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This volume developed from the wide-ranging presentations and discussion during and after the conference “Ceramics, cuisine and culture: the archaeology and science of kitchen pottery in the ancient Mediterranean world”, held at the British Museum in December 2010 and organised jointly between the Museum’s Departments of Greece and Rome and Conservation and Scientific Research, in collaboration with the Leverhulme Trust funded ‘Tracing Networks’ Research Programme (Universities of Leicester, Exeter and Glasgow).

The idea of making this theme the topic of a conference germinated within a British Museum research project on ceramic grinding bowls from the eastern Mediterranean led by the two editors. It was in many ways a logical development of the close collaboration between archaeologists and scientists at the Museum, which highlighted the enormous potential of such interdisciplinary work. Most of all, however, it seemed timely. We realised that while the subject was only just beginning to attract attention in scholarship on the first millennium Aegean, elsewhere researchers were actively developing new approaches and investigating different types of kitchen pottery, notably from prehistoric and protohistoric assemblages in the European, Near Eastern and Mediterranean worlds. Coincidentally, food and cuisine was just beginning to crystallise as a key theme within the British Museum’s research programme for the next years.

The aims of the conference were to stimulate an interdisciplinary exchange of ideas and approaches to the study of kitchen pottery between archaeologists, material scientists, historians and ethnoarchaeologists and to set this vital but long-neglected category of evidence in its wider social, political and economic contexts, so as to exploit it more effectively for understanding ancient societies. Out of this discourse the current volume arose, containing a cross-section of the ideas, approaches and research that were put to discussion in 2010, embedded in their wider epistemological framework by an introductory chapter, and rounded off by concluding reflections on a changing Aegean in the modern era. Rather than mere transcripts of original presentations, the chapters of this volume are the outcome of research transformed and informed by discussions and interactions which began at the conference. The topics they present were deliberately chosen for being more than just isolated case studies; they illustrate the range of approaches at our disposal today, often involving a collaboration between archaeology and science so as to address questions more in-depth.

We tried to structure the different topics discussed during the conference by grouping them under three main headings (see table of contents); of course, this is just one of a range of conceivable arrangements, as the topics are tightly interconnected and fluid, and as the batterie de cuisine reflects such a wide variety of interlinked aspects of ancient societies, from vernacular traditions, staple foods, and special haute cuisine dishes, to dynamics of change, new culinary identities, acculturation, colonialism, and trade. The individual chapters aim to capture this richness and harness the material’s heuristic potential. A range of social, economic and technological models are discussed on the basis of insights gained from the study of kitchen pottery production, use and evolution. Much discussion and work in the last decade has focussed on technical and social aspects of coarse ware and in particular kitchen
ware. The chapters in this volume contribute to this debate, moving kitchen pottery beyond the Binfordian ‘technomic’ category and embracing a wider view, linking processualism, ceramic-ecology, behavioural schools, and ethnoarchaeology to research on historical developments and cultural transformations covering a broad geographical area of the Mediterranean region and spanning a long chronological sequence.

The conference would not have been possible without the active support of the Keepers of our respective departments at the British Museum, Lesley Fitton in the Department of Greece and Rome, and David Saunders in the Department of Conservation and Scientific Research, as well as the collaboration of Lin Foxhall and her staff at the ‘Tracing Networks’ Research Programme at the University of Leicester. We gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance of the Institute of Classical Studies, London in the conference organisation and of the British Museum’s Scholarly Publications Fund in the volume’s production. Invaluable support was rendered by Catherine Higgitt, Trevor Coughlan, Nigel Meeks and numerous others both within the British Museum and beyond, who generously gave their time and skills to ensure the success and smooth running of the conference. Many colleagues were instrumental to the intellectual and physical production of this volume: Vanessa Baldwin, Lesley Bushnell, Claudio Capelli, Lindy Crewe, Maria Effinger, Ian Freestone, Andrew Gardner, J. D. Hill, Elena Isayev, Carolyn Jones, Alan Johnston, Thomas Kiely, Alexander Livingstone Smith, Colin Macdonald, Aurélia Masson-Berghoff, John Meadows, Nigel Meeks, Corinna Riva, Ross Thomas, Andrew Shapland, Valerie Steele, Ben Stern, Ole Stilborg, Michael Tite and Roberta Tomber. The British School at Athens and the Athenian Ashram provided inspirational surroundings for research. Special thanks are due to Julie Gardiner, Julie Blackmore and Sarah Ommenney at Oxbow for expertly seeing the volume through to publication, and to Pam Scholefield for producing the index. Above all, however, thanks are due to the authors of the present volume and to the conference participants who – by presenting papers or posters and stimulating contributions to the discussion – provided the invaluable mix of ingredients for the preparation of the ποικιλία presented in the present volume.


