natural misgivings of his companions, and their desire to continue on their way, it is Odysseus’ desire for gain and hospitality that drives him to engage with “others.” Even when he suspects he will be met with savagery (9.215), he is compelled by his arrogant spirit, _thumós agénōr_ (9.213)

In the crew’s next experience of cultural contact, a different explicit motive is provided. Odysseys and his men visit the family of Aiolus, who live in a kind of incestuous golden age with Aiolus’ six sons and six daughters married to one another, enjoying a
perpetual feast with their parents (10.7-9). The Achaeans remain with them for a month and Odysseus makes a specific request for directions to their homeland (10.17-8):

άλλα ὅτε δὴ καὶ ἔγον ὁδὸν ἔτεον ἤδ’ ἐκέλευον 10.17
πεµπέµεν, οὐδὲ τι κεῖνος ἀνῆνατο, τεῦχε δὲ ποµπήν.

But when I asked about the route and urged him to convey us, he did not deny us, but provided an escort.

In all previous episodes that Odysseus narrates about his wanderings before arriving among the Phaeacians, this need is not expressed at all, certainly not as the reason Odysseus wishes to seek out strangers. Was this need ever-present in all their previous landfalls and simply never mentioned before? More likely it indicates a change in Odysseus’ understanding of his situation. He has landed in very strange places several times now, and this time realizes that he needs help finding the way home. This progression in Odysseus’ thinking is more believable than the notion that directions home are what Odysseus was seeking from new peoples all along, but not expressing this need. The need developed over narrative time, especially since the traumatic Cyclops episode.

The next experience of cultural contact is with the Laestrygonians, man-eating giant pastoralists. Here Odysseus repeats the formula for investigating new peoples which he spoke in the land of the Lotus-eaters (10.100-2 = 9.88-90), and paraphrased with reference to the Cyclopes (9.174). With no stated motivation, he selects three of his companions to discover which humans, tínes anêres, inhabit the land. The result is disaster, with all men and ships lost except for one that preserved Odysseus and a small crew.

The penultimate contact with “others” that occurs in Odysseus’ description of his adventures is the episode when his men land on the island Aeaea and encounter the goddess
Circe, who proves pivotal in Odysseus’ *nostos*. The motivation for this contact is Odysseus’ constant curiosity, which, however, has become tempered by events (10.148-55):

> ἔστην δὲ σκοπὴν ἐς παπαλόεσθαν ἀνελθὼν,  
> καὶ μοι ἐείσατο καπνὸς ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης  
> Κύρκης ἐν μεγάροις διὰ δρυμὰ πυκνά καὶ ὕλην.  
> μερμήριξα δ’ ἐπεὶτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν  
> ἐλθεῖν ἦδὲ πυθέσθαι, ἐπεὶ ἴδοι αἴθοπα καπνῶν.  
> διὸς δὲ μοι φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι,  
> πρῶτ’ ἐλθόντ’ ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης  
> δεῖπνον ἐταίροισιν δόμεναι προέμεν τε πυθέσθαι.  

I stood at the look-out, having climbed a rugged slope, and the smoke at the house of Circe appeared to me from the land of wide paths through the dense thicket and wood.

I was anxious in my mind and heart whether to go and investigate since I had seen the shining smoke. But this seemed more profitable to my mind, first to go back to the swift ship and sea coast, to give a meal to my companions, and then to go investigate.

The trauma of previous episodes seems to have altered Odysseus’ eagerness to approach strangers. True to himself, he cannot resist the temptation, but now he experiences anxiety, *mermērixa*, throughout his mind and spirit, *katà phréna kai katà thumōn*. This is a significant change from the eager Odysseus who needed no reason to approach an unknown settlement, besides his own nature.

Changed too are the feelings of his crew towards his drive to meet new peoples; they have been put at mortal risk several times by his curiosity, and now openly weep when he
recommends seeking out the local inhabitants. In the following passage we see his companions’ reactions, and also a specific statement of a reason to approach unknown peoples (10.189-205):

[Hear my words, companions, though you keenly suffer evils:]  

O friends, for we cannot see what way is night and what way dawn, nor where the sun shining on mortals goes under the earth, nor where it rises; but let us consider quickly if there is some skill [we can try]; I think there is not.

For, having climbed up to a rugged look-out, I saw
an island, which the boundless sea surrounds.

It lies low, but in the middle of it I saw clearly with my eyes
smoke through the dense thicket and wood.’

Thus I spoke, and the heart is each man was broken,

Remembering the deeds of Antiphates the Laestrygonian

And the violence of the terrible, man-eating Cyclops.

They cried shrill and poured down heavy tears
but no profit came to them in their weeping.

Then, I counted all my well-greaved companions
in two groups, and sent a leader with each;

I led one group, and godlike Eurylochos led the other.

They are utterly lost and cannot navigate. Like in the land of the Laestrygonians (10.86) but
to a greater degree, geography and its relation to the heavenly bodies have become entirely
incomprehensible from the vantage point of Aeaea (10.90-5). Their only hope is to follow
the smoke rising up from the centre of the island, a sure sign of human-like activity. This
suggestion causes despair among Odysseus’ companions, who remember the mortal danger
of their recent experiences (10.198-201). Odysseus feels this anxiety as well, but presses on
to seek contact for the purpose of learning how to sail home.

Lastly, Odysseus tells the story of the Sirens. This is the final episode to be examined
closely here revealing why characters pursue cultural contact in the Odyssey, the others
being minor incidents that can be understood from Table 1. Warned about the Sirens by
Circe, but told that he may listen (12.159-62), Odysseus makes the necessary preparations to
safely meet them. He does this to hear their beautiful song and gain knowledge of all that
became of the Achaeans and Trojans, and everything else besides (12.188-93).
Hartog identifies this passage, Odysseus eager to hear the Sirens, and the passage when he wants to see the Cyclops even though he suspects danger (9.229) as the rare occurrences when Odysseus expresses a desire to see and learn about the world around him (2001, 15-6). Through the passages assembled above it is clear that Odysseus does indeed desire to know about other peoples and places, relentlessly. While he may be “a traveller against his will” (Hartog 2001, 15), once on the sea, he does not unwillingly come into contact with unknown peoples. He actively seeks out this contact, for profit, aid, knowledge, conveyance and directions. Often, none of these are needed, he simply strikes out because his spirit impels him to. It is part of his identity, and one of the essential reasons that such an epic can be organized around Odysseus. Without this drive to discover unknown peoples and places, how much poorer a story would the *Odyssey* be? The *Odyssey* is the story of the man who learned the minds and cities of a great many human beings, and without this essential drive to explore, how could this have been so?

**Multicultural banqueting in the *Odyssey***

There may have been several reasons compelling Odysseus and his companions to make contact with foreigners in the *Odyssey*, but the mode of this contact is largely uniform. There is an expectation expressed throughout the epic for hospitality, presented most fully in the form of feasting, from which numerous benefits might be derived, including all those mentioned above as motivating cultural contact: profit, aid, knowledge, conveyance. All these could be gotten through the institutions of hospitality, which is mostly narrated through events of feasting. Even when Odysseus struck out in search of nothing but
satisfaction of his curiosity, hospitality was what he expected. In this section we examine the events of multicultural banqueting in the *Odyssey* with close attention to diction and sociology, and with reference to Table 1.

Hartog, Malkin, and Dougherty have worked on perceptions and representations of “other” cultures in the *Odyssey*, but none has put a special emphasis on banqueting. Bakker (2005; 2013) has thoroughly investigated Odyssean feasting, without placing a special emphasis on its relationship to cultural contact or cultural difference. It is here that I think my perspective unites previous scholarship on the *Odyssey* and opens up new territory in the cultural history of Archaic Greece. In the imaginary world of the *Odyssey*, contact with the many unusual beings that inhabit its landscape is mediated by banqueting, whether these beings are humane or monstrous. It can then be extrapolated that in the Archaic Greek imagination represented by the poet and audiences of the *Odyssey*, banqueting is the primary mode of contact with “others.” Moreover, differences in cuisine and hospitality in the *Odyssey* are the primary indices of cultural difference, as Odysseus states in his formulaic question about the nature of unknown peoples (6.120-1; 9.175-6; 13.201-2). If Achaeans are to recognize previously unknown peoples as same or “other,” their styles of feasting and recognition of the rules of hospitality are the primary bases on which they do so (Bakker 2013, 54). If we combine these observations with Ian Morris’ arguments (1997, 558; 2000, 157, following Nagy 1990, 48, n. 40.) that the society represented in the Homeric poems has its primary relevance to the Greeks of the eighth and seventh centuries, then we can say that in the Archaic Greek imagining of their past and heroes, banqueting is the primary mode of contact with other cultures and a subject of significant interest and anxiety for Homeric audiences. Following Bakker (2013, 53), who puts the Cyclops episode at the thematic and
structural centre of the epic, we can see that concerns about multicultural banquets and failed hospitality are central to Archaic Greeks’ thinking about how their world came to be.

From Table 1 we see that there are sixteen separate events in the *Odyssey* that can be described as multicultural banquets.\(^{30}\) It will be useful to divide the events according to what sort of creature the Achaeans find across the dinner table, whether human, monster, or god. To aid in this, I add to a diagram created by Dougherty (2001, 99; my additions in blue), which structurally represents geographical distance and cultural difference among the creatures encountered in the *Odyssey*. For the purposes of this study, distinctions in banqueting practice and diction are mapped onto the diagram (Table 2), including the experience of Menelaus with the Phoenician King Phaidimos.

