AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY

THE JOURNAL OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Volume 110 • No. 4

October 2006

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY

THE JOURNAL OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

EDITORS

Naomi J. Norman, *University of Georgia*
Editor-in-Chief

Madeleine J. Donachie
Managing Editor

Julia Gaviria
Assistant Editor

John G. Younger
Editor, Book Reviews, *University of Kansas*

Elizabeth Bartman
Editor, Museum Reviews

ADVISORY BOARD

Susan E. Alcock
Brown University
John Bodel
Brown University
Larissa Bonfante
New York University
John F. Cherry
Brown University
Jack L. Davis
University of Cincinnati
Janet DeLaine
Oxford University
Natalie Boymel Kampen
Columbia University
Claire L. Lyons
Getty Research Institute
Andrew M.T. Moore
Rochester Institute of Technology
Ian Morris
Stanford University
Sarah P. Morris
University of California at Los Angeles
Robin Osborne
Cambridge University
Jeremy Rutter
Dartmouth College
Michele Renee Salzman
University of California at Riverside
Guy D.R. Sanders
American School of Classical Studies at Athens
Andrew Stewart
University of California at Berkeley
Lea Stirling
University of Manitoba
Cheryl A. Ward
Florida State University
Katherine Welch
Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
Greg Woolf
University of St. Andrews

Susan Kane, *ex officio*
Oberlin College

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Kimberly A. Berry, Vanessa Lord, Lauren Maurand, Kathryn Armstrong Peck, Jennifer Sacher, Miles M. Styer

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY, the journal of the Archaeological Institute of America, was founded in 1885; the second series was begun in 1897. Indices have been published for volumes 1–11 (1885–1896), for the second series, volumes 1–10 (1897–1906) and volumes 11–70 (1907–1966). The *Journal* is indexed in *ABS International Guide to Classical Studies*, *American Humanites Index*, *Anthropological Literature: An Index to Periodical Articles and Essays*, *Art Index*, *Arts & Humanities Citation Index*, *Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals*, *Book Review Index*, *Current Contents*, *Humanities Index*, and *Wilson Web*.

MANUSCRIPTS and all communications for the editors should be addressed to Professor Naomi J. Norman, Editor-in-Chief, *AJA*, Department of Classics, Park Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-6203, fax 706-542-8503, email nnorman@aia.bu.edu. The *American Journal of Archaeology* is devoted to the art and archaeology of ancient Europe and the Mediterranean world, including the Near East and Egypt, from prehistoric to Late Antique times. The attention of contributors is directed to "Editorial Policy, Instructions for Contributors, and Abbreviations," *AJA* 104 (2000) 3–24. Guidelines for *AJA* authors can also be found on the World Wide Web at www.ajaonline.org. Contributors are requested to include abstracts summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their articles. Manuscripts, including photocopies of illustrations, should be submitted in triplicate; original photographs, drawings, and plans should not be sent unless requested by the editors. In order to facilitate the peer-review process, all submissions should be prepared in such a way as to maintain anonymity of the author. As the official journal of the Archaeological Institute of America, *AJA* will not serve for the announcement or initial scholarly presentation of any object in a private or public collection acquired after 30 December 1973, unless its existence was documented before that date or it was legally exported from the country of origin. An exception may be made if, in the view of the Editor-in-Chief, the aim of the publication is to emphasize the loss of archaeological context. Reviews of exhibitions, catalogues, or publications that do not follow these guidelines should state that the exhibition or publication in question includes material without known archaeological findspot.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW should be sent to Professor John G. Younger, Editor, *AJA* Book Reviews, Classics Department, Wescoe Hall, 1445 Jayhawk Boulevard, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7590, tel. 785-864-3263, fax 785-864-5566, email jyounger@ku.edu. The following are excluded from review and should not be sent: offprints; reeditions, except those with great and significant changes; journal volumes, except the first in a new series; monographs of very small size and scope; and books dealing with the archaeology of the New World.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY (ISSN 0002-9114) is published four times a year in January, April, July, and October by the Archaeological Institute of America, located at Boston University, 656 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02215-2006, tel. 617-353-9361, fax 617-353-6550, email aia@aia.bu.edu. Subscriptions to the *American Journal of Archaeology* may be addressed to the Institute headquarters. A subscription request form can also be downloaded from the *AJA* Web site (www.ajaonline.org). An annual subscription is $75 (international, $95); the institutional rate is $250 (international, $290). Membership in the AIA, including a subscription to *AJA*, is $125 per year (C$192). Student membership is $73 (C$118.50); proof of full-time status is required. International subscriptions and memberships must be paid in U.S. dollars, by a check drawn on a bank in the U.S., by money order, or by credit card. Subscriptions are due 30 days prior to issue date. No replacement for nonreceipt of any issue of *AJA* will be honored after 90 days (180 days for international subscriptions) from the date of issuance of the fascicle in question. When corresponding about memberships or subscriptions, always give the account number, as shown on the mailing label or invoice. A microfilm edition of the *AJA*, beginning with volume 53 (1949), is issued after the completion of each printed volume. Subscriptions to the microfilm edition, which are available only to subscribers to the printed *AJA*, should be sent to National Archive Publishing Company (NAPC) (formerly ProQuest Information and Learning), 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Back issues of *AJA* and the *Index 1907–1966* may be ordered from the Archaeological Institute of America. Back issues of the *AJA* from 2000–present are available in nonprintable pdf format on the *AJA* Web site. Exchanged periodicals and correspondence relating to exchanges should be directed to the Archaeological Institute of America in Boston. Periodicals postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: send address changes to the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Archaeological Institute of America, located at Boston University, 656 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02215-2006.

The opinions expressed in the articles and book reviews published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* are those of the authors and not of the editors or of the Archaeological Institute of America.

Copyright © 2006 by the Archaeological Institute of America

The *American Journal of Archaeology* is composed in ITC New Baskerville
at the offices of the Archaeological Institute of America, located at Boston University.

The paper in this journal is acid-free and meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the
Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Attic Vases in Etruria: Another View on the Divine Banquet Cup by the Codrus Painter

AMALIA AVRAMIDOU

Abstract

The Codrus Painter was a distinct cup painter active during the period in which the Parthenon was constructed. His repertory includes episodes from Attic mythology, athletics, and Dionysiac scenes, while his style was clearly influenced by contemporary sculpture. His vases were not distributed to Athenian or even to the local Greek clientele but instead were exported to other prosperous Mediterranean centers in Etruria, southern Italy, and farther west. The fact that the majority of his cups were found abroad, especially in Etruria, raises questions concerning the role of Attic vases in Italy and particularly the Etruscan interpretation of scenes depicted on them. This article examines, as a case study, the Divine Banquet cup by the Codrus Painter to more fully understand the relationship between Attic vases and their Etruscan context. The deep-rooted Etruscan tradition of banqueting and its importance in funerary customs are key factors in the analysis of the cup.*

THE CODRUS PAINTER AND THE ETRUSCAN MARKET

The distribution of cups by the Codrus Painter[1] and his circle followed routes established during the sixth century B.C.E. by much earlier Attic potters and traders who supplied the Etruscan market with products from the Athenian Kerameikos. The so-called Tyrrhenian amphoras and the vases produced by Nikosthenes' workshop enjoyed great popularity among the Etruscans, leading Athenian potters and painters, as it has been argued,[2] to adopt shapes and decoration that would appeal to these purchasers.[3] Although the Etruscan market gradually lost interest in Attic vases during the second half of the fifth century B.C.E., it continued to be a significant export destination for Athenian red-figure pots.[4]

The repertory of the Codrus Painter includes several pieces depicting athletes and youths, departures of warriors, episodes from the Dionysiac cycle, and scenes either inspired from rare Athenian myths and heroes or rendered in a unique way.[5] One would be hesitant to pair the Codrus Painter with any of his contemporaries (e.g., the Eretria Painter[6]), since there are few female scenes and even fewer wedding themes. The mythological episodes of the Eretria Painter's work differ from those preferred by the Codrus Painter, even in Dionysiac scenes. Admittedly, both painters illustrate youths and athletes, but the Codrus Painter appears to have been more interested in the male athletic body than was his contemporary.

The majority of the vases produced by the Codrus Painter and his circle consist of cups, some skyphoi, and a few stemless plates. In contrast to the work of contemporary vase painters such as the Eretria Painter, the Calliope Painter, and the Marlay Painter, only two fragments by the Codrus Painter have been found in Greece.[7] The study of more than 100 vases attributed to the Codrus Painter and his circle established prov-

* An earlier version of this article was first presented at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens in 2005. I would like to thank the members of the School for their comments, the two anonymous readers for their suggestions, and H.A. Shapiro for his guidance

[1] The painter is named by Beazley after the depiction of the mythical Athenian king Kodros on one of his cups now in Bologna (*ARV*[2], 1268.1; *CVA* Bologna 1.3, 8–9, pls. 19–22; Carpenter et al. 1989, 356). His work is the topic of my dissertation (Avramidou 2005).