London, April 2015
Michela Spataro and Alexandra Villing
The study of Iron Age kitchen pottery has long been neglected in Cypriot archaeology. In his seminal work on the material culture of the island, Gjerstad devoted two plates only, placed at the end of the volume, to the coarse ware ceramics, among which he included some cooking pots, without arranging them in a chronological frame (Gjerstad 1948, pls. LXX–LXXI). Little progress has been made since, notably because no Iron Age settlement has been properly excavated and published (Pilides 2005; Spagnoli 2010). Besides, no extensive programme of physico-chemical analysis has been applied to this kind of ceramic ware. This is largely due to the predominantly art-historical and historical approaches to the study of this period (see Reyes 1994), as well as the usual concentration on tombs, sanctuaries and high status buildings by archaeologists.

However, as is often the case in the archaeology of the island, new insights into the potential value of kitchen pottery for reconstructing history have resulted from a new approach to the material culture of Late Bronze Age Cyprus. Archaeologists now try to detect migrations and to find archaeological testimonies of the so-called “Hellenisation” phase of Cyprus also in the profound changes that affected domestic assemblages (artefacts related to eating, drinking and clothing).

Yet this ethnicity-focused interpretative framework does not take into account the longue durée: it concentrates on particular moments of change and the possible explanations for them. It does not examine Late Bronze Age cultural innovations in their full cultural context, and it dismisses the subsequent (post-early 1st millennium BC) changes that also affected the Iron Age kitchen pottery repertoire of Cyprus. Similar-seeming evolutions may have quite distinct causes, and univocal explanations are always too simplistic. Changing through time, culinary habits (that is, not only dietary practices but also gestures and spaces, and ways of preparing, presenting and consuming food) also change according to social environment, as demonstrated by anthropological studies. This paper does not seek to impose alternate views on a heavily debated theme; rather, by adopting a diachronic and a social perspective on the longue durée of the Cypriot Iron Age, it aims to challenge current interpretations in favour of a more nuanced view. As a matter of fact, any explanation must remain highly speculative because of the unsatisfactory state of the primary evidence, which comes almost exclusively from tombs.

A diachronic perspective: Aegeanising versus Orientalising

From the 12th century BC onwards, new kitchen pottery types enter the Cypriot repertoire and new, Aegean-type vessels eventually replace the older, insular and Levantine-type shapes (Jung 2009, 80–81; Jung 2011). Other ceramic “innovations” enter the Cypriot repertoire at the same time: most importantly, wheel-made wares replace the traditional hand-made Late Bronze Age wares (Base-Ring and White Slip). As far as fine wares are concerned, this phenomenon, once considered positive proof of a massive Aegean immigration to Cyprus, has been interpreted in a
more nuanced way in the last decades (Sherratt 1991 and 1992; Iacovou 2005). The kitchen pottery evidence - barely studied until very recently - was not part of the debate. Interestingly enough, it is now widely used by those who argue for a massive migratory episode to Cyprus in the 12th century BC.

New kitchen pottery types are also attested in contemporary contexts in the southern Levant, but on a more restricted scale, both geographically (the Philistine cities) and chronologically (Killebrew 1999; Yasur-Landau 2005; Ben-Shlomo et al. 2008). In Cyprus, this change in the everyday pottery repertoire affects all settlements, from temporary ones (Maa) to centuries-old cities (Enkomi) (Fig. 22.1; Jung 2011), and it is a long-term change. The Geometric kitchen pottery repertoire (11th–10th centuries BC) from Cyprus is definitely Aegeanising and it is remarkably homogeneous in all regions of the island. First defined by Karageorghis in his study of the Palaepaphos-Skales tombs on the western coast, this repertoire is also attested in the Geometric necropolis of Kition, on the southeastern coast of the island, for example (Figs. 22.2–22.4).

All vessels are wheel-made on a fast wheel. Although the fabric varies according to workshops, all cooking vessels share common characteristics: their walls are quite thin, and, although their fabric is specific to kitchen pottery (and very distinct from fine but also common wares), it is far less coarse than that of the preceding Bronze Age pots, and also that of the subsequent Archaic cooking wares: the pots have a relatively fine clay with small inclusions. Soot-marks demonstrate beyond doubt that vessels found in funerary contexts were actually used as cooking implements. Their presence in funerary assemblages testifies to a secondary use. The repertoire comprises three main shapes: the jug, the amphora, and the cooking pot.