One of the important observations made in the previous chapter about banqueting in the *Iliad* is that multicultural banquets are never designated with the term *daís* or its cognates. This characteristic does not hold for the *Odyssey*. The longest narrated banquet in this epic is a multicultural banquet, designated as a *daís* (8.429). The banquet proper begins at 8.469 and does not end until 13.16, during which Odysseus tells the tale of his wanderings, containing eight instances of multicultural banqueting. In its narrated length, it

---

\(^{30}\) Menelaus hosted by a Phoenician (4.615-9); Odysseus hosted by Calypso (5.192-227); Odysseus hosted by the Phaeacians (4 banquets: 7.133-232; 8.55-108; 8.469-586; 13.24-69); Odysseus’ companions hosted by the Lotus-eaters (9.82-104); Odysseus and companions with the Cyclops (9.105-479); Odysseus and companions hosted by Aioulus (10.1-18); Odysseus and companions with the Laestrygonians (10.100-132); Odysseus and companions hosted by Circe (4 banquets: companions, 10.189-243; Odysseus alone, 10.325-405; Odysseus and companions 10.455-486; 12.16-30); Cretan Odysseus hosted by an Egyptian (14.276-86); Cretan Odysseus hosted by a Phoenician (14-287-94).
is similar to the *kukeṓn* banquet between Nestor and Machaon (*Il.*11.617-14.8), but also dwarfs that example, being twice as long.

Through Table 2, we are able to see correlations between banqueting terminology and the nature of the culture banqueting, being either similar to or different from the Achaeans on the axes of distance and difference. An elite banquet between Achaeans in the *Odyssey* is referred to as a *daís* (4.3, 4.621, etc.). The only other cultures that have the *daís* are the Laestrygonians, the Aiolians, and the Phaeacians. Of these three, only the Phaeacians share their *daís* with an Achaean. The Laestrygonians live in a city like normal human beings, but they are giants, and although they have a *daís*, it is cannibalistic, and they do not share it with Achaeans, but make of Achaeans their food. The Aiolians have a *daís* among themselves, but this does not extend to their hosting of Achaeans, which is designated as *phílei*, a corollary of *xenízein* (Herman 1987). According to Herman, a *phílos* is a friend from one’s own community, while a *xános* is a friend from abroad. By treating Odysseus as a *phílos*, he seems to make of Odysseus a member of the community in some sense, but the *daís* does not extend to him.

The Aiolians exist in the divine realm, as Aiolus has been entrusted with the winds by Zeus (10.21-2). The Cyclopes and Phaeacians are stated to be close to the gods (7.199-206, 6.377-87, 5.29-42). By their close relationship with the gods these beings are defined as different from the Achaeans, and they are marked on the distant portion of Table 2. Calypso and Circe are divinities (5.180; 10.135-9) who seem to live at great distance from the Achaeans, but they are not so different in their respect for strangers as are the Cyclopes, and are placed intermediate between the savage Cyclopes and the friendly Phaeacians.
There are no banquets among the Olympian gods in the *Odyssey*. The closest the epic comes to the grand divine banquets of the *Iliad* is the meal of ambrosia and nectar between Hermes and Calypso (5.92-4). In this realm of divine or divinely-connected beings, marked as “there” on the diagram, the *daís* exists only among the Aioli and the Phaeacians, but only the Phaeacians incorporate Odysseus into their *daís*. The Aiolians make him and his companions welcome as local friends (*phílei*) but do not incorporate them into the community the way the Phaeacians do; indeed, the Phaeacians eventually wish Odysseus to become one of them, marrying Nausicaa.

In this “other” realm inhabited by the divine and semi-divine, the meals taken and cuisine offered are generally described with *ad hoc* expressions that are not formulaic for meal taking in the *Odyssey*. A characteristic of these multicultural banquets, which are sometimes banquets between humans and gods (Calypso and Circe), is generalizing terminology that does not specify the kind of meal, which can be seen in Figures 1 and 2. Calypso serves Odysseus ‘every kind of food to eat and drink, such as mortal men eat’ (5.196-7). Circe mixes a *kukeôn*, and later serves ‘food and drink’ (10.235, 379). Polyphemus enjoys a cannibalistic *dórpon* (9.291), ‘eating human meat and drinking milk’ (9.297). It is not possible therefore to systematize the types of banquets according to diction, as it is possible in the *Iliad*. What remains of the Iliadic system is that the *daís* continues to indicate a kind of civilization familiar to Achaeans, with populated cities, kings, queens, and agriculture (Laestrygonians, Aiolians and Phaeacians), even if the *daís* is deadly to the Achaeans. Those who do not have the *daís* stand at a greater remove culturally, and these are the Cyclops, Calypso, and Circe, appearing either at the “there” or the “other” coordinates on the diagram. One of the connections between these three beings and between their shared
lack of the daís is their lack of community. If a being lives alone, among whom might she divide a feast? In terms of multicultural banquets, the common diction used in the Iliad is also not prominent in the Odyssey; only with the Egyptians and with the Cyclops (ironically) is a multicultural banquet referred to with words related to xénos.

Outside the divine realm, Odyssean Achaeans banquet with a variety of mortal beings. In these multicultural banquets as well, there is no formulaic diction coordinated to particular kinds of meals. They feast with the Lotus-eaters, who ‘give them lotus to eat’ (9.93). These people are very different from the Achaeans in lifestyle, but not quite as monstrous as the Laestrygonians, and these relations are represented in Table 2. It appears that the Achaeans might feast with these giants, but soon they become the food (10.124), as they would with the Cyclops.

Closer to the Achaean world, and encountered often on returns to it, are the Phoenicians and Egyptians. Menelaus was hosted by the king of Sidon, and this hosting must have included banqueting, although the text merely states that Menelaus was ‘accepted into’ the household of Phaidimos, and that he was given a gift of a silver krater (4.615-9). The standard terms of banqueting with “others,” words related to xénos, appear only obliquely when Cretan Odysseus was accepted into the household of the Egyptian king; here the text states that the king ‘feared the wrath of Zeus Xenios’ (14.283-4) and the result was that Cretan Odysseus was hosted in Egypt for seven years.

Xenía makes an ironic appearance in the company of the creature who least follows its rules. When Odysseus ill-advisedly approaches the Cyclops, he hopes to receive hospitality, xeínia (9.229), and a guest gift, xeinēion (267-8). From 9.268-71, Odysseus attempts to explain to Polyphemus the rules of hospitality, but the result is death for some of
his companions. After discovering the nature of the beast, Odysseus is taunted by Polyphemus in terms of xenía; the Cyclops says that the xeínēion Odysseus shall receive will be to be eaten the last of his companions (9.369-70). The most ample discussions of xenía in the Odyssey occur where there is none, here with the Cyclops, and also with the suitors on Ithaca. The Cyclops episode is echoed by the experience of disguised Odysseus among the suitors, who likewise deny him the customary respect of hospitality and assault him (Bakker 2013, 55).

In a text which contains clear statements of the rules of hospitality and kindness to strangers, it is remarkable that in the many examples of successful multicultural banqueting—with Calypso, Circe, Aiolians, and Phoenicians—the terms are not used. There is an extensive exploration of the rights of strangers in Odysseus’ meeting with the Phaeacians, which, while addressing xenía, is remarkable for being a series of multicultural banquets designated with daís. The Phaeacians do not know strangers (6.205, 7.32-3) but both Nausicaa (6.206-10) and the old wise man Echeneus (7.162-6) know how strangers are to be treated to food, comforts, and hospitality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλὰ δότ', ἀμφίπολοι, ξείνῳ βρῶσίν τε πόσιν τε,</td>
<td>6.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λούσατε τ' ἐν ποταμῷ, δὴ ἐπί σκέπας ἑστ' ἄνέμοιο.</td>
<td>6.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ ξέινον μὲν ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου</td>
<td>7.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔσσον [sc. εἶσον] ἀναστήσας, σὺ δὲ κηρύκεσσι κέλευσον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁδὸν ἐπικρῆσαι, ἱνα καὶ Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπείσομεν, δὸς θ' ἱκέτησιν ἅμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ·</td>
<td>7.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόρταν δὲ ξείνῳ ταμή δότω ἐνδον ἐόντων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, my attendants, give food and drink to the stranger [xeînos].
And bathe him in the river, where there is protection from the wind

***

Now come and raise up the stranger
and set him on a silver-studded chair, but you bid the heralds
to mix wine, so that we can pour a libation to Zeus delighting in thunder,
who follows suppliants, and they are deserving of reverence.

Let a housekeeper give a meal to the stranger from what lies inside.

Not so long after being welcomed with traditional hospitality, the king is so impressed with Odysseus that he wishes him to join the family by marrying Nausicaa (7.313-5). Like so many other multicultural encounters described above, the Phaeacian experience remains ambivalent (Reece 1993, 107-16), with the Phaeacians being both extremely generous in their hospitality (Reece 1993, 102-4), and also unkind to strangers and sometimes insulting at the banquet (Reece 1993, 104-7). A great interpretive apparatus is not required when we understand that in this most extended experience of cultural contact in the Odyssey the main contours of the Archaic Greek concerns about contacting foreigners and feasting with them are expressed, as they are expressed in the Odyssey’s presentation of Phoenicians, Egyptians, and the goddesses Calypso and Circe. The perspective of the Odyssey and of Odysseus is intensely interested in discovering new peoples in the proper way, through hospitality, and anxious about the dangers that such events present.

**Conclusion**

In the world of the Odyssey, a banquet might be a boon or a bane, whether it is conducted with “others,” Achaeans, or one’s own family. The hypothetically dangerous
foreigners of Odysseus’ formulaic question (6.120-1; 9.175-6; 13.201-2) share the designation *hubristai* with the abusive suitors (24.282), forever divvying their *daís* out of Odysseus’ and Telemachus’ possessions. In Odysseus’ trip to the underworld, Agamemnon tells the tale of his murder at a meal at the hands of his wife and cousin (11.409-11). The Achaeans present also very positive, heartwarming, and beneficial images of banquets, such as those of Telemachus with Menelaus or Nestor.