[2] Von Mehren 2001.

[3] Boardman 1979, 34–5; Arafat and Morgan 1994, 115–16; Osborne 2004b, 78–9.

[4] On the decline of the Etruscan market, see Arafat and Morgan 1994, 120–21.

[5] E.g., his name piece depicting Kodros (supra n. 1), Aigeus meeting Themis (*ARV*[2], 1269.5; Schefold 1988, 234, fig. 282 [3]), the birth of Erichthonios witnessed by legendary Athenian kings (*ARV*[2], 1268.2; *CVA* Berlin 3, 14, pl. 113).

[6] Lezzi-Hafter 1988.

[7] One of these is from the Acropolis (Athens National Museum Acropolis Coll. E98 [Graef and Langlotz 1909–1933, 47, pl. 39.526]); the other is from Brauron (Brauron Archaeological Museum A34 [*ARV*[2], 1689.39bis; *Paralipomena* 472; Kahil 1963, 17 (A34), pl. 10(2, 4)]). The Codrus Painter is a specialized cup painter, in contrast to the Eretria Painter, the Calliope Painter, and the Marlay Painter, who produced a variety of shapes and consequently exported their products to different markets in Greece and beyond. From a brief survey of the catalogued vases with known provenance in the *ARV*[2], one notices that the Eretria Painter targeted equally the Greek (20 vases) and the Etruscan (21 vases) markets, a pattern followed by the Marlay Painter, while the Calliope Painter was oriented more toward Greek clientele: 19 vases were found in Greece, 7 in Etruria.

American Journal of Archaeology 110 (2006) 565–79

enance for only 46 vases, 35 of which are credited to the Codrus Painter himself and 11 to distinguishable hands within his circle. Of the Codrus Painter's vases with a known provenance, 22 are from Etruria (plus four vases attributed to his circle), three are from Magna Graecia (plus three vases from his circle), five are from Spain, and six are from France and the Black Sea.[8] Thus, it appears that the Codrus Painter's vases were predominantly exported to Etruria and intentionally targeted two principal markets: Vulci and Spina. It is of further interest that his most impressive cups, in terms of decoration and size, were also purchased there. One of these vases, the Divine Banquet cup, was found in Vulci and is the focus of this examination.

THE DIVINE BANQUET CUP AND QUESTIONS OF ICONOGRAPHY

Now housed in the British Museum, the Divine Banquet cup by the Codrus Painter depicts five divine couples and two young males, all identified by inscriptions.[9] Side A (fig. 1) shows Amphitrite and Poseidon, Hera and Zeus, and Ganymede at the far right. A column between the two couches almost certainly indicates an interior setting.[10] Arafat suggests two different settings for each exterior side: one for Zeus and Poseidon, along with their wives; another for the two additional divine couples. However, when he discusses different scenes of divine libation that include the depiction of a column, he interprets it as a symbol of a temple or of Olympus.[11] The column may also stand for an *oikos,* indicating a household, since side A represents the two pairs of spouses par excellence.

All the gods, except for Ares on side B, are leaning on pillows, holding phialae, and carrying their attributes, while an empty table sits by every couch.[12] The Codrus Painter took great care to individualize the figures' hair and beards, presenting a variety of headbands, hairstyles, and wreaths made from ivy, laurel, and myrtle.[13] On the left, Amphitrite sits faithfully by Poseidon, who is easily recognizable by his trident, while she holds an alabastron and a pin to extract perfume from it.[14] To the right, Zeus carries his scepter and extends his right hand to uncover his wife's veil, while Ganymede stands by the couch observing the scene with a strainer in his hand.[15]

Side B (fig. 2) presents a similar arrangement, showing Aphrodite and Ares on the left, and Ariadne and Dionysos on the right. Ares has just set his phiale on the table, and a spear rests on his shoulder as he makes room for Aphrodite to sit on the couch. She stands in front of the table holding a pyxis[16] and is about to let her fine chiton loose from her shoulder. On the other couch, Dionysos reclines holding a thyrsos. He offers a phiale to Ariadne, who sits at the foot of the couch. Komos, as an infibulated satyr, stands near Dionysos' kline. He has lost almost all his untamed traits and stands as a counterpart to the servant of the Olympian gods, while providing at the same time a direct reference to mortal symposia and komos activities.[17]

Finally, in the tondo (fig. 3) Plouton holds an empty horn and offers a phiale to his wife, Persephone, who sits on his couch. Plouton's hair resembles that of Dionysos, and he wears an elaborate myrtle wreath on his head. Persephone makes a gesture similar to Ariadne's as she accepts the phiale. Her feet do not reach the ground, perhaps an indication of her young age.[18]

After examining the interior and exterior images of the vase, it becomes clear that the scenes should be treated together as a unifying whole rather than in isolation. The gods recline with their partners sitting by their feet at the end of the kline in the well-known custom of the symposion.[19] Carpenter considers Dio-

---

[8] Avramidou 2005.

[9] British Museum E82 (1847.9–9.6), from Vulci: 0.123 x 0.320 m (*ARV*[2], 1269.3; Carpenter et al. 1989, 356; Carpenter 1995, 145–63).

[10] Peschlow-Bindokat (1972, 60–157, esp. 100–1) places the exterior scenes on Olympus.

[11] Arafat 1990, 92–9.

[12] See Boardman (1990, 122–31) on klinai, their function, and origin.

[13] For wreaths and their function on symposia and ritual, see Tolles 1943, 28–9; Heilmeyer 2003, 296–99.

[14] Ridgway 1967, 307–8. See also the Tomba della Caccia e Pesca, Tarquinia, 540–30 B.C.E., depicting a servant extracting perfume from an alabastron with a pin (Ath. *Deipnosophistai* 2.46a–b, 3.101b–c).

[15] Simon (1953, 60) interprets the scene as a *hieros gamos.* For the unveiling of Hera and its allusion to privacy, see Arafat 1990, 99.

[16] Carpenter 1995, 145. For a close representation of a woman holding a similar pyxis, see the oinochoe by the Schuwalow Painter, 435–430 B.C.E. (*ARV*[2], 1207.28; Lezzi-Hafter 1976, 104, no. S13, pl. 87a).

[17] See *LIMC* 6:94–8 (esp. 96, no. 11, s.v. "Komos") for the Codrus Painter cup; for his infibulation, see Carpenter 1995, 147–48. See also Ath. *Deipnosophistai* (10.424–25) on wine pourers (*oinochooi*) of noble families.

[18] Schauenburg 1953, 38–72, esp. 42–3; Bemmann (1994, 20–8) on Plouton/Hades. First literary mention of the name "Plouton" is found in Soph. *Ant.* 1,200. See *LIMC* 4:367–94 (esp. 375, no. 44, s.v. "Hades") for the Codrus Painter cup. The myrtle was sacred to Persephone, and Plouton is often depicted with a myrtle wreath (see Mylonas 1960, 68–118, esp. 107–9). For more representations of Plouton and Persephone performing a libation, see Simon 1953, 67–78. On Persephone's young age, cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 343.

[19] For the origins of the reclined symposion, see Dentzer 1971, 215–58; 1982, 51–70. For assemblies of gods, see Knell 1965; Laurens and Lissarrague 1990, 53–74.

Fig. 1. Side A of the Divine Banquet cup by the Codrus Painter, showing Poseidon and Amphitrite, Zeus and Hera, and Ganymede (© Trustees of The British Museum).

Fig. 2. Side B of the Divine Banquet cup by the Codrus Painter, showing Ares and Aphrodite, Dionysos and Ariadne, and Komos (© Trustees of The British Museum).

Fig. 3. Tondo of the Divine Banquet cup by the Codrus Painter, showing Plouton and Persephone (© Trustees of The British Museum).

nysos the key to the overall interpretation of the cup. Of the works he mentions, the closest parallel to the Codrus Painter's arrangement of couples is a black-figure amphora in Boston.[20] He also points to its relation in imagery to the Totenmahl reliefs, as he shows the multiple functions of the symposion in weddings, funerals, and other gatherings. Ultimately, Carpenter concludes that the Codrus Painter chose to represent the divine couples banqueting because he wanted to surprise the viewer by applying a rather unusual motif in the iconography of the gods.[21]

Simon compares the Divine Banquet cup to the Roman Göttermahl reliefs and points out that in times of extreme danger or need, there were calls for help to the gods. It is possible that the cup represents the honors the Athenians bestowed upon the gods when they were seeking help and benevolence during the plague that struck in the early years of the Peloponnesian War. Simon interprets the Divine Banquet cup as a very special case of a *theoxenia*, a feast prepared by mortals to be joined by the deities they intended to honor.[22]

Although there are several black-figure and early red-figure representations of Dionysos and Ariadne together on a couch and many scenes of gods performing libations, the cup by the Codrus Painter deviates from this tradition.[23] A characteristic example of divine assemblies can be found on the stamnos by Hermonax, dated to 460 B.C.E., which depicts Zeus, Hera, and Plouton, among other deities.[24] The gods, however, are not presented as banqueters, and the notion of equality and uniformity is lacking. Even the psykter-krater by the Troilos Painter in New York, dated to 470 B.C.E. (fig. 4), should be viewed only as a transitional

[20] Carpenter 1995, 159, fig. 9.