The first two categories are similar, the only difference being that the amphora is usually slightly bigger and possesses two handles. The vases are globular, with a
Figure 22.2. Cypro-Geometric cooking jugs from Kition, MLA 1065/84 and 89. Photograph S. Fourrier, Courtesy Department of Antiquities of Cyprus.

Figure 22.3. Cypro-Geometric cooking amphora from Kition, MLA 1065/82. Photograph S. Fourrier, Courtesy Department of Antiquities of Cyprus.

Figure 22.4. Cypro-Geometric cooking pot from Kition, MLA 1065/94. Photograph S. Fourrier, Courtesy Department of Antiquities of Cyprus.

cylindrical neck and a rounded rim. Their average height is around 25 to 30 cm and they have a flat or disc base. This base allows the vases to stand steadily, and this feature, along with the soot-marks, which are always located on one side of the vessels, has been taken as evidence that they must have been placed next to the heating source and not
directly on or in the fire. The pots would have stood on a flat surface, near the pile of embers, thus suggesting the use of built hearths (Ben-Shlomo et al. 2008, 236–238; for similar developments in 12th-century BC Lefkandi see Lis this volume, fig. 9.2). Built hearths are a cultural innovation in 12th-century BC Cyprus and they are considered to be of Aegean origin (Karageorghis 2011, 22–23). The heating installation used in Cyprus before the 12th century BC (from the Early Bronze Age onwards) and after the 9th century BC (as far as we can judge from the vessels’ shape, soot-marks and from later iconographic representations) is the open hearth. No domestic quarters have been systematically excavated in Iron Age settlements on Cyprus, though, no domestic Iron Age cooking hearth has been published and we are thus compelled to use indirect testimonies, such as for example iconographic representations and the soot-marks left on the cooking pots, to understand what kind of hearth may have been used in domestic contexts.

According to Ben-Shlomo et al., Aegean-type cooking jugs would have been used for “slow, low-heat cooking (simmering) of liquid dishes” (Ben-Shlomo et al. 2008, 237). Their reasoning is based on the “size, shape and wall thickness” of the jugs, some of which may have been made in the same fabrics as other non-cooking classes of pottery. As far as we can judge by eye, the fabric of the Cypriot cooking jugs is specific: as a matter of fact, it constitutes the main criterion of identification for fragmentary vases. Made of refractive fabrics, thin-walled pots would allow a rapid transmission of heat, unlike heavy-walled pots, and they would thus be suitable for rapid, high-temperature cooking. This is also suggested by comparative evidence, especially from Hellenistic and Roman times. So I would suggest that the Cypriot “Aegeanising” cooking jugs were employed for boiled, rather than stewed, preparations.

The final shape, which is much scarcer in the tombs than the jug and the amphora, is the Levantine-type cooking pot (Fig. 22.4). It is a common Cypriot and Levantine Bronze Age shape. The main differences lay in the fabric and in the manufacturing technique. The vessel’s rounded base and large mouth, covered by a lid, make it particularly well adapted for stewing. But a closer examination shows that its fabric and manufacturing technique are the same as those of the “Aegeanising” jugs and amphoras. Besides, soot-marks, on one side only, suggest that the pot was not placed directly in the fire, despite its rounded base, but rather close to the fire, presumably on a built hearth. As already mentioned above, direct evidence from the Early Bronze Age, and indirect evidence (mostly 6th-century B.C. iconographic representations) from the later Iron Age, show that the Cypriots traditionally cooked in pots that were placed on stands directly in the fire. The round bottoms of the Levantine-type cooking pots would make them unsuitable for use on a flat surface: the shape is Orientalising, but the way the vessels were used is Aegeanising.

A new, radical and reverse change occurs in the Cypro-Geometric III period (9th century BC). From then on, the cooking vessel par excellence, in all regions of Cyprus, is the cooking pot (Fourrier 2007, with references). This is a long-term change, which lasts until new kitchen pottery types progressively enter the repertoire in the Hellenistic period. The vase has a rounded base, a short cylindrical neck and a round or triangular rim (Fig. 22.5). It was made on a slow wheel, using the coils technique. The soot-marks cover the whole surface of the vase, and the often heavily
burnt base shows that the vessel was placed directly on the fire, presumably on a stand.\textsuperscript{14} As already noted, such a shape was particularly suitable for slow cooking (stewing).\textsuperscript{15} It is a Levantine shape used in a Levantine way.\textsuperscript{16}