The ambivalence of banqueting with close relations and old family friends is found also in the Odyssey’s imagining of banquets with the “other.” The Phaeacians provide rich hospitality to Odysseus, as much as he could ever desire in terms of food, drink, entertainment, and wealth. These “others” present dangers as well; outside the sphere of the royal family, many Phaeacians do not like foreigners, and are openly rude to Odysseus (Reece 1993, 104-16). Circe, who eventually provides great help and rich feasting, begins as a malignant force, threatening the lives of Odysseus and his companions. Calypso’s rich hospitality has its own danger not unlike that of the Lotus-eaters; if the goddess had her way, Odysseus would forget his wife and *nostos*.

Closer to home, an Achaean is as likely to encounter the Egyptians or Phoenicians with hostility as with hospitality according to the *Odyssey*. That both were possible is central to the Achaean worldview. It might occur to one to launch a raid on an Egyptian city. If the raid goes badly, maybe the same man will supplicate the king and offer his service (14.244-86). A Phoenician might deceive an Achaean, pretending to be his ally, and then sell him into slavery, or a Phoenician king may want to maintain guest-friendship with an Achaean king. Foreigners offered opportunities and dangers, and this is the perspective of the *Odyssey*.
That this was also a perspective common in Archaic Greek society is suggested by the *Odyssey* and supported by the evidence for Greek knowledge of West Semitic feasting culture. Erich Kistler has examined the literary evidence at length, and argues for specific Greek adaptations of West Semitic feasting culture in the *Odyssey* (1998, 128, 130-1). He singles out the development of metasympotic poetry, songs about drinking and feasting, as a Near Eastern genre that finds its first Greek expression in the *Odyssey* with the threat of Antinous (21.293-310) and the speech of Odysseus at 9.3-11 (1998, 133-5), which developed a religious nature, being performed at public sacrificial meals in Greek cities (López-Ruiz 2010, 183; following Obbink 1997, 50).

That feasting with other cultures was not only prominent in Archaic Greek poetic imaginings of the past, but was also crucial for their society in the present, is also confirmed by the modes of diplomacy in Greek cities. The work of Gernet (1982), Bruit (1989), and Cerqueira Lima (2013) all demonstrate that the standard mode of forming, solidifying, and maintaining relations with other Greek and non-Greek cities was through the reception of a visitor with a sacrificial feast at the communal hearth of the community. Multicultural banqueting was codified in Greek law under the terms of *proxeny*. The Greek communal banquet, in the Archaic and Classical periods, served a variety of functions, and one of them was to incorporate visitors and foreigners into the community, defined by participation in communal sacrifice and feasting.

Communal feasting at the arrival of a foreigner, the Greek adaptation of West Semitic poetic genres related to feasting, and the iconographical and archaeological evidence presented in the first two chapters of this study all show that the *Odyssey*’s imaginary world of monsters and heroes reflected real concerns of Archaic Greeks in terms of how they
should relate to non-Greeks they encountered, and reflected real experiences of this contact, particularly with the West Semitic world. The multicultural banquet and other attendant strictures of hospitality were seen, from the perspective of Archaic literature, as the safest and preferable way that a Greek might establish a profitable relationship with a foreigner, and it is clear that historical Greeks had the same perspective.
Conclusion

Happy is he who has both loving children and swift horses,
both hunting dogs and a friend in a foreign land.

—Solon, frag. 23 West

This conclusion proceeds from a presentation of the broad arc of the dissertation’s arguments and conclusions to a review of the smaller, but still valuable points made in the individual chapters. I then present examples of how the multicultural banquet can be used as an interpretive model to account for evidence of cultural exchange between Greece and the West Semitic world, and how the ideas argued in this dissertation intervene in the larger narratives about the development of Archaic Greek culture and society.

General Conclusions

The reading of the Homeric poems offered in Chapters 3 and 4 provides evidence that, in the thought-world of some Greek-speakers in the eighth to the sixth centuries BCE, contact between Greeks and non-Greeks was ideally mediated by banquets. Whether encounters were peaceful or violent, it is against a standard of peaceful contact at a banquet that the encounters are judged, as Odysseus judges the Cyclops as savage and malevolent in terms of his refusal to offer the expected hospitality. This evidence correlates with the suggestions of archaeologists, such as Erich Kistler (1998; 2009), Ian Morris (2000), and
Albert Nijboer (2013), that elite Greeks sometimes took opportunities to banquet with non-Greeks. The Homeric evidence I present demonstrates that the archaeological evidence for multicultural banqueting has its complement in the internal lives of Archaic Greeks. They imagined interacting with non-Greeks at multicultural banquets, with attendant benefits and dangers.

The archaeological and iconographical evidence for the development of banqueting styles in the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age, in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia, is used in a new way in Chapters 1 and 2. It is not configured as evidence for the transference and development of banqueting styles, but is rather configured as evidence that various elite groups had opportunities to banquet with one another, primarily in the context of diplomatic contact (the Amarna period, the Cypriot kingdoms) and political domination (Mycenaean-Minoan relations, Assyrian-Levantine relations). Similarities in banqueting styles are presented not as yet another cultural artefact adapted from one culture by another (Matthäus 1999-2000); they are evidence for the mode of contact that makes such adaptations possible, thereby making an important contribution to an area of ancient history that has long been undertheorized (Bentley 2011).

Using an indication from the Amarna period (1391-1334 BCE) that the contacts maintained between the Great Kings through letters and invitations to festive banquets were not primarily for the purpose of trade but rather were for the purpose of maintaining contact and peaceful relations (Liverani 2000, 19, 21), I shift the focus of discussions of the motivation for contact in the Iron Age and Archaic period from real capital to symbolic capital. Using a theory developed by Mary Helms (1988, 262-4) in relation to traditional societies around the world and employed by Louise Steel (2004) in relation to Bronze Age
Cyprus, and coordinating it with recent conclusions drawn by Alain Duplouy (2006, 164-78), I argue that the primary motivation for cultural contact in the Iron Age and Archaic period was the drive to become more elite. Members of elite groups sought out contact with other elites and adapted foreign ways of life and knowledge in an effort to further differentiate themselves in their home communities. Another motivation for the same activity must have been to be recognized as elite by foreigners, as implied in Duplouy’s argument that one of the symbolic functions of foreign goods was to articulate the owner’s foreign contacts (2006, 177). Foreign goods articulated that the owner was esteemed, in some fashion, by foreigners, since it was through social relationships that goods were exchanged (Duplouy 2006, 171-2), but I argue that it not the goods that were sought in the first place, but the knowledge, practices, and lifestyles of foreign elites. Contacts were made because of an interest in having contacts with foreigners and because of the idea that this could bring benefits, but it was not primarily for material profits that these contacts were established, even if this naturally becomes part of the equation after the establishment of relations. As an event at which members of different populations can establish and reaffirm contacts, the multicultural banquet achieves an important position in the history of diplomacy.

This context of contact, the multicultural banquet, is firmly established by the evidence presented in this dissertation, for the Amarna period in the Late Bronze Age, for the last century of the Iron Age (850-750) in my chronological definition of that period (1100-750), and for Archaic Greece (750-490). As a consistent feature of interstate relations, it can be employed by future scholars seeking to account for cultural continuities or contexts of cultural contact and exchange in all the periods in which multicultural banquets are
attested. A banquet, as a culturally rich event that features invocations to the gods, ritual formulae, songs, music, decorated banqueting services and furniture both in Greece and the Near East, is the fullest account of a context of cultural contact for the Iron Age and Archaic Greece, significantly more detailed than those often mentioned in scholarship, such as trade at emporia, warfare and mercenary service, or multicultural communities. All of these contexts have their explanatory power, but none is more specifically linked to the evidence of cultural exchange between Greece and the Near East—certain aspects of divinities, ritual or poetic formulae, artistic motifs, and the alphabet—than the multicultural banquet. It is of great use in accounting for cultural exchange in these areas, and a demonstration of this will be made below.

Specific Arguments in Chapters 1-4

In Chapter 1, we have seen that banqueting imagery has been entwined with royal power since the beginning of civilization in Mesopotamia and Egypt. The power of kings is often expressed through their association with food and drink, and their control and distribution of it. This must be related to the redistributive nature of the economies of these earliest states; through the authority of the kings, priests, and their retainers, agricultural surpluses were collected as a form of tax and redistributed to workers and officials. The imagery of kings in possession of food and drink, and offering it in banquets to those close to them, reflects the redistributive reality of these early states. The primary symbolism of these depictions, however, is the great power of the king to ensure the welfare of the state and its people. These ideas are cogently argued by Ziffer (2005). In Mesopotamia and Egypt
in the third millennium BCE, the king was like a god who personally bestowed livelihood on his people. In this role, he was, or was representative of, a god who ensures agricultural success and the subsequent survival and livelihood of the people. The banqueting imagery primarily relates to the king as provider and protector, not as redistributive administrator, but as divine power.

The continuity of banqueting motifs, from the third millennium BCE to the end of the Late Bronze Age, from Ur to Hattusa, is presented here for the first time as the result of multicultural banqueting. Ziffer states that banqueting “became a high point of court life and an efficient tool in power politics” (2005, 133). As such, representatives of different states would have had opportunities to experience the banqueting practices and symbolism of the dominant power, and as power shifts, and one state yields sway to another, the neophyte kingdom would adapt and rearticulate the pre-existing symbolism of royal banqueting, with necessary remodelling of meanings and styles to fit the times. This dynamic, suggested by the long continuity of banqueting iconography from Mesopotamia to Asia Minor, is confirmed by the diplomatic practices in the Amarna letters, where each Great King expects envoys from his Brother Kings to be sent on the occasion of their festivals and ceremonies, all of which involve feasting. The provision of food and drink to foreign visitors, and long periods of hospitality, was essential to ancient Mesopotamian and Anatolian diplomacy. Indeed, in Hittite diplomacy of the thirteenth century BCE, probably that of Hattusili III (1286-1265 BCE), the provision of beer and bread was the very definition of a specific interstate relationship, that of safe passage (Tawagalawa letter, Beckman et al. 2011, AhT 4 §8).
The Bronze Age iconography of the banquet demonstrates continuity from Sumerian to Hittite, Minoan and Mycenaean representations, all of which prefer pairs of banqueters sitting across from one another. In the Levant and Egypt, the banquet is usually limited to the offering ceremony, where a human or god banquets alone. Representations of pairs of banqueters are rare. While Mesopotamia, Anatolia, Crete and Mycenaean Greece have banqueting representations distinct from the offering ceremony, the presentation of offerings to a seated figure who holds a cup, drinks, or sits before a table of food, is a type of representation that is common to the Hittites, Akkadians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Levantines, Mycenaeans and Cretans, and therefore the offering ceremony to a seated banqueting human or deity follows a similar pattern in all of the regions studied.