[21] Carpenter 1995, 163. See also Boardman (1990, 122–31) on the impropriety of gods reclining on a kline.

[22] Simon 1969, 267–68, figs. 256–58.

[23] For libation scenes with Zeus, see Arafat 1990, 89–103. For the introduction of Herakles and divine libations, see Kunisch 1993, 11–12. For a symposion of Poseidon and Apollo, see Blatter 1975, 5. For an overview of representations of Dionysos and Ariadne on a couch, see Carpenter 1995, 154–60. For an example close to the Divine Banquet cup but dated to the mid fourth century B.C.E., see the red-figure *chous* from the Kerameikos (Knigge et al. 1978, 56–7, fig. 23).

[24] Bochum, Ruhr University, Kunstsammlungen S258; *ARV*^{2}, 484.18; Carpenter et al. 1989, 248; Bemmann 1994, 176, fig. 5[7].

link between representations of divine libations and illustrations of heroic funerary banquets honoring, for example, Achilles, Herakles, and other fourth-century heroes; it does not faithfully employ the motif of *theoxenia* as it was standardized in the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.E. Although it alludes to feasting, the collectivity of the gods is not emphasized as it is on the cup by the Codrus Painter, where there is uniformity of poses and arrangement. The scene on the Troilos Painter's psykter-krater clearly emphasizes Dionysos, since its continuous frieze presents two episodes with the wine god as protagonist: receiving a crown from Hera, and enjoying a banquet with Herakles and other deities.[25] The Codrus Painter cup breaks from this tradition by representing all the gods on equal footing and thus stressing their significance as a family. Such a notion of parity and balance of the gods matches the character of the Parthenon and the Nike Temple friezes.

The Divine Banquet cup is not a representation of *theoxenia*, an institution known mainly from epigraphical sources.[26] No food is being consumed and no elaborate klinai are being prepared, activities that usually anticipate any divine participation in a mortal feast. There are also no specific heroes being honored. Instead, the Divine Banquet cup presents us with a feast of democratic parity,[27] similar to those held in Athens, with the only difference being that wives are participating instead of hetairai. Zeus and Hera, the royal spouses, face Poseidon and Amphitrite, their marine counterparts.[28] These divine unions set an example for gods and mortals alike. However, the tondo represents a different married couple: Plouton and his abducted bride, Persephone. Side B introduces yet another aspect of divine marriage—that of the illegitimate couple. The god of war and strife is notorious for his affair with the wife of Hephaistos.[29] Next, Dionysos and his mortal wife, Ariadne, allude to an "improper" union, since their bond was the result of

Fig. 4. Psykter-krater by the Troilos Painter, Metropolitan Museum of Art 1986.11.12 (© The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

Theseus' abandonment of his bride on Naxos.[30] Overall, the cup epitomizes all sorts of marriages, and the inclusion of Ganymede and Komos may imply other types of unions as well.

Lissarrague, among other scholars, maintains that the phiale is not the common drinking vessel at symposia but rather indicates the divine or heroic nature of the beholder.[31] If true, then one wonders whether the gods are indeed pouring a libation and, if so, to whom. It is preferable to endorse the suggestion of Laurens, who views the libation as a generic motif essential in several scenes, including the banquet, equal in meaning and significance to the *dexiosis* motif. She interprets it as a symbol of pact, peace, and solidarity among the Olympian family.[32]

---

[25] On the psykter-krater by the Troilos Painter, see Wolf 1993, 28–9, no. 23, figs. 54, 55; Carpenter 1995, 160–61; 1997, pl. 27b. For the full publication of the psykter-krater, see Padgett 2002, 249–66, pls. 67–70a–b.

[26] Jameson 1994, 35–57.

[27] The same idea is found in, among other sources, Plut. *Banquet of Seven Sages* (11.154c): "conversation like wine [. . .] should be equally shared among all and belong to them in-common."

[28] RE 1:963–67, s.v. "Poseidon." According to a different tradition, Poseidon abducted Amphitrite on the island of Naxos (Eust. *Od.* 3.91.1458, line 40), thus bringing together the two stories of Dionysos and Ariadne and Plouton and Persphone.

[29] *LIMC* 2:2–5, 123–25, s.v. "Aphrodite." According to the Boeotian tradition, Aphrodite and Ares were married and Harmonia was their daughter, but Homer clearly presents them as lovers.

[30] For a brief discussion on the iconography of Dionysos–Ariadne and the contribution of the Codrus Painter, see Carpenter 1995, 154–60. The union of Dionysos and Ariadne recalls the custom of the closest male relative marrying the wife of the deceased family member; this was common practice but not the standard marriage procedure.

[31] Lissarrague 1995, 132 n. 22. It is common for Dionysos to fulfill the libation himself (see Lissarrague 1995, 134 n. 34). For the act of libation, the instruments used, and the way it is performed, see Lissarrague 1985, 3–16.

[32] See Laurens (1985, 35–59), who argues against Simon 1953, 7–9. Veyne (1990, 17–30) follows the same line of thought as Laurens. Machaira (2000, 339–44) discusses votive reliefs and explains that the divine libations were a remainder from the chthonic origin of the gods.

The libation delimits the divine world from that of the mortals and unites the participants.[33] On the Divine Banquet cup, the gods follow a pattern (recognizable by men) to create unity against Fate. The liminal, almighty Plouton is both among and apart from them by appearing in the tondo of the cup. Wine is necessary for all occasions: the libation, the banquet, and the trip to the Underworld.[34]

Thus, when viewing the Divine Banquet cup, our attention is drawn to two gods: Plouton and Dionysos. All male gods on the cup have certain chthonic aspects. For example, Plouton is interchangeably known as *Allos Zeus* or *Zeus Chthonios*; Poseidon, the god of earthquakes, is often characterized as Hades; Ares is called *Ther(e)itas*; and Dionysos' powers often extend to the Underworld as Dionysos Zagreus.[35] In Etruria, Dionysos was identified with Fufluns, a nature divinity with chthonic associations. The cult of Fufluns Pachies (Dionysos Bacchus) in Vulci, findspot of the Divine Banquet cup, is well attested in the fifth century B.C.E.[36]

The sixth-century frieze from Poggio Civitate (Murlo) represents an interesting assembly of gods, which could elucidate further the role of Dionysos as a chthonic deity in Etruria. According to Gantz, one of the frieze plaques depicts two divine triads: Zeus, Athena, and Hera, and Demeter, Dionysos, and Persephone, sitting one next to the other. Hermes and Iris stand at the top of each group.[37] The identification of Dionysos as a complement to Persephone and Demeter strengthens his chthonic character and associates him with a Hades-type figure. The rare appearance of Plouton/Hades in Greek art may be partially responsible for his absence from Etruscan art of the Archaic and Classical periods. If this is the case, then the Divine Banquet cup should be viewed as an important source of imagery for perhaps the last god of the Greek pantheon to be adopted by the Etruscans.

ICONOGRAPHY OF THE DIVINE BANQUET CUP VS. OTHER WORKS OF ART

The Divine Banquet cup shows distinct similarities with the so-called Totenmahl reliefs found in Athens and elsewhere in the Greek world, with reliefs and statue-urns from Chiusi (fig. 5), and with other material from both Etruria and Asia Minor.[38] Dentzer explored the origins and the representation of the reclined banquet and concluded that this practice spread to Greece and Etruria around 600 B.C.E.[39] The Greeks gave a new twist to the motif of the reclining banqueter by formalizing a three-figure pattern: the reclining man, a woman usually seated on a throne, and a youth assisting with the wine. Originally, this type of funerary banquet was used mainly for representations of heroes, and only later did it expand into the iconography of the heroized dead. In the Classical period, it had both a votive function (as is often attested by an inscription) and a funerary role.[40]

The production peak of the Totenmahl reliefs was ca. 400 B.C.E., and by the fourth century B.C.E. they had spread all over the Greek world. The chthonic, heroic character of the reliefs is often illustrated by the addition of a horse's head and a snake or a dog near the reclining figure, while a resemblance with the iconography of Asklepios clearly springs forth, such as on the relief from Piraeus dated to ca. 400 B.C.E. (fig. 6).

The Totenmahl reliefs prove that the symposion played a central part in the iconography of the dead.[41] Murray examined the opposition between death and the symposion in the Greek world, while focusing on the social impact that a death has on the community. He concluded that the Totenmahl reliefs simultaneously depict the feast of the heroized dead and reflect the beliefs of a sect regarding life in the Elysian Fields.[42] The single and group symposia in

---

[33] Lissarrague 1995, 139–41, 144.