Two major disruptions thus marked the repertoire of Cypriot kitchen pottery. In the Late Cypriot IIIA period (12th century BC), the heavy-walled, hand-modelled and round-bottomed cooking pots of longstanding Levantine tradition were replaced by thin-walled, wheel-modelled and flat-bottomed cooking jugs of Aegean type. This new repertoire was adopted in all regions of the island and it remained in use for at least three centuries. The “Aegeanising” cooking jugs were then replaced, in the course of the Cypro-Geometric III period (9th century BC), by heavy-walled, coiled and round-bottomed cooking pots of Levantine tradition. This new repertoire was adopted in all regions of the island and it remained in use for around six centuries, until its replacement by Hellenistic types. Same causes, same effects? The answer is obviously not straightforward. As mentioned above, the adoption of new Aegean-type kitchen pottery in the Late Bronze Age has been claimed by some scholars to corroborate the reality of a massive migratory episode to Cyprus (Jung 2011, especially 69–72). Can the same explanation be valid for the change that occurred in the 9th century BC? Is the hypothesis of a massive Phoenician migration to Cyprus sustainable? It is not supported by the archaeological and epigraphic evidence. Written testimonies, in particular, show that Cyprus remained, for the whole Iron Age, a predominantly Greek-speaking island. Some Levantine people certainly settled in Cyprus in the 9th century BC, notably in the area of Kition (Cannavò 2011, 482–493), but this rather limited migration did not lead to a demographic shift in favour of Phoenician-speakers. It appears to have had real and profound effects on culinary practices, though, as is demonstrated by the kitchen pottery repertoire.

The Iron Age evidence should thus prompt us to adopt a more cautious approach to what may have happened on Late Bronze Age Cyprus. I doubt that the realm of “everyday” life is as conservative a sanctuary of “ethnic” customs as claimed by some scholars;\textsuperscript{17} rather, like other realms of domestic and social life, it is a cultural construct. As such, it may reveal contacts and acculturation. The “pots = people” theory has been abandoned for fine wares; the new “cooking pots = people” theory should also be abandoned or, at least, nuanced.\textsuperscript{18}

A social perspective: sanctuaries and palaces

As already stated, contextual studies are few in Cyprus, because the evidence itself is limited. No Early Iron Age settlement has been excavated and published and so we have no evidence of cooking ware assemblages from domestic contexts. The Cypro-Geometric assemblages come almost exclusively from tombs. Nevertheless, the kitchen pottery vessels and bronze skewers, deposited among other prestige artefacts, such as weapons and bathtubs, show that communal meals, implying in particular the sharing of meat, were an integral part of elite practice.\textsuperscript{19} The deposition of similar cooking implements, two centuries later, in the “royal” tombs of Salamis reveals a remarkable consistency of elite practices during the whole Cypriot Iron Age.\textsuperscript{20}

New evidence from recent excavations at Amathous helps us to go one step further and make a contextual comparative analysis. Kitchen pottery can thus be studied in its primary context of use, and not only in its secondary deposition as part of a funerary assemblage. Two contemporaneous Cypro-Archaic II ceramic deposits (6th century BC) have been found at Amathous: one on the acropolis, in the Aphrodite sanctuary;\textsuperscript{21} the other at the foot of the Classical and Hellenistic city wall, at the northern limit of the lower city.\textsuperscript{22} This last assemblage was a refuse deposit from the acropolis royal palace, as demonstrated by the discovery of joins between sherds found in situ in Cypro-Archaic layers during the palace excavations and other pieces found in the deposit. Both assemblages result from destructions that affected both the sanctuary and the palace at the time of the Ionian Revolt, probably when Onasilos of Salamis besieged the city (499–498 BC).

Kitchen pottery is attested in both assemblages, but the divergences are many. The first one is quantitative: cooking wares represent less than 1% of the total ceramic assemblage in the sanctuary, but they represent 10% in the palace. The second difference is qualitative: the sanctuary cooking set is very limited, compared to the much more varied palace equipment. It chiefly comprises cooking pots of small dimensions, with an average height of c. 20 cm. Cooking pots also represent the most common shape in the palace assemblage (80% of all cooking vessels), but they show morphological variations, especially in the shape of the rim. Besides, some very big examples (c. 50 cm high, Fig. 22.6) demonstrate that food was processed for large groups of people. Other kitchen pottery shapes are attested (plates, jugs, pans), some of which are barely known from other contexts. With the exception of certain pottery types, whose use is documented by other testimonies (chiefly iconographic representations), it is often difficult to know what was cooked and/or prepared in what ceramic shape. But various cooking recipes may correspond to the varieties of shapes. Of special interest are the fragments of grills that suggest the practice of roasting meat (and/or fish?) (Fig. 22.7).\textsuperscript{23}