The preference for depicting pairs of banqueters in Minoan Crete and Mycenaean Greece beginning in the Late Bronze Age was likely influenced by Hittite banqueting customs and representations. The Ahhiyawa texts attest diplomatic relations between the Hittites and Mycenaeans from the fifteenth to thirteenth centuries, and in such a situation, Hittite and Minoan diplomatic relations of the sixteenth century are very likely, especially given the Minoan, then Mycenaean, nature of Millawanda (Miletus). Shortly after the Mycenaean domination of Crete (1450 BCE), Mycenaean pictorial kraters become very popular at the North Syrian city of Ugarit and on Cyprus, and this popularity suggests Ugaritic and Cypriot awareness of Mycenaean banqueting. In the fourteenth century BCE, Mycenaean Greece (Ahhiyawa), a Cypriot kingdom (Alashia), and Ugarit were all enmeshed in in the system of diplomatic relations attested by the Amarna letters and Ahhiyawa texts.

Diplomatic relations between Hattusa and Ahhiyawa attested in Hittite texts are good evidence of multicultural banqueting because of the nature of Near Eastern diplomacy at the
time. Besides this, the material culture of banqueting is excellent evidence that multicultural banquets occurred between the Mycenaeans and Minoans. Knowledge of each other’s banqueting customs was complete enough for the Mycenaeans to dramatically alter their banqueting service on Minoan models, and then, once the Mycenaeans came to dominate, the Cretan banqueting services changed in emulation of the Mycenaean. Wright comes to the conclusion that feasting was an important context of intercultural contact among Minoan, Mycenaean, and Cycladic societies (2004, 172).

In a study of multicultural banqueting in the development of Archaic Greece, which means the emergence of literate Greece from the decline earlier in the Iron Age, it is important to investigate evidence for the phenomenon in the period before the decline, which began with the end of the Late Bronze Age. We have found that the phenomenon examined in the Iron Age and Archaic period in Chapters 2–4 has a Late Bronze Age precedent among Greek-speakers, and that multicultural banqueting during that period was both part of diplomacy (the Ahhiyawa texts) and part of the dynamic of relations between cultures who would come to have hostile relations of dominance and subordination (the Mycenaeans and Crete). As something that articulates power relations (Dietler 2001), feasting can be deployed both in peaceful and hostile contexts.

Chapter 2 dealt with the phenomenon of reclined banqueting from the perspective that a distinctive and elaborate form of consumption that achieved elite status could not be incorporated into any culture without some member of that culture having a direct experience of it. Levantine artistic motifs are not enough to alter the behaviour of Assyrian kings and Greek, Etruscan, and Sikel aristocrats. These artistic motifs must have had manifestations in the habitus of elite Syrians and Phoenicians, as demonstrated by the text of
Amos, and other elite groups must have had opportunities to witness these behaviours. I demonstrate that reclined banqueting is found in several other places in the Hebrew Bible, attributed to those unfaithful to Yahweh, both to Israelites and Judahites who do not honour the covenant, and those who belong to other cultural groups, not included in the covenant of Yahweh. Like so much of the behaviour decried as abhorrent in the Hebrew Bible, reclined banqueting can be seen as an element of Phoenician royal culture as it is an aspect of Samarian royal culture in Amos.

In the first millennium BCE, the practice begins in Syria-Palestine, with Aramaean and Phoenician-speaking peoples, and spreads from there both East and West. The first indication of the practice outside of the Levant are the Cretan votive shields found in the Idaean cave of Zeus depicting klīnai from the first half of the eighth century, which show that some form of reclined banqueting was known at the time among the elite at Knossos. The metalwork is close to North Syrian style, and I suggest that skilled artisans were exchanged by elites in Crete and the Levant who had previously established relationships. It was likely in the establishment of this relationship at events involving banqueting and hospitality that Cretan elites learned of the West Semitic style of banqueting. I propose a similar process to account for the Cypriot evidence. Greek-speaking Cypriot kings maintained relationships with their Phoenician and Syrian neighbours on Cyprus and in the Levant, and it was through such relationships that the Cypriot Greeks learned of reclined banqueting, as self-same events.

The situation in Assyria is different. They were the dominant power in the Near East at the time of the earliest evidence for reclined banqueting, in the eighth century. From the ninth to the seventh centuries, the Assyrians became progressively more involved with the
Levant, and exacted tribute from the cities under their sway, including those in Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine. I propose that it was in this situation of dominance over the cultures that practiced reclined banqueting that Assyrian royalty developed an interest in reclined banqueting. The elites of tributary cities, subdued by the Assyrians, would have welcomed representatives of the Assyrians to their royal banquets. In this context of a multicultural banquet, Assyrians could have learned the dynamics of multicultural banqueting; much of the tribute extracted by the Assyrians from Levantine cities certainly belongs in the context of royal banqueting (Reade 1995). The appearance of the practice on the relief of Ashurbanipal shows that the Assyrians were not merely interested in Phoenician and Judean banqueting equipment because they were decorated with precious materials, like ivory, metals, and gems. They were interested in replicating aspects of the practice for which the equipment was intended.

Once the practice had reached Crete, it spread through the Greek world beginning with areas united by Dorian cultural affinity—Corinth (column kraters, larnax of Kypselos) and Sparta (Alcman). I certainly do not mean to connect this with the mythical Dorian invasion, or suggest that it remained the province of Dions for long. However, reclined banqueting in the Greek-speaking world appears first in the eighth and seventh centuries and in Dorian-speaking regions only. Within Greek culture(s), there are several categories of belonging, and one of those was belonging to large cultural blocks united by dialect. The closeness of relations between Dorian Greek cities would have allowed for the swift spread of the practice and its transformation into the syssition and symposion. This element of eastern luxury, transformed eventually into a mainstay of Classical Greek culture, was transmitted through the Dorian cultural sphere to other groups of Greeks likely at festivals
such as those for Zeus at Olympia and for Apollo at Delphi, both located in Dorian-speaking areas. This occurred before the closing off of Dorian culture to outside influences, seen at Sparta and throughout Crete later in the Archaic period.

While it is most likely that the Spartans and Corinthians learned of reclined banqueting from Crete, there are other possibilities which also relate to how the practice became incorporated into Attic-Ionic-speaking areas of Greece. Early Euboean exploration of the Mediterranean involved Cypriot partners (Duplouy 2006, 165), already familiar with Phoenicians, and a settlement at Pithekoussai, whose tombs show a mixture of Greek, Phoenician, and Etruscan goods. The Etruscans were eager consumers of Phoenician and Greek goods, and some had adapted the reclined style of banqueting by the second half of the seventh century. Because of the early presence of Phoenicians in the Tyrrhenian (ninth century at the latest), the Euboean founders of Pithekoussai and Cumae, the Corinthian founders of Syracuse, and the Spartan founders of Tarentum, had other opportunities to witness Phoenician elite behaviour related to their exploration of the Mediterranean and foundation of new settlements in the eighth century. The Etruscans were impressed by reclined banqueting and it became an integral part of their culture no less so than it did in Greece. There is a possibility that some Greek-speakers were encouraged to learn the practice because of Etruscan enthusiasm for it. In a context where Greek and Phoenician seafarers were eager to establish relations with the wealthy Etruscans, an Etruscan penchant for reclined banqueting may have been a driver of Greek adaptation of the practice from Phoenicians or Etruscans in the West. The only sure evidence that some Greek-speakers knew of reclined banqueting earlier than the second half of the seventh century (when it is attested in Etruria) are the Cretan shields and the North Syrian-style silver bowl with the
Cypriot syllabic inscription, and some Greeks could have adapted the practice in the cultural ferment of the central Mediterranean in the seventh century. Wherever it was, multicultural banqueting was necessarily involved. For the elite to adapt a practice of the complexity of reclined banqueting, the prospective adopter requires the motivation of prestige. They must have seen those they wished to emulate banqueting this way.

Moving on from reclined banqueting, which is an indication of multicultural banqueting from an *etic* perspective, Chapters 3 and 4 focus on the Homeric poems, demonstrating from an *emic* perspective that multicultural banquets are the primary context of peaceful cultural contact in the thought-world of Archaic Greece. Despite the many cultural traits shared by the Achaeans and Trojans, the text of the *Iliad* draws clear cultural distinctions between the Achaeans and Trojans, especially with the use of the term *allodapós*. Hector and Achilles, the main characters of the narrative, both point out the alien nature of the other side using this term. Therefore, occasions that involve representatives of the Trojan and Achaean sides can be described as multicultural.