[34] Particularly interesting for this argument is the article by Metzger (1944–1945, 296–339, esp. 314–23) in which he discusses the different aspects of Dionysos as a god of vegetation, of the Underworld, and of the Eleusinian cult. He also mentions literary sources that support the confusion of Dionysos and Hades and how this notion of an Infernal Dionysos existed already, not only in the Orphic Magna Graecia but also in Athens, during the mid fifth century B.C.E.

[35] On Zeus: RE, 993, 997, 1001, s.v. "Pluton"; see also a marble votive relief of Zeus Epiteleios, rendered in the iconography of Plouton (*LIMC* 8:341, no. 210, s.v. "Zeus"). For the chthonic aspect of Ares, see Harrison 1891, 350–55; RE, 1003, s.v. "Pluton." On Poseidon and Hades: RE, 990–1027, s.v. "Pluton," esp. 1001–3, for the syncretisms; RE, 509, s.v. "Poseidon." Also note that one of the entrances to Hades was thought to be near the sanctuary of Poseidon at Hippeios Kolonos (Paus. 1.30.4; Soph. *OC* 1589). On Dionysos/Hades, see RE, 993, 996, 1002–3, s.v. "Pluton"; *LIMC* 3:417–18, s.v. "Dionysos."

[36] *LIMC* 3:531–40, s.v. "Dionysos/Fufluns," with bibliography. On Fufluns/Dionysos and Infernal Etruscan deities in relation to Attic vase painting, see Isler-Kerényi 2003, 43–4.

[37] Gantz 1971, 13–22. I acknowledge the early date of the plaque and the fact that the Murlo gods are sitting and not reclining in pairs as on the Codrus Painter cup, but I believe that it is worth bringing it into discussion.

[38] E.g., the pedimental sculpture from Sardis and the Satrap Sarcophagus discussed by Hanfmann 1974, 289–302.

[39] Dentzer 1971, 217–40; 1982, 21–70, 301–428.

[40] Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 62–3; Dentzer 1982, 453–558.

[41] The deceased were also thought to partake in sympotic events during the Genesia and Anthesteria (Murray 1988, 251).

[42] On death and the symposion, see Murray (1988, 239–57) and his comments on the choral lyric fragment: "Then he will lie in the deep-rooted earth/and share no more in the symposion, the lyre/and the sweet cry of the flutes" (240). See also

Fig. 5. Relief with a banquet scene, ca. 460 B.C.E. (Jannot 1984, no. 15, fig. 180).

Etruria probably originate from similar beliefs about the Afterlife.[43]

Thönges-Stringaris rightly points out that the representation of the women sitting by the feet of the gods, as we see on the Divine Banquet cup, appears at a later date on relief sculpture. In this sense, one is led to assume that either the Codrus Painter is "ahead of his time"[44] or the Totenmahl motif originates not from a preexisting work of sculpture but perhaps from a lost wall painting.[45]

Mitropoulou states that Attic votive banquet reliefs appear ca. 450 B.C.E., but they are quite rare.[46] Perhaps the closest parallel to the scene depicted on the Divine Banquet cup is a Totenmahl relief from Piraeus that Dentzer dates ca. 420 B.C.E. (fig. 7).[47] It depicts a divine/heroic couple sharing a kline and a table with fruit in front of them. This relief evidences an iconographic motif that might not have been popular but was not unknown in Athens in the second half of the fifth century. Thus, the Divine Banquet cup does not stand isolated, since it appears to have incorporated an arrangement of divine couples used mainly for the (cult) representations of heroic figures. It seems the Codrus Painter wanted to stress the chthonic aspect of the divine/heroic banquet motif by representing the divine couples in the company of Persephone and Hades. Although he created an assembly of gods similar to that found on the Parthenon frieze,[48] the inclusion of Persephone in this gathering meant that the iconographical frame had to change. The best way to combine the Olympians with the gods of the Underworld seems to have been the heroic banquet. As a result, the Divine Banquet cup is closer to the iconographical tradition of many fifth-century B.C.E. votive banquet reliefs, where *oinochooi* and nude youths are often depicted, but woshippers are not.

excerpts from *Alkmaionis* (252–55), an anonymous epic poem written before Thucydides: "he laid down the corpses . . . and set before them a rich feast and cups as well, and placed crowns on their heads." For more sources regarding the Orient and the Greeks, see Dentzer 1971, 226–27, 244–45, respectively; for the banquet motif in art, see Dentzer 1982, 71–154; for drinking, feasting, and esp. death, see Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 62–8.

[43] For a comparison of the one-man symposion found in Etruria and the East, see Dentzer 1971, 231–32. Rathje (1994, 95–9) stresses the role of the Phoenicians in transporting not only merchandise but also banquet customs and other ideas to Etruria from the East. For a recent treatment of the "single-symposiasts," see Fehr 2003, 23–37.

[44] Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 18; Dentzer 1971, 253–58; 1982, 121–22.

[45] This suggestion will be pursued further by the author elsewhere. For the relation between vase painting, sculpture, and monumental painting, see de Cesare 1997.

[46] Mitropoulou 1977, 117–20.

[47] Dentzer 1982, 336–37, fig. 475. Cf. also Dionysos and Tragoedia on a kline accompanied by actors on the votive relief from Piraeus, ca. 420–400 B.C.E. (Kaltsas 2002, 138, no. 264 [Athens NM inv. 1500]).

[48] Berger 1996, 135–36, 140 (E V–VI). Note that Amphitrite, Ariadne, Plouton, and Ganymede were not depicted on the Parthenon frieze, nor was Persephone, whose absence is thought to be the cause of Demeter's grief (Simon 1982, 139).

Fig. 6. Totenmahl relief from the Asklepieion in Piraeus, ca. 400 B.C.E. (Kaltsas 2002, 136, no. 261).

The Parthenon frieze was a public monument, a collective dedication to Athena, while the Divine Banquet cup was a gift to the gods on a more personal level. The Codrus Painter combined the heroic banquet motif with the Parthenon's monumentalized version of divine assemblies.[49] The point of interest on the frieze was the peplos scene, which takes place in the center, while on the Codrus Painter's cup the focus lies on the couple depicted in the tondo, Plouton and Persephone, thus enhancing the theme of marriage and death seen throughout the cup.

GREEKS, ETRUSCANS, AND THE SYMPOSION

In the first half of the seventh century B.C.E., the custom of banqueting appears to have been only partially known in Etruria. Gradually, in the sixth century, imported Greek vases, especially Corinthian, provided the model for representing a Greek symposion, where there is an almost exclusive presence of men reveling, while illustrations of couples banqueting appear only ca. 530–510 B.C.E.[50]

The presence of women in symposia starts ca. 500 B.C.E., and they are almost always dressed, contrary to the male servants who are nude, perhaps as a symbol of the heroization of the dead. Women (and men) on wall paintings often represent members of the extended family.[51] Bonfante rightly points out the contrast of the Etruscan noble families, where the women enjoyed a prominent public life, with both the male-dominated Greek democracy and the later Roman tradition of the paterfamilias.[52] A much stronger point is made by Lewis, who suggests that the presence of women in Attic sympotic scenes was in fact customer-driven, attempting to satisfy the requests of Etruscan clients and represent their activities on clay.[53]

Several wall paintings from Etruscan tombs depict banquet scenes that may be compared stylistically to the divine banquet of the Codrus Painter's cup.[54]

[49] The arrangement of the divine couples on the circular area of the cup may also be used to support the idea that the gods on the frieze actually sit in a circle (Neils 1999, 6–20; 2001, 64, fig. 49).

[50] Dentzer 1971, 247–50; Bonfante 1986, 34–43; Tuck 1994.

[51] Ath. *Deipnosophistai* 1.23d (citing Arist.), 12.515a–b, 517 d–f (FGH 115F204); Small 1974, 85–94.

[52] Bonfante 1986, 234.

[53] Lewis 2003, 188–90. For a discussion on the significance of female representations on Attic vases found in Etruria, see Lewis 1997, esp. 146–47.

