I cannot in good faith recommend this book, however. It will be of little use to the specialists, and it is too fraught with mistakes to be used by beginners. There are, unfortunately, too many errors in the text to be given in full here. For this reason I will give examples of the various types of problems encountered in this book.

The use of bold face to indicate words to be treated is inconsistently used. In example 391 (p. 64), the first person preterit form a-še-ša-nu-nu-un is given in bold in a passage meant to exemplify third-person-singular preterit forms. In example 10 (p. 10), no form is given in bold, although kat-ta-wa-tar should be. Not all grammatical endings are given in the paradigms even though they may appear in the example passages. For example, in the preterit active paradigm in §2.2.1.3 (p. 60) and the accompanying subsection 4 (p. 65), the first-person-plural form -men is not mentioned, but in example 400 (p. 65) the form ku-in-nu-un-mi-en is given. There is nothing in the book to indicate to the beginner that this is an appropriate first-person-preterit form. There are also a large number of errors in the translations. Some of these can be attributed to problems in the translation of the work from German into English, such as translating wenn in oracle texts as “when” and not “if.” Others are simply incorrect translations of the Hittite. For example, the phrase za-a-u KUBABBAR in 106 (p. 24) is incorrectly translated as “the golden zaú” when it is actually “the silver zaú” (p. 147). The editing of the book is also subpar. Note, for example, that the text at the end of the introduction is for some reason not double spaced (p. 6). A further problem is one of fonts. The Akkadian dotted S is given as “!” in the transliterations: in the first example we have II-BAT given twice (p. 9).

Dennis Campbell

The University of Chicago


This book results from a colloquium organized by Sharon Stocker and James Wright at the 2002 meetings of the Archaeological Institute of America. Its eight accounts discuss the remains of feasting in the archaeological record and the written records of feasts both in Linear B and in Homer.

I start with the clear theoretical description of feasting in Louise Steel’s “A Goodly Feast . . . A Cup of Mellow Wine: Feasting in Bronze Age Cyprus” (chap. 7). She states that “food and drink are symbolically charged because they represent embodied material culture” (p. 161). Social codes are inscribed into diet, dietary restrictions, the preparation and choice of food, and the occasion.

Feasts differ from household dining in their choice of location, quantity and choice of food and drink, dining paraphernalia, and the identity of the participants. The author distinguishes between patron-sponsored feasts (“a single individual who asserts and maintains his elevated social position,” p. 163) and communal feasts whose participants contribute to the feast, potluck style. Communal feasts celebrate social cohesion and identity; patron-sponsored feasts operate more exclusively, since the patron invites the participants to join an elite group.

At Chalcolithic Kissonerga-Mosphilia in Cyprus a special area produced many bowls and the remains of hunted deer and male goats, whose preponderance may symbolize economic lavishness. In the Bronze Age, Anatolia introduces Cyprus to orchard husbandry, olives, grapes, and cattle; new types of monochrome bowls and spouted flasks respond to these innovations. In the thirteenth century, a building X at Kalavasos-Ayios Dhimitrios held the remains of a single feast deposit; the large number of restorable vessels, including Mycenaean imports, attests to another result of public feasts, breakage. Mycenaean drinking sets become more common in the thirteenth century (especially in tombs) and are displaced by Mycenaeanizing wares and metal drinking sets in the twelfth century.

Similar deposits are described by M. K. Dabney, P. Halstead, and P. Thomas, “Mycenaean Feasting on Tsoungiza at Ancient Nemea” (chap. 4). One such, dating to LH III A2 early, was only half-excavated, but it obviously held one or a few separate feasts. A large percentage of the pottery consisted of mendable bowls and unpainted jugs. The faunal remains included burned and butchered cattle, pig, sheep, and goat, with some dog, ass, and red deer.
Elisabetta Borgna’s “Aegean Feasting: A Minoan Perspective” (chap. 6) first describes feasting deposits at LM III B–C Phaistos. From the Acropolis Mediana, drinking sets include kraters and deep bowls, belonging to a community feast. From the Casa a ovest del Piazzale I comes a more complex deposit of vessels and implements belonging to a host-sponsored event.

In the Prepalatial period, paved areas (in front of tombs) provide arenas for feasting, but drinking sets come later (Kamares ware). The Neopalatial banquet halls in the palaces lead Borgna to posit that an “elite ideology of consumption was materialized according to a common and codified architectonic language” (p. 138). The gold drinking cups in the Shaft Graves are evidence of an exclusive elite whose “restricted attendance at feasts sanctioned bonds with powerful ancestors, legitimized powers, and strengthened ties among equals” (p. 143).

James C. Wright contributes “The Mycenaean Feast: An Introduction” (chap. 1) and “A Survey of Evidence for Feasting in Mycenaean Society” (chap. 2). In his introduction, Wright lays out theoretical concepts and practical aspects addressed in the other papers.

Although Wright acknowledges that “feasts occur throughout the year,” are “performed by every social group,” and celebrate “any event from birth to death” (p. 5), the papers here concern only political feasts that offer arenas for elite competition. Household and small community feasts are not considered, and “none of these papers . . . considers the role of gender in feasting” (p. 9). This is too bad since it is the general assumption that men feasted on the products of their hunt. Women appear, however, on sealstones and in frescoes as boar hunters (Tiryns fresco), archers (CMS XI 26), and sword wielders (Mycenaean Cult Center fresco and painted plaque, and CMS II 3.16).

Wright’s Survey (chap. 2) sets the stage for the evidence of elite feasting at Pylos, in the Linear B documents, and in the Homeric epics. First, feasting is “a social activity that binds a group through sharing,” cuisine, and etiquette (p. 14); yet it affirms status distinctions. We can identify feasts by their repeated and conventionalized leavings in the archaeological record. Cooking and drinking sets are easily noticed (figs. 2–7, tables 4–5).