In the Epic Cycle and the *Iliad*, banquets shared between Achaeans and Trojans are consequential events integral to the narrative, which demonstrate the opportunities and dangers of multicultural banqueting in the Archaic Greek imagination. The human cause of the Trojan War was a multicultural banquet gone wrong, when Paris is hosted by Menelaus in Sparta, and violates that hospitality by eloping with Helen. This hospitality, explicitly involving banqueting (Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 95-7), is presented in terms of *xenia*, both as it occurs in the epitome of the *Cypria* (Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 85-105), and in Menelaus’ statement of his grievance against Paris (*Il.* 3.351-4). As part of the diplomatic efforts to retrieve Helen without resorting to armed conflict, an Achaean envoy including Menelaus,
Odysseus, and Talthybius came to Troy to negotiate Helen’s return, and were hosted by the Trojan elder Antenor (II. 3.205-8). Here we see multicultural banqueting between opposed forces in a contentious situation where threats were issued. These banquets which occurred before the action of the Iliad are consistently referred to in terms of xenía.

The concept of xenía ‘guest-friendship’ is not, however, coextensive with the concept of multicultural banqueting in the Iliad. Another consequential multicultural banquet is that insisted on by Achilles at the arrival of Priam. The vocabulary of banqueting becomes significant here, since it is the unmarked, generic word for ‘meal’ that is used, dórpon (24.601), a word that can be further specified as an everyday meal, a deîpnon, or as a special distributive meal, a daîs, but no further specification appears at Achilles’ banquet with Priam. Words related to xenía refer to monocultural hospitality, to multicultural hospitality between Achaeans and Trojans (Paris by Menelaus, Menelaus by Antenor), and between Argives and Lykians (Bellerophon by Oineus, Bellerophon by the king of Lykia), and to hospitality between gods (Thetis by Hephaestus). Such words are not used in the meeting of Priam and Achilles. Nor is daîs used, the standard word for elite banquets among heroes and gods. One of my discoveries is that these multicultural banquets occurring in association with the Trojan War can never be designated as daîs, and multicultural banquets sometimes occur apart from the concept of xenía.

It is obvious that events of multicultural banqueting are prominent and consequential in the Iliad, and this is relevant to the cultural history of Archaic Greece. The Iliad imagines the exploits of the heroic ancestors of the great men of Archaic Greece, and its episodes and themes by the very nature of traditional literature must accord with the interests and concerns of this Archaic audience. I argue that the Greek-speakers of the eighth and seventh
centuries BCE configured elite feasting as an appropriate means of communicating and negotiating with non-Greeks. It was the primary context considered appropriate for establishing and maintaining relations with outsiders. As Achilles implies in his meeting with Priam at the end of the epic, their relations shall be defined either by banqueting, in which case it is possible for Priam to get what he wants, or by violence, in which case it is not possible.

Multicultural banqueting in the *Odyssey* is much more common, plays a larger role, and is described in different terms. The distinctions among different kinds of banqueting in Homeric diction found in the *Iliad* are not replicated in the *Odyssey*; *daís, dóron, ésthein, pásasthai, and phágein* all refer to multicultural banquets at different points in the *Odyssey*, as shown by Table 1. I follow the tradition of François Hartog (2001 [1996]), Irad Malkin (1998), and Carol Dougherty (2001), in viewing Odysseus’ adventures as being related to Archaic Greek experiences of exploration in the Mediterranean. I highlight Odysseus’ perspective on “others,” because he seems to desire contact even when danger is the likely result. Odysseus’ perspective is, in part, a corollary to the process identified by Mary Helms (1988, 262-4), in which elites seek esoteric knowledge and external systems of status marking, identified in different terms by Erich Gruen, who remarks on the “powerful ancient penchant (largely unnoticed in modern works) of buying into other cultures to augment one’s own” (2011, 5). Even when yet another detour and delay had no obvious benefit, if Odysseus saw an opportunity to make contact with strangers, he relished it, even as his shipmates became more and more disillusioned with his approach to these matters, and as many encounters turned out badly. When Odysseus states that he is seeking a gift, his behaviour corresponds to Duplouy’s theory of elite social recognition, whereby elites sought
and displayed foreign goods as symbols of their elite status and foreign relationships (2006, 177-8). Odysseus’ approach to “others” seems to correspond with what has been observed in the Amarna letters of the Late Bronze Age, where much of the correspondence seems to serve the primary purpose of making and maintaining contact.

While previous scholars have seen Odysseus’ adventures as a whole relating to cultural contact in the lived experience of Archaic Greeks, they have not identified the banquet as the primary context mediating this contact in the Archaic Greek imagination. It is here that I think my perspective unites previous scholarship on the Odyssey and opens up new territory in the cultural history of Archaic Greece. In the imaginary world of the Odyssey, contact with the many unusual beings that inhabit its landscape is mediated by banqueting, whether these beings are humane or monstrous. It can then be extrapolated that in the Archaic Greek imagination represented by the poet and audiences of the Odyssey, banqueting is the primary mode of contact with “others.” As others have pointed out (Bakker 2013, 54), differences in cuisine and hospitality in the Odyssey are the primary indices of cultural difference, as Odysseus states in his formulaic question about the nature of unknown peoples (Od. 6.120-1; 9.175-6; 13.201-2).

**Multicultural Banqueting as Interpretive Model**

The evidence presented in this dissertation shows, in the first place, that multicultural banquets occurred among Mediterranean elites, including Greek-speakers, both in the Late Bronze Age and the early Archaic period (Chapters 1 and 2), and secondly, that in the thought-world of Archaic Greeks, banqueting with “the other” was the primary and ideal
mode of cultural contact (Chapters 3 and 4). With this, I have established a consistent historical and social context for the interpretation of the evidence of cultural exchange, which is more specific and cogent than those currently resorted to in scholarship, such as Mediterraneanization, mixed marriages, multicultural communities, or networks of trade. I do not deny the existence of these social phenomena and processes; on the contrary, each of these dominant theories would be enhanced by incorporating the data I present. In the minds of Greek-speakers in the eighth and seventh centuries, banqueting was the best way to organize contacts, negotiations, alliances, and exchanges of all kinds. Whether one approaches this subject of cultural exchange from the perspective of economics, sociology, religion, colonization or armed conflict, all narratives will be improved if the analyst reconstructs a context of contact that involves Greeks and non-Greeks sometimes seated at the banquet table together, or reclining together at a banquet.

Once multicultural banqueting is established as something that occurred, not rarely or unusually, but as a standard mode of making and reaffirming contacts between Greek-speaking and non-Greek-speaking groups, it has the potential to become an interpretive model to explain the cultural exchanges between Greeks and various other groups. The evidence of cultural exchange that is of most concern to me is that which relates to Greek religion, rituals, and language and poetry; these exchanges have motivated my study of modes of contact. There is a relatively small number of words of Semitic origin that seem to have been borrowed by Greek-speakers between the end of the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Classical period, that is, in the Iron Age and Archaic period. While it may never be possible to exclude the possibility that these words were already used in the Greek of the Late Bronze Age, they do not appear until the Archaic period, and thus it is most
likely that they were borrowed in the Iron Age or Archaic period. Among these, it is possible to isolate a group united by semantics that relate to cuisine, banqueting equipment, and the sorts of rituals attested at banquets in the Archaic period. In alphabetical order these are:

- **kádos** ‘vessel for water or wine’ (Archilochus frag. 4 West; Anacreon frag. 28 Page)
- **kasía** ‘variety of cinnamon’ (Sappho frag. 44 Lobel and Page)
- **kathairō** ‘purify (a cup for wine libation by fumigating with sulphur)’ (Il. 16.228) ‘cleanse (kraters or banqueting tables)’ (Od. 20.152, 22.439)
- **katharós** ‘clean, spotless’ (Od. 6.61; Archilochus frag. 12 West; Alcaeus frag. 38a Lobel and Page)
- **krókos** ‘saffron’ (Il. 14.348; h. Demeter 6; Hipponax frag. 41 West)
- **kúathos** ‘ladle for drawing wine from a krater’ (Anacreon frag. 11a Page)
- **múrra** ‘myrrh’ (Sappho frag. 44 Lobel and Page)
- **pallakís** ‘concubine’ (Il. 9.449, 452; Od. 14.203)

All these words have been shown to have West Semitic (Ugaritic, Phoenician, Aramaic, or Hebrew) cognates in recent scholarship, and are presented as borrowings into Greek from West Semitic languages, with the acknowledgement that the ancient Semitic language that preserves the cognate form may not be the one from which the Greeks borrowed the word, as in the case of Ugaritic, which did not exist at the time I propose for the borrowing. Masson (2007, 735-6) addresses kádos, kasía, krókos, and múrra, and Bai (2009, 50, 66, 85) addresses kathairō, katharós (along with Burkert 1992, 62), kúathos, and pallakís. Considering the evidence presented in this dissertation, the contexts of these lexical
borrowings can confidently be stated to have been multicultural banquets. Sometime in the
ninth or eighth centuries, Greek-speakers attended banquets with speakers of Semitic
languages, and one of the effects of this experience was to adapt words for foodstuffs,
banqueting equipment, and incense. One of their motivations for establishing contact was
precisely the acquisition of this kind of knowledge—something foreign that elites could use
to mark themselves as foreign in their home communities, as Helms (1988, 262-4) suggests.

Consider another example. In the Archaic period, a new god appears in the religion
of some Greek-speakers, Adonis, who has an undeniably Semitic name (Loretz 1980) and
myths that indicate that he was a Greek interpretation either of Phoenician Baʿal or
Babylonian Tammuz. I propose that multicultural banqueting allows us to interpret this
cultural exchange. When Achilles convinces Priam, with threats, to dine with him, he
narrates a myth at the beginning of the meal, by way of urging Priam to take food though he
is in mourning. At this multicultural banquet that brings the great epic to a close, looming
large in the imagination of the Archaic Greeks, the host narrates a myth involving Zeus,
Apollo, Artemis, Leto, and Niobe, in order to persuade his guest, in a highly contentious
atmosphere where violence is possible (Il. 24.602-17). We have seen in Chapter 3 that
hospitality in hostile contexts was part of the Archaic Greek imagining of contact with
foreigners; Odysseus and Menelaus were hosted by Antenor when they came to Troy to
negotiate the return of Helen before the war. Multicultural banqueting was an important
mode of contact even among enemies. In such a contentious context as the banquet of
Achilles and Priam, part of the negotiation and persuasion involves references to gods. The
real multicultural banquets between Greeks and others I have argued for as part of the social
practices of the Archaic Greek elite would very likely also have had references to gods, both
in the form of persuasive myths, and in the form of prayers, libations, and oaths (López-Ruiz 2010, 37). We can observe that very often in the Homeric poems, myths are narrated by characters in order to persuade their interlocutors in contentious situations, such as the reconciliation of Achilles and Agamemnon, when Agamemnon narrates a myth of Zeus, Hera, and Delusion (Il. 19.91-133).