[54] Based on Steingräber (1986), 24% of 177 Etruscan tombs dating from the late sixth to the end of the fourth century B.C.E. depict banquet scenes in the strict sense (i.e., excluding

There are 200 known Etruscan painted tombs, mainly in Tarquinia and Chiusi, dating from the Archaic through Hellenistic periods and thought to belong to the restricted elite of a timocratic society.[55] The Tomba del Triclinio (470 B.C.E.) is a good parallel, although an even better example, contemporary to the Divine Banquet cup, comes from the Tomba della Nave in Tarquinia (ca. 440–400 B.C.E.). One wall of the tomb depicts a banquet scene with two couples sharing couches, a *citharode*, and youths assisting with wine; another shows a ship unloading goods and vases, docked probably at Gravisca, the port of Tarquinia.[56]

Literary sources and archaeological evidence show that Etruscan and Greek funerary customs were quite different. Even though there are admittedly very few scenes of prothesis and processions of the dead from the High Classical period, such scenes are conspicuously absent throughout all periods of Etruscan art, which is characterized instead by a proliferation of banquet scenes and events in the presence or absence of the deceased.[57] Several banquet scenes, such as the relief plaques from Poggio Civitate and the reliefs from Chiusi, dated from the end of the sixth to mid fifth century, are comparable to the Codrus Painter's cup, even though they pre-date it.[58] The symposia illustrated on contemporary Greek cups provided the basic guidelines for the Etruscan artists, who enriched their representations of banquets with details more familiar to them, such as the lebes underneath the kline, the local dress code, and the presence of women.[59] The exact place of the banquet is never indicated, but usually the existence of a couch and a column favors an interior space. Jannot goes so far as to accept the possibility of banqueting inside the tomb or in a tent near the entrance, based on some illustrations of dining on mattresses. The banquet probably took place the very day of the burial, and it differed from the *perideipnon* of mainland Greece, which was prepared in the house of the deceased.[60]

Fig. 7. Totenmahl relief in Piraeus, ca. 420 B.C.E. (Dentzer 1982, 336–37, fig. 475).

---

dance, music, and other activities that follow a banquet). More than half of these tombs (60%) come from Tarquinia, 75% of them represent couples banqueting, 55% are dated between the mid fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.E.

[55] See Fehr (1971) on Tomba dei Vasi Dipinti, 500 B.C.E. (pp. 353–54), Tomba del Vecchio, 500 B.C.E. (355), Tomba 3098, 500 B.C.E. (368), Tomba del Triclinio, 470 B.C.E. (352), Tomba dell Orco II, 325–300 B.C.E. (329–30). For the last, see also Torelli 1987, 161–78; Small 1994, 34–58. For vessel types found in Etruscan tombs, see Reusser 2002, 1:192–202.

[56] Reusser 2002, 2:102. Steingräber (1986, 327–28, no. 9, pls. 118–20) dates it to the late fifth century, while Spivey (1991, 135–37) prefers ca. 450 B.C.E. See Leighton (2004, 111–12, fig. 47) with a general dating of 440–400 B.C.E.

[57] These representations are often thought to have been made to cast doubts on death itself and to lighten up the heavy atmosphere (de Marinis 1961, 113–17, 119–23; Bonfante 1986, 232–75). Shapiro (2000, 330–36) discusses the Attic and Etruscan banquet and funerary customs and points out that representations of banquets on the ground are "an Athenian adaptation to the customs of the Etruscan clientele."

[58] See Jannot (1984, esp. 420–42) for banquet scenes and a good summary of the subject. See also the plaques from Poggio Civitate (Murlo), dated ca. 575–550 B.C.E. (Small 1971).

[59] Reusser (2002, 1:23–30) states that little is known about the agora centers in Etruria. On the question of how much of Athenian iconography was understood by the Etruscans, the demand for Attic vases, and the ability of the Etruscans to adapt the Greek myths to their own beliefs and customs, see Osborne 2001, 277–95, esp. 288–92. On the value (if any) of the Greek sympotic pottery found in Etruscan tombs, see Gill and Vickers 1990, 1–30, esp. 29–30; 1994; 1995, 225–49. For the counterargument, see Spivey 1991, 134–35. Lewis (2003, 175–92) deals with different iconographical case studies, including sympotic scenes, to demonstrate the need to examine the Attic vases primarily within their Etruscan context and less in relation to social and/or political changes in Athens.

[60] In Greece the *perideipnon* took place in the tomb during the Geometric period, but from the Archaic and Classical times, the feast was organized in the house of the deceased. There is, however, evidence for large-scale meals during the Theseia in the fourth century, which took the form of a funerary meal. In the Tomba del Letto Funebre in Tarquinia, the deceased reclines on a kline as if participating in the banquet with the rest of the relatives, while the Tomba della Ciaia strengthens the suggestion that the reliefs of Chiusi depict real scenes in immediate connection to funerary ceremonies of that area. For illustrations of Tomba del Letto Funebre, see Steingräber 1986, 318–19, no. 82, pl. 110[2]; of Tomba della Ciaia, 269–70, no. 18.

Funerary banquets were common to the Etruscans, and the Divine Banquet cup was probably interpreted as funerary once it found its way to Etruria. The deceased, as a new Persephone, enjoyed the wine libation of his/her family, such as the scene depicted on the cup. Similar beliefs that the gods accompany the deceased may be deduced from the decoration of Etruscan cistae and mirrors, for example the bronze mirror in Brussels showing Fufluns, Athena, and Artemis, who is carrying a soul.[61] According to Etruscan customs, wives accompanied their husbands at the funerary banquets that took place at the tomb. The illustration of such an activity helped in perpetuating it. Also, the associations of Dionysos with fertility, death, and immortality are prominent in the rituals of his *thiasoi*.[62] Their gatherings recall assemblies of gods, such as those depicted in vase painting, when they welcome a new member in the Olympian family.[63] The Divine Banquet cup would have provided comfort for the deceased and his relatives by assuring them that he would be well received in the Underworld, as the divine family rejoices with Persephone.

Apart from the Etruscan buyer, the Greek viewer would have reached a similar conclusion. According to Artemidorus (*Oneirocritica* 5.82.7), the Greeks believed that the deceased was not only present during the *perideipnon* but actually hosting it. The relatives wearing garlands delivered eulogies or recited songs in honor of the dead member of their community. The living and the dead took part in this banquet for one last time, unlike at the meals that were prepared at the tomb, which the living did not attend for fear of placing themselves under the spell of the Underworld spirits. With the end of the *perideipnon*, the period of uncertainty about the deceased's soul ceased and Hades accepted him.[64]

The role of the family and the notion of its reunion in the Afterlife are found for the first time in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (1555), where Clytaimnestra describes how her husband will be received by his daughter Iphigeneia in Hades. It is interesting to note that the Greek word for funeral, *kedeia,* was used to define both an alliance and a connection by marriage. Tragedy may also help explain the figure of Komos on the Codrus Painter's cup, since this word signifies not only revelry but also formal lamentation.[65] The Divine Banquet cup may be better explained as the mourning of the family for a deceased member.

ATTIC VASES IN ETRURIA: CONTEXT AND USE

In modern literature, the discussion about the use of Attic vases by the Etruscans falls into four categories: (1) the traditional assessment of Beazley that the Etruscans did not have any control over the themes decorating Attic vases;[66] (2) an alternative viewpoint, best represented by Arafat and Morgan, that Athens and Etruria were parallel interacting systems, not core and periphery;[67] (3) the argument of Spivey, who interprets the Attic vases as being fully integrated in their new context;[68] and (4) the radical approach of Lewis, who states that the major production of Attic vases was strongly influenced by Italian markets (in both Etruria and Magna Graecia) regarding not only their shape but also their iconography.[69]

The best way to understand the function of Attic vases in both cultures, Greek and Etruscan, is an approach that will neither overemphasize the Etruscan factor nor underestimate it. Isler-Kerényi favors such a double perspective and examines the Attic vases as a system that can be used by two diverse societies.[70] Reusser's *neues Denkmodell* supplements and supports this approach. He emphasizes the importance of the shapes of vases imported in Etruria, but he also accepts that decoration played a significant part. Admittedly, the banquet was important to Etruscans, but it was fundamentally different from the Athenian symposion, which explains the adaptation of Attic vases to local Etruscan practices.[71] The prevailing role of Attic vases

---

[61] In the Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, Brussels (Bonfante 1986, 244, fig. viii[17]).

[62] See Farnell (1921, 373–402) and a passage from Pl. *Resp.* (400C), where the Orphics are said to persuade individuals and communities that they can provide purgation of the soul of the deceased as well as of the living by means of sacrifice and feasts.

[63] E.g., Robertson 1991, 75–6, 92–3. An early Etruscan example of divine gathering comes from Poggio Civitate (Murlo) (Gantz 1971).

[64] Garland 1985, 36–41, 146.

[65] Arist. *Poet.* 1452b.18.

[66] Beazley 1989, 62: "It seems that neither at Spina nor anywhere else did the taste of the local customers influence the range of subjects. The clients of the Athenian Kerameikos, the peoples overseas, Greek and Barbarian, did not dictate the subjects: they admired and accepted." See also Osborne (2004a, 41–54), who states that Athenian painters did not bother "second-guessing the tastes or needs of the export market" (52).

[67] Arafat and Morgan 1994, 120; see Marconi (2004, 27–40), who proposes a "pluralistic approach to the interpretation of Attic vases" (40).

[68] Spivey 1991.

[69] Lewis 2003.

[70] Isler-Kerényi 2003, 40–7. See also Boardman (2001, esp. 164, 226, 236), where he maintains that the Greek potters were more concerned with producing a desirable shape than with targeting the Etruscan market with scenes chosen deliberately for the Etruscan buyer.