Sharon Stocker and Jack Davis, in “Animal Sacrifice, Archives, and Feasting at the Palace of Nestor” (chap. 3) present six LH III (A-)B deposits excavated both in and outside the Pylos palace; these contained the select bones of adult bulls “probably representing a sacrifice to the gods” (p. 62). The bones, almost solely mandibles and leg joints (fig. 2), were burned.

From Archives Room 7, the burned bones of ten bulls were found with 20–22 miniature kyliles. The PY Ta tablets found nearby list twenty-two seats and eleven tables, as if diners are paired like those depicted in the Pylos Throne Room fresco and in the Knossos Campstoil fresco. Since the miniature kyliles are too small for use, they must have been “employed in ritual,” but it seems to me more likely that the kyliles were employed, instead, in the administrative process as tokens representing the diners and/or seats.

The authors conclude that the twenty-two diners might “have comprised representatives from the principal subcenters of the kingdom of Pylos” (p. 71, and n. 58). The bones of the ten bulls, however, might refer instead to the nine regional centers only in the Hither Province (PY Vm 20; cf. Homer’s nine cites of Pylos) and the palace itself. Stocker and Davis then go on to calculate the number of people fed by the ten bulls (ca. 100 kg of meat per bull): 1,000 people, roughly one-third the population of Pylos (assuming a territory of 15 ha and 200 people/ha; see n. 62).

Finally, the authors propose that the feast in question might have celebrated the wanax’s appointment of a new damokoro (a local official, Ta 711) (p. 73). Though this feast was special, the fresco program in the megaron assumes that such feasts were routine.

Thomas G. Palaima summarizes the evidence for “Sacrificial Feasting in the Linear B Documents” (chap. 5) with useful translations in appendixes. The Thebes Wu sealings record a first-stage contribution of forty-eight animals (sheep, goats, pigs, a Bronze Age suvetaurilia) from twenty-three individuals (the number of seal impressions). Sometimes the animals’ handlers are also named, apparently responsible for the animals being properly “finished” (o-po), fattened up for sacrifice (fodder is also recorded). The animals are brought from far away, including two sites in Euboia, presumably to be kept at
Thebes—compare the “animal pens” at Knossos (AJA 89 [1985]: 308–16).

Other texts (PY Ta series, Un 138) give last-stage information for presumably the same feast to which the excavated bones and miniature kylikes belong. The Ta tablets list furniture (the twenty-two seats and eleven tables), vessels, fire and cooking implements, and tools of sacrifice (two knives, two stunning axes, and two ceremonial bridles for leading the animals, obviously in pairs). The twenty-two seats comprise six thrones and sixteen stools. Since thrones (chairs with backs) and stools are paired, we can imagine sets of six tables with matching throne and stool seats and five tables with just two stools each.

Susan Sherratt’s “Feasting in Homeric Epic” (chap. 8) first describes how the Homeric heroes feast at every opportunity. While meat is always consumed, that could not reflect reality. The egalitarian nature of Homeric feasts is bound up in the terminology (daïs or “shared feast”), the seating arrangement (in a circle, with food passing from left to right), and the process of slaughter. Heroes barbeque their own meat. Thigh bones are cut out for the gods and burned—does this practice refer back to the accounting system in evidence at Pylos?

The words for feast (daïs, eîlapînê, and éranos) seem already archaic in Homer. Iron spits for barbequing are not much attested before the Early Iron Age. Bronze Age cauldrons could only have been used for boiling meats in stews; similarly, Homer’s cauldrons are used only to heat water for ablutions.

Sherratt discusses wine in detail, its grades, locales, and aging. Since unmixed wine produced drunkenness (bad), wine must always have been mixed (Homer mentions it twice). Women, however, such as Circe and Helen, mix wine with drugs. The clay kraters used for mixing wine and water begin in LH III A1, contemporaneously with the appearance of the Mycenaean palaces, reflecting “a deliberate inclusion of wider elements of society in official feasting” (p. 206). Finally, Sherratt discusses the epic singing in the epic songs themselves, mirroring “the contexts of their own performance” (p. 188).

The information in this book is a feast in itself. Its format is large and spacious, with wide margins for notes and copious bibliographies. And its low price means that all can afford a copy.

John G. Younger

University of Kansas


This important volume for textile history publishes papers from a two-day colloquium held in October 2001 at the Abegg-Stiftung.

Museums hold hundreds of thousands of single textile items and fragments from the ancient world with little information on where they came from. That means that textiles were usually studied as objects of art based on the piece itself. Once removed from their contexts dating was notoriously difficult. Most old finds were from graves, and the finders often cut pieces up to preserve only the most salable pieces rather than whole garments. The site of Karanis years ago produced finds from living areas, however, and indeed today more domestic sites are being excavated even though the finds are often from rubbish dumps. There is now much more of a realization that textiles are themselves archaeological objects as much as are pottery, coins, and other artifacts, which help in giving much more reliable dates.

The first section of the volume is devoted to funerary contexts. Cäcilia Fluck writes on textiles from Arsinoe, specifically Georg Schweinfurth’s finds from 1886. By that time the site had been largely plundered and demolished by sebakhîn digging for fertilizer. Schweinfurth’s interest in the textiles was scholarly and not commercial. A peculiarity of textiles from this site and the Fayûm seems to be garments with pile on the inside. C-14 analyses have given dates in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D.

W. Godlewski studies material from Al-Naqlûn. Various hermitages yielded fragments, mostly linen with some wool and occasionally camel or donkey hair. The hermitages were probably