**Multicultural Banqueting in the Development of Archaic Greek Culture and Society**

The learning of new foreign words and stories about foreign gods can be situated in the context of a multicultural banquet. Such motivated adaptations on the part of the Greeks presuppose the attainment of at least a low level of bilingualism. At least a low level of bilingualism is also necessary for the adaptation of the alphabet by the middle of the eighth century (Jeffrey 1990), with the related borrowing of the names of most of the signs in the abecedary. Bilingualism must be addressed in accounts of the borrowing of words, myths, and a script. Negative assessments of Greek bilingualism have served to obscure the logical necessity behind these adaptations. Referring to the Hellenistic period, but reflecting on the Classical, Momigliano wrote that “Greek remained the only language of civilization of every Greek-speaking man” (1975, 8). While hard to believe, at least we can imagine that it was a lack of motivation to learn other languages that created this situation, a lack of motivation directly related to the cultural dominance of Greek civilization in the wake of Alexander. The Greek-speakers of the eighth and seventh centuries were not in a similar situation. In the interstate world of the early Archaic Mediterranean, the Phoenician, Aramaic, and Lydian
languages, to leave aside for a moment their social practices, art, ideas, and rituals, were spoken by the culturally dominant; the civilizations who spoke these languages were bearers of prestige in the eyes of Greek-speakers, who, without this perception, would not have become such avid consumers of Near Eastern lifestyles, to the extent that they were celebrated and excoriated by the Archaic Lyric poets. Greek civilization experienced moments when it was considered the pinnacle of culture (Momigliano 1975, 7), but the Archaic period was not one of those moments. Much of the evidence of cultural exchange that appears in Archaic Greece and in the Iron Age can be explained by the fact that the Greeks regarded the cultures of the Near East as more prestigious, and elite Greeks wished to build on their prestige by acquisition of Near Eastern knowledge, lifestyles (Helms 1988), and goods (Duplouy 2006). One of the things they adapted from the Levant was the practice of reclined banqueting, but they were acquisitive of all manner of intellectual property in order to amplify their prestige, and it follows that they would have had a concurrent interest in the sayings, myths, and songs of Near Eastern languages.

The multicultural banquet can also serve to contextualize the acquisition of the low level of bilingualism in evidence. What Jonathan Hall calls the “supraregional and transethnic elite” (2009, 613) in the Archaic period established and maintained relations among its members by meetings involving banqueting, as suggested by Morris (2000) and Nijboer (2013), and elaborated fully in this dissertation. In the eighth and seventh centuries, Greek-speakers were in the process of adapting the ways of life that define this elite. Often referred to in terms of guest-friendship, I have shown above that the nature of these multicultural banquets transcend the Homeric concept of xenía. Once contacts had been established, it is likely that they were maintained by envoys sent with tokens or letters of
introduction, as in the only Iliadic reference to written language, the baneful letter sent to accompany Argive Bellerophon to Lykia (Il. 6.173-77). These periods of hospitality could last for several months to a few years, all of which are long enough periods to develop a low level of bilingualism, learn the names of prestigious items, and understand some of the sayings and stories that were presented at elite banquets. It is not that, in the visit of an envoy, he would not have had opportunities to learn his host’s culture at other events, but the banquet is the prime venue for display of luxurious lifestyles, art, and poetry.

Multicultural banqueting does not have to be part of long-term hospitality for it to promote bilingualism. As a repeated feature of interstate social relations in the eighth and seventh centuries, as the way Archaic Greeks expected to interact with non-Greeks, it provides motivation for multiple experiences of contact with the same group of non-Greeks. In the operation of this social institution, Greek-speakers, eager to make contact, to learn esoteric knowledge and to acquire items not available in their home communities, could develop a progressively greater competence in a non-Greek language. The linguistic and poetic evidence of exchange attests as much, and I have demonstrated that the primary mode by which the Greeks made contacts with non-Greeks, and expected to make contact with them, was at multicultural banquets.

Jonathan Hall, one of the most prominent scholars of Archaic Greece, is not fond of the term ‘culture,’ stating that “the sort of theoretical sophistication that has been displayed with such good effect in discussions of ancient ethnicity has rarely been extended to the realm of culture” (Hall 2009, 610). Despite the anthropological turn that has favoured the *emic* comprehension of a society (Hall 2009, 610), it must be acknowledged that our research questions are formulated from an *etic* perspective. These works of scholarship are
produced because people today have questions about antiquity. Sometimes, as in the case of linguistic difference, these questions held little interest for the ancient Greeks. That fact does not make the question less worthy of pursuit. From our contemporary perspective, it is not wrong to study “Greek society,” “Greek culture,” or “the Greeks,” even as we acknowledge that these singular terms efface the pluralities of Greek societies, cultures, and ethnic groups in the formative Archaic period. What justifies the investigation of something singular called Greek are the corpora of evidence left to us. Even if we acknowledge that Greeks from different parts of the Mediterranean considered themselves different from other Greeks, from the perspective of a scholar today, we detect commonalities in the Archaic literature left to us from Lesbos, Miletus, Sparta, Boeotia, Paros, Samos, Athens, Sicily and Magna Graecia. They express concerns about *poleis* ‘city-states,’ concerns about festivals in honour of the gods in which poets and athletes compete, concerns about the gods and the non-Greeks they encounter, and most of these authors who survive have a common reference point—some relationship to the Homeric poetic tradition. From our *etic* perspective on the remains of antiquity, we can usefully discuss Greek society using data from a number of different regions. We can state, firstly, that when a Greek-speaker banquets with a non-Greek-speaker, this constitutes a multicultural banquet, and secondly, that such events were identified by the Greeks of the eighth and seventh centuries as the ideal mode of contact with other cultures.

Some readers of this dissertation might wonder whether “multicultural banqueting” is merely another way of saying *xenia* ‘guest-friendship.’ I have shown that, in the case of the *Iliad*, multicultural banqueting is certainly not limited to events designated with words related to *xenia*, as my analysis of the banquet between Achilles and Priam demonstrates. In
the *Odyssey*, which for many scholars models Greek responses to their historical encounters with non-Greeks in the Mediterranean, the multicultural banquets are referred to with a wide variety of terminology, little of it related to *xenia* (Chapter 4, Table 1). Banqueting with the other was the ideal mode of cultural contact for Greeks in the eighth and seventh centuries even where no relationship of guest-friendship existed.

Having investigated multicultural banqueting in the Late Bronze Age, many of the perspectives offered on multicultural banqueting in Archaic Greek literature seem to reinstantiate the practices of diplomacy seen in the Amarna letters, and in the Hittite diplomacy that engaged the Mycenaean Greeks as seen in the Tawagalawa letter. Here, states wish to maintain and retain contact with other states as an end in itself and they send envoys back and forth. We have seen in Hittite diplomacy that the provision of bread and beer to a foreigner establishes a specific diplomatic relationship. Having nothing to do with guest-friendship, this is how the Hittites express the concept of safe passage (Beckman et al. 2011, Tawagalawa letter, AhT 4 §8). At the end of the Iron Age and beginning of the Archaic period, the iconographic and literary evidence shows that Greek-speakers sought out contact with prestigious foreigners, not primarily for the acquisition of goods, but for the acquisition of knowledge and symbolic capital. In short, they wished to become more elite (Duplouy 2006), and acquired foreign practices, cultural artefacts, and symbols of status-marking to achieve this end. These eighth and seventh century Greeks had ideas about the parameters of cultural contact passed down through oral tradition and its imaginings of interaction with foreigners. Those they encountered first in their explorations of the Mediterranean in the Iron Age and Archaic period were mostly West Semitic-speaking people from Syria and Phoenicia. The establishment of multicultural banqueting as the
primary mode of intercultural contact must have involved interest in commensality on all sides. Once established, these relations, mediated at banquets, were profoundly influential on the development of Archaic Greek society. Multicultural banqueting provides the mode of contact that best explains the clear evidence of cultural exchange between the Semitic and Greek worlds, having an effect on the Archaic Greeks such that modern scholars would not recognize an ancient Greece that had not learned much from the Near East.