[71] Reusser 2002, 1:204–6.

in Etruria is usually related to the way the elite used them to display their elevated status. Their tendency to favor vases illustrating Homeric heroes, Herakles, and other prominent figures functioned as a pattern that separated them from the commoners, the same way that knowledge of Greek mythology was deemed exclusive to the upper class.[72]

Apart from vases with mythological representations that were exported to Etruria, there are hundreds of Attic vases depicting youths, athletes, and scenes from everyday life. The Etruscans borrowed several customs from the Greeks, including the organization of athletic events. This is well illustrated in a number of monuments, such as the funerary frescoes from Tarquinia and the relief limestone bases with athletes from Chiusi. In some cases the games were performed by professional athletes, while in others by slaves, proving that the social ideal supporting the Greek institution of the palaestra was not blindly copied by the Etruscans. Panathenaic amphoras and other vases with athletic scenes were interpreted through a different prism once they were adopted in an Etruscan environment. They obtained a funerary character, since games were offered to the deceased—either literally or symbolically—following the Etruscan tradition.[73]

ATTIC VASES AND THE ETRUSCAN SYMPOSION (OF THE ELITE?)

Greek and particularly Attic vases are often found in Etruscan tombs, but their role is not exclusively funerary, since there is evidence that Attic vases were used in daily life before being put in graves.[74] Studies on food remains from Etruscan tombs shed some light on the symbolic and ritual value of the funerary symposion.[75] The food offered and consumed during the banquet played an important role as a status symbol. Throughout history, wine remains a nutritious element of the human diet and the ultimate symbol of prosperity in the world of both the living and the dead.[76] Drinking cups, gaming pieces, and food are placed in the hands of the deceased, thus making them eternally active members of the group of banqueters.[77]

It is often thought that the symposion in Etruria had a principal role in upper-class ceremonies, which followed the Greek example of public meals and the more aristocratic private dinners. Some scholars prefer to see the symposion as basically a social ritual that becomes sacred only when it is held in honor of the dead or when the individuals offer libations to the gods. Our perception of the banquet as an emblem of the aristocratic life may be erroneous, since most information comes from funerary contexts.[78]

In an attempt to clarify the situation, Reusser reexamined the issue of Attic pottery as status symbol based primarily on archeological evidence. He concluded that Attic vases were not luxury items but rather “desirable things for comfort or enjoyment, but not indispensable.”[79] Literary sources relate Attic vases to imports by the Etruscan elite, but as Reusser has proven, most of these tombs are not aristocratic; they belong to a wide class of colonists, traders, city dwellers, and soldiers (*Mittelschicht*). Therefore, the Attic vases were not used exclusively by the aristocrats but also by the upper and middle classes.[80]

THE POWER OF THE IMAGE: INTERPRETING THE VASES

The Etruscan iconography of the Afterlife is often influenced by Attic prototypes, yet it remains distinct from them, as is the case of the classical statue urns from Chiusi that show the deceased, his wife, and a youth, or the winged figure (Vanth), guiding him to the Afterlife, and the stone group from Chianciano, Chiusi (460–440 B.C.E.), with a similar composition.[81] A multileveled reading of vase paintings may also serve as proof of the new role that figured vases undertook in an Etruscan environment. For example, a red-figure cup from a site near the river Po (Le Balone, Tomb I) dates to ca. 450 B.C.E. and shows in the tondo a seated Hades with a horn of plenty and a phiale in front of an altar. On each exterior side, a Nike is flying, holding a phiale and an egg. An Etruscan viewer would probably read this scene in relation to death and afterlife, interpreting Hades as Aita, and Nike as

[72] Spivey 1991, 145–46; Arafat and Morgan 1994, 117: “Greek mythology was different from Etruscan, but it was meaningful and readily adaptable to Etruscan themes.”

[73] Bonfante 1986, 72–3; Spivey 1991, 143–44.

[74] Reusser (2002, 1:29–45, 48–122) uses new data from Etruscan sanctuaries and tombs to invert the current statistics, while Spivey (1991, 132–33, 149) argues that, despite all reservations, the statistics will not change greatly and that the Etruscan tombs will continue to be the main source of Greek vases. The same opinion is expressed by Lewis 2003, 177–78.

[75] Bertani 1995, 41–64.

[76] Amouretti 1992, 69–75.

[77] Nilsson 1999, 7–23.

[78] Torelli 1989, 301–10. On similar ground, see Dentzer 1971, 250–58; Schmitt-Pantel 1992, 49–53; Pontradolfo 1995, 176–95; Rathje 1995, 167–75. See also Dentzer (1982, 429–52) on the social role of the symposion in the Greek world.

[79] Reusser 2002, 1:119.

[80] Reusser 2002, 1:119–23. Cf. evidence from the late sixth-century B.C.E. Orvieto, a city with an “urban demos,” a middle class based on craftsmen and tradesmen, often of foreign origin, as the excavations show (Bonfante 1986, 55).

[81] Bonfante 1986, 109, fig. iv[19].

Vanth, while for a non-Etruscan viewer it would have a less symbolic value.[82]

Massa-Pairault elaborates further on this approach, maintaining that the Greek myths are polysemantic and may be used by other societies (non-Greek poleis) to promote their own system of ideology and iconography. For example, the illustration of a typical Athenian myth, such as the birth of Erichthonios, may have a "local" function in legitimizing the succession of power within the Etruscan community.[83] Alternatively, one may suggest an assimilation of the Athenian divine child to an Etruscan deity, particularly the demon Tages. It would be interesting to examine if the depiction of marine creatures similar to Triton, often found in funerary contexts, is related to Etruscan beliefs of the Afterlife.[84]

The handshake and its symbolic value in Greek and Etruscan art was examined by Davies, who concluded that the *dexiosis* motif is not found exclusively in a funerary context but is employed on a number of conventional scenes as a symbol of parting, death, and, perhaps, reunion with ancestors in the Underworld, as well as marriage. From the mid fifth century B.C.E., the motif of the handshake applies more frequently to mortals and starts to convey a political meaning as a symbol of a pact or an agreement (e.g., on decrees). In Etruria the handshake is used mainly in scenes with officials or with deceased. It did not follow the development of the *dexiosis* motif in Greek classical art and its polysemantic value; instead, it maintained a more strict symbolic relation with beliefs about the Afterlife.[85]

CONCLUSION

The Etruscans came in contact with the Greeks at the end of the eighth century B.C.E., and they accepted their myths, trends, and customs. This explains their adoption of Greek myths and practices such as the symposion.[86] The banquet and, therefore, the pottery involved in it were vital parts of the Etruscan culture. The Etruscans were selective about the Greek models that they followed.[87] The best indication of this is the development of the Etruscan funerary symposion, which may have started as a reflection of a custom sprung from Greek (high) society but was adapted to local needs and traditions. The idea that sympotic pottery in Etruria was considered less precious and less significant than in Greece is, in my opinion, mistaken.

Reusser showed that Athenian potters were aware of Etruscan preferences and eager to satisfy the local taste.[88] Since the potters produced shapes to the Etruscan liking, and not according to any Oriental, Egyptian, or Cypriot models, it is possible that Athenian painters, including the Codrus Painter and his circle, aspired to the same profitable patterns. This does not mean that there was a specific attempt to represent a particular Etruscan motif or deity; there was instead a desire to evoke an Etruscan interpretation of otherwise regular Greek subjects. However, there are vases produced specifically for the Etruscan market, such as the Perizoma group and certain komos scenes, which are used by some scholars as the exception proving the rule that wants the Athenians little, if at all, preoccupied with the favorite Etruscan subjects of vase paintings.[89]

The Divine Banquet cup by the Codrus Painter offers a good opportunity for multiple approaches to its interpretation. The painter used the Olympian family as a model of gatherings after a funeral, while at the same time he applied the familiar motif of the heroic banquet to clearly designate their higher status. The same way the gods partake of the banquet of Plouton and Persephone, so too will the mortals organize the postfuneral feast. The Divine Banquet cup was not purchased in Etruria merely because it was a pretty vase from Athens but because it was decorated with a scene identifiable with Etruscan practices. It is doubtful that

---

[82] Reusser 2002, 1:167, no. 137, 181–83; *LIMC* 8(1):173–83, s.v. "Vanth"; *LIMC* 4:394, s.v. "Hades/Aita/Calu." On an Etruscan deity equivalent of the Greek Hades and a bacchic ritual in his honor, see Isler-Kerényi 2003, 40–1.

[83] Massa-Pairault (1999, 521–54) claims that the Etruscan Nike can be interpreted as an alter ego of Athena (528), Aphrodite can sometimes be identified as Ourania, equal to Iris, while Eos is related to the Etruscan Turan (529–30), principal deity of love and true origin. Also, from a deposit at the sanctuary of Mater Matuta comes a vase representing Aglauros, which according to Massa-Pairault, suggests a connection to the "politico-religious vision of Servius Tullius" (522). Erichthonios, along with other heroes such as Kephalos, Eumolpos, Hippothoos, incorporates the ideas of *phyle* and *genos*. This concept of a child incarnating a place and a political principle is maintained in Etruria (523–31). For a recent treatment of the reception of Attic pottery in non-Greek states, see Fless 2003, 241–43.