We now have a stable model for cultural contact between Greeks and non-Greeks in the eighth and seventh centuries, established from both etic and emic observations. It can be elaborated fruitfully because of the richness of ancient banqueting traditions. In both Greece and the Near East, banquets were the primary context for the use of inscribed drinking bowls, for the performance of poetry, and for the ostentatious display of wealth, such as decorated serving vessels and elaborate furniture. In both Greece and the Near East, banquets were a context for songs, prayers, libations, oaths, and negotiations. With the multicultural banquet established as a consistent mode of cultural contact, much of the evidence of cultural exchange between Greece and the Near East finds a context which can be used to cogently account for its adaptation, including artistic motifs, myths, lexical items and poetic formulae. With my work, we can account for these adaptations not only as seen from the external perspective, but through the expectations of the Archaic Greeks themselves, who understood cultural contact to be mediated by banquets, and who strove to increase their prestige by acquiring yet more symbols of their elite status.
Tables
Table 1: Cultural contact in the *Odyssey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Motivation for contact (Odyssey lines)</th>
<th>Odyssey lines referring to cultural encounter</th>
<th>Achaean individual or group</th>
<th>Other Culture</th>
<th>Banquet (Yes/No, Greek diction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Profit (4.90)</td>
<td>4.81-91</td>
<td>Menelaus</td>
<td>Cypriots, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Aithiopes, Eremboi, Libyans</td>
<td>No (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Divine knowledge, escape (4.351-2; 4.376-8; 4.384-6)</td>
<td>4.454-6</td>
<td>Menelaus and Companions</td>
<td>Egyptian (Proteus)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shelter, aid (4.615-9)</td>
<td>4.615-9</td>
<td>Menelaus</td>
<td>Sidonians (King Phaidimos)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Compulsion (4.555-60; 5.104-13, 5.13-7)</td>
<td>5.192-227</td>
<td>Odysses</td>
<td>Nymph/Goddess (Calypso)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aid, conveyance (6.112-26)</td>
<td>6.119-250; 7.133-232; 8.55-108; 8.469-586; 13.24-69</td>
<td>Odysses</td>
<td>Phaeacians (Nausicaa) Phaeacians (Alcinous/Arete)</td>
<td>No (Nausicaa, food given); Yes (Alcinous); δαιτωμόνας (7.148); δαισάμενοι (7.188); δαίτος (7.232); δαϊτ’ ἐρατεινήν (8.61); δαιτὶ τὲ τέρπηται (8.429); μήρα δὲ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Cultural contact in the *Odyssey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Motivation for contact (Odyssey lines)</th>
<th>Odyssey lines referring to cultural encounter</th>
<th>Achaeans individual or group</th>
<th>Other Culture</th>
<th>Banquet (Yes/No, Greek diction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motivation for contact (Odyssey lines)</td>
<td>9.82-104 Odyssey and Companions</td>
<td>Lotus-Eaters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>κήαντες δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα τερπόμενοι (13.26-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Curiosity (9.87-91)</td>
<td>9.105-479 Odyssey and Companions</td>
<td>Cyclopes (Polyphemus)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>δόσαν λωτοῖο πάσασθαι (9.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Curiosity (9.172-6)</td>
<td>10.1-18 Odyssey and Companions</td>
<td>Aioli (Aiolus)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>φίλει (10.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Directions, conveyance (10.17-8)</td>
<td>10.100-132 Odyssey and Companions</td>
<td>Laestrygonians</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ἱγθεὶς δ’ ὡς πείροντες ἀτερπέα δαῖτα φέροντο (10.124)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Cultural contact in the *Odyssey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Motivation for contact (Odyssey lines)</th>
<th>Odyssey lines referring to cultural encounter</th>
<th>Achaean individual or group</th>
<th>Other Culture</th>
<th>Banquet (Yes/No, Greek diction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aid, directions (10.148-55; 10.189-205)</td>
<td>10.189-243; 10.325-405 (Od. alone); 10.455-486; 12.16-30</td>
<td>Odysseus’ Companions; Odysseus alone; Odysseus and Companions</td>
<td>Goddess (Circe)</td>
<td>Yes τυρόν τε καὶ ἄλφιτα καὶ μέλι χλωρόν οἶνῳ Πραμνείῳ ἐκύκα (10.234-5); βρώμης δ’ οὐχ ἀπετει οὐδὲ ποτήτος (10.379); ἐσθίετε βρώμην καὶ πίνετε οἶνον (10.460); σῖτον καὶ κρέα πολλὰ καὶ αἴθοπα οἶνον ἔρυθρόν (12.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Curiosity (12.47-52; 12.154-64)</td>
<td>12.182-200</td>
<td>Odysseus and Companions</td>
<td>Sirens</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>13.272-286</td>
<td>Cretan Odysseus</td>
<td>Phoenicians</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>14.276-86</td>
<td>Cretan Odysseus</td>
<td>Egyptians</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>14.287-94</td>
<td>Cretan Odysseus</td>
<td>Phoenicians</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Cultural contact in the Odyssey, coordinated with its motivations, the groups involved, and the question of whether banqueting featured in the encounter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Motivation for contact (Odyssey lines)</th>
<th>Odyssey lines referring to cultural encounter</th>
<th>Achaean individual or group</th>
<th>Other Culture</th>
<th>Banquet (Yes/No, Greek diction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Multicultural region</td>
<td>19.172-184</td>
<td>Cretan Odysseus (Aithon)</td>
<td>Eteocretans, Kydonians, Dorians, Pelasgians</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Slavery</td>
<td>20.364-383</td>
<td>Suitors</td>
<td>Sicilians</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cultural contact in the Odyssey, coordinated with its motivations, the groups involved, and the question of whether banqueting featured in the encounter.
Table 2: Banqueting Coordinated with Geographic and Cultural Distance