[84] Herbig and Simon 1965, 30, pls. 47 (Tages), 48, 49 (Triton). For the sea creatures, see also Shepard 1940.

[85] Davies 1985, 627–40. See also an example from Soph. *OC* 1, 631–32.

[86] Shapiro 2000, 315–18; Reusser 2002, 1:189.

[87] Small 1974, 85–94; this is made evident by Reusser (2002, 1:178–79), who elaborates on warrior scenes to explain how Greek vases found in Etruria do not have solely a funerary character.

[88] Reusser 2002, 1:124–25.

[89] For the Perizoma group, see Shapiro (2000, 315–37), who describes the way the Athenians viewed the Etruscans as "exotic foreigners." For the Etruscan perception of Attic vase paintings, see Reusser (2002, 1:146–51) with extended presentation of different subjects.

the Codrus Painter considered prospective Etruscan buyers, but one cannot exclude the possibility that what was illustrated on the cup was a recognizable pattern, explicable by Etruscan beliefs and customs.

Even though the Greeks "exported vases rather than images," one cannot deny that the images played a significant role and were not irrelevant to the place they were found.[90] On a broader level, one should not focus merely on whether the Greeks specifically illustrated certain subjects because they expected the Etruscans to recognize them or that the Etruscans necessarily were acquainted with all versions of myths (which might be true, but we have no sources to prove one way or another). It seems that the Etruscans knew some myths and invented a few more, and that their own, separate customs found an illustrated vocabulary on the Attic vases.[91]

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
KRESGE HALL 1-535
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
1880 CAMPUS DRIVE
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60208-2600

Works Cited

Amouretti, M.-Cl. 1992. "Les Boissons hors le Symposion." In *La Sociabilité à Table, Commensalité et Convivialité à travers les âges. Actes du colloque de Rouen, 14–17 novembre 1990,* edited by M. Aurell, O. Dumoulin, and F. Thelamon. Rouen: Publications de l'Université de Rouen.

Arafat, K.W. 1990. *Classical Zeus—A Study in Art and Literature.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Arafat, K.W., and C. Morgan. 1994. "Athens, Etruria and the Heuneburg: Mutual Misconceptions in the Study of Greek–Barbarian Relations." In *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies,* edited by I. Morris, 108–34. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Avramidou, A. 2005. "The Codrus Painter: An Iconographical Study." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University.

Beazley, J.D. 1989. *Greek Vases. Lectures by J.D. Beazley,* edited by D. Kurtz. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press.

Bemmann, K. 1994. *Füllhörner in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Berger, E. 1996. *Der Parthenon in Basel, Dokumentation zum Fries.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Bertani, M.G. 1995. "Il 'banchetto dei morti' in Etruria Padana." In *Agricoltura e commerci nell'Italia antica, Atlante tematico di topografia antica 1,* edited by L. Quilici and S. Quilici Gigli, 41–64. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Blatter, R. 1975. "Eine neue Schale des Epidromos-Malers." *Hefte des Archäologischen Seminars der Universität Bern*:5–9.

Boardman, J. 1979. "The Athenian Pottery Trade: The Classical Period." *Expedition* 21:33–9.

———. 1990. "Symposion Furniture." In *Sympotica. A Symposion on the Symposion,* edited by O. Murray, 122–31. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 2001. *The History of Greek Vases. Potters, Painters and Pictures.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Bonfante, L., ed. 1986. *Etruscan Life and Afterlife.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Carpenter, T.H. 1995. "A Symposion of Gods?" In *In Vino Veritas,* edited by O. Murray and M. Teçusan, 145–63. London: British School at Rome, in association with the American Academy at Rome, Swedish Institute at Rome, Istituto Universario Orientale di Napoli, and Università di Salerno.

———. 1997. *Dionysian Imagery in 5th-Century Athens.* Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press.

Carpenter, T.H., T. Mannack, and M. Mendonça. 1989. *Beazley Addenda: Additional References to ABV, ARV² and Paralimpomena.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, G. 1985. "The Significance of the Handshake Motif in Classical Funerary Art." *AJA* 89(4):627–40.

de Cesare, M. 1997. *Le Statue in Immagine: Studi sulle raffigurazioni di statue nella pittura vascolare greca.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

de Marinis, S. 1961. *La tipologia del banchetto nell'arte Etrusca Arcaica.* Rome: Studia Archaeologica 1.

Dentzer, J.-M. 1971. "Aux origins de l'iconographie du banquet couché." *RA*:215–58.

———. 1982. *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde Grec du VII au IV siècle av. J-C.* Rome: Ecole Française de Rome.

Farnell, L.R. 1921. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fehr, B. 1971. *Orientalische und Griechische Gelage.* Bonn: Bouvier.

———. 2003. "What Has Dionysos to Do with the Symposion?" In *Symposium: Banquet et représentations en Grèce et à Rome,* edited by C. Orfanos and J.-C. Carrière, 23–37. *Pallas* 61. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

Fless, Fr. 2003. "Akzeptanz und Integration attischer Keramik des 4. Jahr. v. Chr." In *Die Materielle Kultur griechischer Poleis und ausgriechischer Gesellschaften, Griechische Keramik in Kulturellen Kontext,* edited by B. Schmaltz and M. Söldner, 241–43. Akten des Internationalles Vasen–Symposions in Kiel (24–28/9/2001). Münster: Scriptorum.

Gantz, T.N. 1971. "Divine Triads on an Archaic Etruscan Frieze Plaque from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)." *StEtr* 39: 3–24.

Garland, R. 1985. *The Greek Way of Death.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Gill, D.W., and M. Vickers. 1990. "Reflected Glory: Pottery and Precious Metals in Classical Greece." *JdI* 105:1–30.

———. 1994. *Artful Crafts.* Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press.

[90] Lissarrague 1987, 261–69. For the double perspective of the Attic vases in Etruria, see Isler-Kerényi 2003, 39–53.

[91] Arafat and Morgan 1994, 133: "Once Attic finewares leave Attica, they cease to be 'Attic' in the sense that they were originally created; vessels selected by Etruria become part of Etruscan material culture, and Etruscan values and interests determine how and when they are used and traded on."

———. 1995. "They Were Expendable: Greek Vases in the Etruscan Tomb." *RÉA* 97:225–49.

Graef, B., and E. Langlotz. 1909–1933. *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen*. Vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hanfmann, G.M.A. 1974. "A Pediment of the Persian Era from Sardis." In *Mansel'e Armagan (Mélanges Mansel),* edited by E. Akurgal and U. Bahadir Alkim, 289–302. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.

Harrison, J. 1891. "Mythological Studies." *JHS* 12:350–55.

Heilmeyer, M. 2003. "Kränze für das griechische Symposion in klassischer Zeit." In *Die Materielle Kultur grie-chischer Poleis und ausgriechischer Gesellschaften, Griechische Keramik in Kulturellen Kontext,* edited by B. Schmaltz and M. Söldner, 296–99. Akten des Internationalles Vasen–Symposions in Kiel (24–28/9/2001). Münster: Scriptorum.

Herbig, R., and E. Simon. 1965. *Götter und Dämonen der Etrusker*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Isler-Kerényi, C. 2003. "Images grecques au banquet funéraire étrusque." In *Symposium: Banquet et représentations en Grèce et à Rome,* edited by C. Orfanos and J.-C. Carrière, 37–47. Pallas 61. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

Jameson, M.H. 1994. "Theoxenia." In *Ancient Greek Cult Practices from the Epigraphical Evidence, Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22–24 November 1991,* edited by R. Hägg, 35–57. Stockholm and Athens: Svenska Institutet and Paul Åströms Förlag.

Jannot, J.R. 1984. *Les Reliefs Archaïques de Chiusi*. Rome: Ecole Française de Rome.

Kahil, L. 1963. "Quelques vase du sanctuaire d'Artemis à Brauron." *AntK* 1, Beiheft:5–29.

Kaltsas, N. 2002. *Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens*. Translated by D. Hardy. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Knell, H. 1965. "Die Darstellung der Götterversammlung in der attischen Kunst des VI und V Jhrs v. Chr." Ph.D. diss., Freiburg.

Knigge, U., R.H. Stichel, and K. von Woyski 1978. "Kerameikos Tätigkeitsbericht 1975/6." *AA* 93:44–67.

Kunisch, N. 1993. "Herakleseinzug und Götterspende." *AntK* 36:11–23.

Laurens, A.F. 1985. "La libation: Intégration des dieux dans le rituel humain?" In *En Grèce ancienne: Images et rituel,* edited by Fr. Lissarrague, 35–59. Recherches et Documents du Centre Thomas More 48. L'Arbresle: La Tourette.