Table 2: Diagram from Dougherty 2001 (adapted from de Certeau 1988). In blue, I have plotted more examples of cultural contact on the axes of geographical distance and cultural difference and added details of the banqueting involved.
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Figure 1: Drawing of LMII-LMIIIA bronze banqueting service from Tomb 14 at Zapher-Papoura, near Knossos, illustrating Mycenaean use of banqueting equipment imported from Crete. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia*, 73(2), 133-178, Fig. 6. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 2: LHIIIB Mycenaean pictorial krater from Pyle-Verghi, Cyprus, in Nicosia, Cyprus Museum 1952/IV-12/1, illustrating the type of Mycenaean banqueting equipment that became popular in LBA Cyprus and Ugarit. Original source: Rystedt, E. (2006). Tracing stylistic evolution in Mycenaean pictorial vase painting, Fig. 1. In Rystedt, E., and Wells, B. (Eds.), *Pictorial pursuits. Figurative painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery*. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Forlag. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 3: The Standard of Ur, British Museum, ME 121201, AN, 2600-2400 BCE, illustrating a Sumerian royal banquet consisting of men seated with drinking cups, attended by servants, and entertained by a lyre-player. Original source: The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, http://www.penn.museum/sites/iraq/?page_id=48. Accessed on 19 March 2012. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 4: Akkadian I Period cylinder seal, illustrating a pair of banqueters drinking from the same vessel through drinking-tubes. Original source: Selz, G. (1983). *Die Bankettszene. Entwicklung eines “überzeitlichen” Bildmotivs in Mesopotamien von der frühdynastischen bis zur Akkad-Zeit*, Fig. 462. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 5: Post-Akkadian cylinder seal, illustrating a pair of banqueters holding drinking-bowls and attended by servants. Original source: Selz, G. (1983). *Die Bankettszene. Entwicklung eines “überzeitlichen” Bildmotivs in Mesopotamien von der frühdynastischen bis zur Akkad-Zeit*, Taf. 46. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 6: Drawing of an Egyptian wall painting, tomb of Rekhmire (TT 100), Sheikh Abd el-Gurna, Thebes, ca. 1400 BCE, illustrating a royal couple sitting before a table of food, while a large number of people seated on the ground are served food and drink. Original source: Dentzer, J.-M. (1982). *Le motif du banquet couché dans le proche-orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.*, Fig. 21. Paris: École Français de Rome. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 7: Section of Egyptian wall painting depicting women at a banquet seated on the ground, tomb of Rekhmire (TT 100), Sheikh Abd el-Gurna, Thebes, ca. 1400 BCE. Original source: Lange, K., and Hirmer, M. (1967). *Ägypten. Architecture, Plastik, Malerei in drei Jahrtausenden*, Taf. 21. Munich: Hirmer Verlag. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 8: Funerary stele from Tell el-Amarna depicting a Syrian mercenary, who is seated and drinks through a drinking-tube, and his wife (Berlin 14122). Original source: Dentzer, J.-M. (1982). *Le motif du banquet couché dans le proche-orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.*, Fig. 22. Paris: École Français de Rome. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].
Figure 9: Egyptian painting on ostrakon, a cat serves a mouse a meal of poultry. Original source: Brunner-Traut, E. (1956). *Die Altägyptischen Scherbenbilder (Bildostraka) der deutschen Museen und Sammlungen*, Taf. 34, 96. Weibaden: Franz Steiner Verlag. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 10: Egyptian painting on ostrakon, a bird and a cat sit for dinner together. Original source: Brunner-Traut, E. (1956). *Die Altägyptischen Scherbenbilder (Bildostraka) der deutschen Museen und Sammlungen*, Taf. 2, 94. Weibaden: Franz Steiner Verlag. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 11: Drawing of ivory plaque from Megiddo, 13th-12th century BCE, illustrating a seated king drinking from a bowl attended by servants, a lyre-player, and presented with captured enemies. Original source: Website of Bruce K. Satterfield, Brigham Young University, http://emp.byui.edu/SATTERFIELDDB/Tabernacle/CerubThroneMegiddo.jpg. Accessed on 19 March 2012. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 12: Drawing of ivory plaque from Megiddo, one of a set of four panels, 13th-12th century BCE, illustrating a man seated before a table of food holds a drinking-bowl, while other men sit facing him and hold smaller bowls. Original source: Ziffer, I. (2005). From Acemhöyük to Megiddo: The banquet scene in the art of the Levant in the second millennium BCE. *Tel Aviv*, 32(2), 133-67, Fig. 22. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 13: Ahiram sarcophagus from Byblos, 13th-12th century BCE, illustrating a king seated before a table of food and holding a drinking bowl, while attendants bring him offerings and dance. Original source: Encyclopædia Britannica, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/media/74323/Carved-limestone-sarcophagus-of-Hiram-king-of-Tyre-bearing-a. Accessed on 20 March 2012. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 14: Orthostat relief from the city wall at Alaca Höyük, illustrating a seated king who drinks from a bowl. Original source: Akurgal, E. (1961). *Die Kunst der Hethiter*, Fig. 93. Munich: Hirmer Verlag. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 15: Stone relief from Maraş, illustrating a royal couple seated with a table of food between them, banquet in the company of a child. Original source: Orthmann, W. (1971). *Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst*, Maraş C/1. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 16: Drawing of an LMI fresco from Ayia Irini on Kea, illustrating men preparing food in tripod vessels. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia*, 73(2), 133-178, Fig. 9. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].
Figure 17: Drawing of an LMI fresco from Tylissos on Crete, illustrating men carrying amphorae. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia, 73*(2), 133-178, Fig. 8. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 18: Drawing of a LHIII fresco from Pylos, after Palace of Nestor II, illustrating men carrying food prepared in tripod vessels. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia, 73*(2), 133-178, Fig. 10. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 19: Campstool Fresco from Knossos, illustrating a man offering a kylix to a seated man. Original source: Argusvlinder weblog, http://argusvlinder.weblog.nl/tag/campstool-fresco/, which graciously made available online an image of the fragments abstracted from their restoration. Accessed 20 March 2012. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 20: Drawing of a portion of the LHIII Pylos Megaron Fresco, illustrating two pairs of individuals seated with small tables between them. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia, 73*(2), 133-178, Fig. 13. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 21: LHIII engraved gold signet-ring from Tiryns, illustrating a seated figure holding a chalice while human-animal hybrid creatures bring liquid offerings. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia, 73*(2), 133-178, Fig. 16. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 22: A drawing of a LHIII Mycenaean pictorial krater from Tiryns, illustrating a seated man holding a kylix and a chariot-race. Original source: Wright, J. (2004). A survey of evidence for feasting in Mycenaean society. *Hesperia, 73*(2), 133-178, Fig. 17. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 23: Old Syrian ritual basin from Ebla, illustrating a pair of seated banqueters with a table of food between them, accompanied by attendants. Original source: Dentzer, J.-M. (1982). *Le motif du banquet couché dans le proche-orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.*, Fig. 25. Paris: École Français de Rome. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 24: Ashurbanipal’s banquet relief, ca. 650 BCE, from Room S of the North Palace at Nineveh, illustrating Ashurbanipal reclining on a couch holding a drinking-bowl, with a table of food before him, and his wife seated facing him. London, British Museum 124920. Original source: Dentzer, J.-M. (1982). *Le motif du banquet couché dans le proche-orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.* Paris: École Français de Rome. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].
Figure 25: North Syrian-style silver bowl from Kourion with Paphian Cypriot Syllabic inscription (Greek), second half of 8th-early 7th century BCE, illustrating a man and a woman reclining and holding drinking-bowls, with a table of food between them. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 74.51.4557. Original source: Karageorghis, V. (1999). A Cypriot silver bowl reconsidered. 1. The iconography of the decoration. MMJ, 34, 13-20. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 26: Phoenician-style silver bowl from Cyprus, ca. late 8th-early 7th century, illustrating a man reclining on a couch and holding a drinking-bowl, accompanied by a servant and a musician, while other men recline on mattresses on the ground. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 74.51.4555. Original source: Culican, W. (1982). Cesnola bowl 4555 and other Phoenician bowls. RStF, 10, 13-32. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 27: Drawing of MMA 74.51.4555 by Culican 1982, illustrating a man reclining on a couch and holding a drinking-bowl, accompanied by a servant and a musician, while other men recline on mattresses on the ground. Original source: Culican, W. (1982). Cesnola bowl 4555 and other Phoenician bowls. RStF, 10, 13-32. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 28: Drawing of Phoenician-style bronze bowl from Salamis, ca. mid-7th century BCE, illustrating a man reclining on a couch accompanied by a woman who plays the lyre, a seated woman drinking from a bowl, a man and a woman having sex on a couch, and attendants bringing drink and playing music. London, British Museum 1892/5-19/1. Original source: Markoe, G. (c.1985). Phoenician bronze and silver bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean. Berkeley: University of California Press. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 29: Fragment of miniature bronze votive shield from the Idaean cave, mid-8th century BCE, illustrating a klīnē, or couch, with attendants standing by. Athens, National Museum 11764.Ia. Original source: Kunze, E. (1931). Kretische Bronzereliefs, 71 bis. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 30: Drawing of a fragment of a miniature bronze votive shield from the Idaean cave, mid-8th century BCE, illustrating a portion of a klīnē, or couch, with a footstool before it. Heraklion Museum No Inv. Nr. Reprinted from Matthäus 1999-2000. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 31: Photograph of a fragment of a miniature bronze votive shield from the Idaean cave, mid-8th century BCE, illustrating a portion of a klīnē, or couch, with a footstool before it. Heraklion Museum No Inv. Nr. Original source: Hartmut Matthäus, pers. comm., 14.05.2014. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].
Figure 32: Drawing of the grave stele of Neo-Hittite Prince Panyunis from Kululu, eastern Anatolia, mid-8th century BCE, illustrating that it was a couch like a klíné that was the site of the eating and drinking mentioned in the inscription. Kayseri Museum. Original source: http://www.hittitemonuments.com/kululu/. Accessed on 21 March 2012. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 33: Ashurbanipal’s banquet relief in context with the rest of the wall relief, illustrating the banquet of Ashurbanipal [Fig. 24] surrounded by natural scenes with vegetation. London, British Museum. Original source: Albenda, P. (1976). Landscape Bas-Reliefs in the Bīt-Ḥilānī of Ashurbanipal. BASOR 224, 49-72. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 34: Assyrian relief showing tribute received from Phoenicia, ca. 700, including a couch similar to a klíné. Original source: Reade, J. (1995). The symposion in ancient Mesopotamia: Archaeological evidence, Figure 18. In O. Murray and M. Tecuşan (Eds.), In Vino Veritas (pp. 35-56). London: British School at Rome. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 35: Drawing by Rudiger Splitter of a hypothetical reconstruction of the larnax of Kypselos, illustrating a man and a woman reclining on a klíné, while servants prepare food. Original source: Splitter, R. (2000). Die “Kypseloslade” in Olympia: Form, Funktion und Bildschmuck: Eine archäologische Rekonstruktion. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 36: The Eurytios krater, ca. 610 BCE. Paris, Louvre E 635, depicting Heracles and the family of Eurytios reclining on klínaí, with tables of food before them, accompanied by Eurytios’ daughter, who stands. Original source: Payne, H. (1931). Necrocorinthia: A study of Corinthian art in the Archaic period, Pl. 27. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 37: Detail of Eurytios krater [Fig. 36]: butchers prepare meat behind the reclining Heracles. Original course: Annette Rathje, pers. comm., 02.09.2013. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 38: Middle Corinthian column krater, ca. 595-570 BCE, illustrating men reclining on klínaí, with tables containing food and drink before them. Paris, Louvre E 634. Original source: Schäfer, A. (1997). Unterhaltung beim greichischen Symposion, Taf. 3-1. Mainz: von Zabern. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 39: Middle Corinthian column krater by the Athana Painter, ca. 595-570 BCE, illustrating men and women reclining together on klínaí, some holding drinking-bowls, with tables containing food and drink before them. Paris, Louvre E 629. Original source: Dentzer, J.-M. (1982). Le motif du banquet couché dans le proche-orient et le monde grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C. Paris: École Français de Rome. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 40: A fragmentary urn lid, ca. 630-620 BCE, from Tolle, depicting a reclining figure. Original source: Rathje, A. (2013). The banquet through Etruscan history, Figure 44.1. In J. Turfa, (Ed.), The Etruscan world (pp. 823-30). New York: Routledge. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].
Figure 41: A portion of the Murlo Frieze, ca. 600-575 BCE, illustrating men and women reclining on *klinai*, holding drinking-bowls, and playing music, attended by servants. Murlo, Antiquarium Comunale. Original source: Stopponi, S. (1985). *Case e Palazzi d’Etruria*, Tav. 3-407. Milano: Electa. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 42: Terracotta depicting reclined banqueting from Castellazzo di Poggioreale, Sicily, late-6th century BCE, illustrating a reclining figure probably holding a drinking-bowl. Museo Archeologico Regionale di Palermo, 21920/2. Original source: Gasparri, L. (2009). Greci e non-Greci in Sicilia. Note sulla coroplastica greca arcaica nelle necropoli indigene e puniche, Fig. 3. In F. Camia and S. Privitera (Eds.), *Obeloi: Contatti, scambi e valori nel Mediterraneo antico. Studi offerti a Nicola Parise* (pp. 153-74). Paestum; Athens: Pandemos. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 43: Attic red-figure volute krater, late-6th century BCE, found at Morgantina (Cittadella), illustrating men reclining, drinking, and playing music. Original source: Stillwell, R. (1959). Excavations at Serra Orlando 1958 Preliminary Report III. *AJA*, 63(2), 167-73, Fig. 24. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 44: Locations of evidence of reclined banqueting in the Mediterranean with dates in centuries BCE. Created using Google Earth.
Figure 45: Painting from Tomba della Scrofa Nera, Tarquinia, first quarter of 5th century BCE, depicting a man, who holds a drinking bowl, and a woman reclining on a *klinē* together, accompanied by a lyre-player and a man who stands. Original source: Moretti, M. (1974). *Etruskische Malerei in Tarquinia*, Fig. 65. Schauberg: Verlag M. DuMont. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 46: Attic black figure neck amphora by the Rycroft Painter, Toledo 1972.54, ca. 520-510 BCE, depicting the ransom of Hector with Achilles reclining. Original source: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/artifact?name=Toledo+1972.54&object=Vase. Accessed on 8 August 2013. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].

Figure 47: The Astarita krater in the Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco I, ca. 560 BCE. Menelaus, Odysseus, and Talthybius are greeted by the family of Antenor. Original source: http://www.christusrex.org/www1/vaticano/ETb1-Krater.jpg. Accessed on 31 July 2013. [This figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions].
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