Laurens, A.F., and Fr. Lissarrague. 1990. "Entre Dieux." *Métis* 5:53–74.

Leighton, R. 2004. *Tarquinia: An Etruscan City*. London: Duckworth.

Lewis, S. 1997. "Shifting Images: Athenian Women in Etruria." In *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, edited by T. Cornell and K. Lomas, 141–54. Accordia 6. London: Accordia Research Institute.

———. 2003. "Representation and Reception. Athenian Pottery and Its Italian Context." In *Inhabiting Symbols. Symbol and Image in the Ancient Mediterranean,* edited by J.B. Wilkins and E. Herring, 175–92. Accordia 5. London: Accordia Research Institute.

Lezzi-Hafter, A. 1976. *Der Schuwalow Maler: Eine Kannenwerkstatt der Parthenonzeit*. Mainz am Rhein: Phililpp von Zabern.

———. 1988. *Der Eretria Maler: Werke und Weggefährten*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Lissarrague, Fr. 1985. "La libation: Essai de mise au point." In *En Grèce ancienne: Images et rituel*, edited by Fr. Lissarrague, 3–16. Recherches et Documents du Centre Thomas More 48. L'Arbresle: La Tourette.

———. 1987. "Voyage d'image: Iconographie et aires culturelles." *RÉA* 89:261–69.

———. 1990. *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual*. Translated by A. Szegedy-Maszak. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1995. "Un rituel du vin: La libation." In *In Vino Veritas,* edited by O. Murray and M. Teçusan, 126–44. London: British School at Rome, in association with the American Academy at Rome, Swedish Institute at Rome, Istituto Universario Orientale di Napoli, and Università di Salerno.

Machaira, V. 2000. "He sponde ston heroiko kai ston theiko kyklo." In *Agathos Daimon—Mythes et Cultes, Ètudes d'iconographie en l'honneur de L. Kahil. BCH* Suppl. 38: 339–44.

Marconi, Cl., ed. 2004. "Images for a Warrior: On a Group of Athenian Vases and Their Public." In *Greek Vases: Images, Contexts and Controversies,* edited by Cl. Marconi, 27–40. Proceedings of the conference sponsored by the Center for the Ancient Mediterranean at Columbia University, 23–24 March 2002. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Massa-Pairault, Fr. H., ed. 1999. *Le mythe grec dans l'Italie antique. Fonction et Image. Actes du Colloque International organisée par l'École français de Rome, l'Istituto Italiano per gli Studi filologici (Naples) et l'UMR 126 du CNRS (Archéologie d'Orient et de l'Occident), Rome, 14–16 novembre, 1996*. Rome: Ecole Française de Rome.

Metzger, H. 1944–1945. "Dionysos Chthonien." *BCH* 68/69:296–339.

Mitropoulou, E. 1977. *Corpus 1, Attic Votive Reliefs of the 6th and 5th Centuries B.C.* Athens: Pyli Editions.

Murray, O. 1988. "Death and the Symposion." *AnnArchStorAnt* 10:239–57.

Mylonas, G. 1960. "Eleusis kai Dionysos." *ArchEph*:68–118.

Neils, J. 1999. "Reconfiguring the Gods on the Parthenon Frieze." *ArtB* 81:6–20.

———. 2001. *The Parthenon Frieze*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nilsson, A. 1999. "The Function and Reception of the Attic Figured Pottery: Spina, a Case Study." *AnalRom* 26: 7–23.

Osborne, R. 2001. "Why Did Athenian Pots Appeal to the Etruscans?" *WorldArch* 33(2):277–95.

———. 2004a. "Images of a Warrior. On a Group of Athenian Vases and Their Public." In *Greek Vases, Images, Contexts and Controversies*, edited by Cl. Marconi, 41–54. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

———. 2004b. "Workshops and the Iconography and Distribution of Athenian Red-figure Pottery: A Case Study." In *Greek Art in View. Essays in Honour of B. Sparkes*, edited by S. Keay and S. Moser. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Padgett, J.M. 2002. "A Unique Vase in the Metropolitan Museum of Art." In *Essays in Honor of D. von Bothmer*, edited by A.J. Clark and J. Gaunt, 249–66. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Museum.

Peschlow-Bindokat, A. 1972. "Demeter und Persephone in der attischen Kunst des 6. bis 4. Jhr BC." *JdI* 87:60–157.

Pontradolfo, A. 1995. "Simposio e Élites Sociali nel Mondo

Etrusco e Italico." In *In Vino Veritas,* edited by O. Murray and M. Teçusan, 176–95. London: British School at Rome, in association with the American Academy at Rome, Swedish Institute at Rome, Istituto Universario Orientale di Napoli, and Università di Salerno.

Rathje, A. 1994. "Banquet and Ideology: Some New Consideration about Banquet at Poggio Civitate." In *Murlo and the Etruscans,* edited by R.D. de Puma and J.P. Small, 95–9. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

———. 1995. "Il banchetto in Italia Centrale: *Quale Stile di Vita?*" In *In Vino Veritas,* edited by O. Murray and M. Teçusan, 167–75. London: British School at Rome, in association with the American Academy at Rome, Swedish Institute at Rome, Istituto Universario Orientale di Napoli, and Università di Salerno.

Reusser, Ch. 2002. *Vasen für Etrurien: Verbreitung und Funktionen Attischer Keramik im Etrurien des 6. und 5. Jhrs v. Chr.* 2 vols. Zürich: Akanthus.

Ridgway, B. 1967. "The Banquet Relief from Thasos." *AJA* 71(3):307–9.

Robertson, M. 1991. "A Fragmentary Phiale by Douris." In *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 5:75–98. Occasional Papers on Antiquities 7. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Schauenburg, K. 1953. "Pluton und Dionysos." *JdI* 68: 38–72.

Schefold, K. 1988. *Die Urkönige, Perseus, Bellerephontes, Herakles und Theseus in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst.* Munich: Hirmer.

Schmitt-Pantel, P. 1992. "Symposion: Banquets, orgies et transgressions." In *La Sociabilité à Table, Commensalité et Convivialité à travers les âges. Actes du colloque de Rouen, 14–17 novembre 1990,* edited by M. Aurell, O. Dumoulin, and F. Thelamon, 49–53. Rouen: Publications de l'Université de Rouen.

Shapiro, H.A. 2000. "Modest Athletes and Liberated Women: Etruscans on Black-figure Vases." In *Not the Classical Ideal,* edited by B. Cohen, 315–37. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Shepard, K. 1940. *The Fish-tailed Monster in Greek and Etruscan Art.* New York and Menasha, Wis.: George Banta.

Simon, E. 1953. *Opfernde Götter.* Berlin: Mann.

———. 1969. *Die Götter der Griechen.* 4th ed. Munich: Hirmer.

———. 1982. "Die Mittelszene im Ostfries des Parthenon." *AM* 97:127–44.

Small, J.P. 1971. "The Banquet Frieze from Poggio Civitate (Murlo)." *StEtr* 1971:25–61.

———. 1974. "Eat, Drink and Be Merry–Etruscan Banquets." In *Murlo and the Etruscans*, edited by R.D. de Puma and J.P. Small, 85–94. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

———. 1994. "Scholars, Etruscans and Attic Painted Vases." *JRA* 7:34–58.

Spivey, N. 1991. "Greek Vases in Etruria." In *Looking at Greek Vases*, edited by T. Rasmussen and N. Spivey, 131–50. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Steingräber, S., ed. 1986. *Etruscan Painting.* New York: Johnson Reprint Corp. and Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Thönges-Stringaris, Rh. N. 1965. "Das griechische Totenmahl." *AM* 80:1–98.

Tolles, D. 1943. "The Banquet-Libations of the Greeks." Ph.D. diss., Bryn Mawr.

Torelli, M. 1987. *La società etrusca: L'età arcaica, l'età classica.* Rome: Nuova Italia Scientifica.

———. 1989. "Banchetto e simposio nell'Italia archaica: Qualche nota." In *Homo Edens 1: Regimi, miti e pratiche dell'alimentazione nella civiltà del Meditterraneo,* edited by O. Longo and P. Scarpi, 301–10. Milan: Diapress/documenti.

Tuck, S.A. 1994. "The Etruscan Seated Banquet: Villanovan Ritual and Etruscan Iconography." *AJA* 98(4): 617–28.

Veyne, P. 1990. "Images de divinités tenant une phiale ou patère." *Métis* 5:17–30.

Von Mehren, M. 2001. "Two Groups of Attic Amphorae as Export Ware for Etruria: The So-Called Tyrrhenian Group and 'Nikosthenic Amphorae.'" In *Ceramics in Context: Proceedings of the Internordic Colloquium on Ancient Pottery Held at Stockholm, 13–15 June 1997,* edited by C. Scheffer, 45–53. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Wolf, S.R. 1993. *Herakles beim Gelage.* Cologne: Böhlau.