The proportional importance of kitchen equipment in
the palace assemblage, as well as the quality and variety of vessels, show that cooking food for communal meals – feasting, in anthropological terminology – was a regular practice in the palace. This is amply confirmed by Greek sources that describe the lavish banquets of the Cypriot kings, and in particular of the kings of Salamis in the 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{24} The evidence does not suggest anything similar for the sanctuary. More evidence is needed: the publication of faunal remains and of cooking wares from other sanctuary and palace contexts may nuance this conclusion based on Amathous alone, but I doubt that it will profoundly alter it. Communal meals, and especially the sharing of meat, remained an elite’s practice in Cyprus that did not leave the realm of the elite (effectively in the palace, allusively in the tomb). It explains why cooking pots were such a suitable funerary gift for a king, be it at Palaepaphos in the Early Iron Age (Karageorghis 1983) or at Salamis in the Archaic period (Karageorghis 1974), among weapons, chariots and bronze cauldrons. Cooking wares are barely attested in ordinary Cypriot Geometric and Cypro- Archaic tombs. They are numerous in elite tombs, among prestige artefacts. It may appear paradoxical, but only at first sight. In fact, cooking pots hint at another royal activity, along with royal practices such as war, hunting and bathing:\textsuperscript{25} feasting.

Feasting, in past scholarship, has traditionally been viewed through the lens of drinking and fine wares, rather than eating and coarse wares, and it is instructive to end this survey with a look at contemporary developments in drinking vessels. At the end of the Late Bronze Age (12th century BC), new types of drinking vessels, of Aegean derivation, were adopted in Cyprus: the first is a medium-deep bowl with carinated shoulder and two horizontal handles (\textit{skyphos}); the second has a long stemmed foot and a vertical handle (\textit{kylix}).\textsuperscript{26} The \textit{kylix} disappears quite early in the Cypro-Geometric I period, but the \textit{skyphos} remains the most common drinking vessel of the Cypriot repertoire until the 9th century BC. From the Cypro-Geometric III period onwards, however, its supremacy is challenged by new Levantine shapes, in particular deep handleless
cups (Fourrier 2009, 131–132). This change is reflected in contemporary images. At the beginning of the Iron Age, drinking men are always depicted using footed deep bowls that they grasp firmly by the stem. Among the rare Geometric representations in vase-painting, the kylix, a rare Aegean shape, is over-represented.\textsuperscript{27} In the Cypro-Archaic period, people are shown reclining for banquets in the Oriental way and holding their handleless cup in the open palm of the hand.\textsuperscript{28}

Drinking vessels, just as cooking wares, were thus subject to both Aegeanising and Orientalising influences; conspicuous consumption – in the shape of drinking and feasting – remained of social significance across time. The status of kitchen pottery in contexts of the elite (“warriors” and “royal” tombs and palaces) appears to remain remarkably consistent throughout the whole Iron Age. Feasting in Cyprus, it seems, remained a habit of the elite; apparently it did not leave the kings’ realm. This is another indication of the stability of Iron Age Cypriot polities that did not experience, at least in the Iron Age, the long maturation process of the Greek city, from rulers’ dwellings to temples.\textsuperscript{29}

**Notes**

1 A new programme (ER02 Fellowship, “Mechanical and thermal behaviour of functional ceramics in the Aegean and Cyprus”), launched within the NARNIA (New Archaeological Research Network for Integrating Approaches to Ancient Material Studies) project is now filling the gap: http://narnia-itn.eu. We also ought to mention an ongoing interdisciplinary project coordinated by A. Vionis (University of Cyprus/Leventis Foundation): *Stirring Pots on Fire Project*.

2 That was the theme of an international conference recently published: Karageorghis and Kouka 2011. The book strongly
supports a migrationist perspective. On the problem of the “Hellenisation of Cyprus” and on the historiography of the concept, see Fourrier 2008.

3 See similar remarks by Sherratt 1991 on the appearance of “Aegeanising” fine pottery on Late Bronze Age Cyprus.

4 For example Dietler and Hayden 2001.


6 The same remark applies to fine wares: the whole material culture of Early Iron Age Cyprus is typologically and stylistically homogeneous (Iacovou 2005). Fabrics, however, point to local workshops.

7 Karageorghis 1983, 368.

8 I would like to thank the successive directors of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus, Dr P. Flourentzos and Dr M. Hadjicosti, for permission to study material from the Geometric necropolis of Kition.

9 Nothing is known of possible funerary rites that would have implied the use of cooking vessels.

10 On hearths and hobs from Early Bronze Age Cyprus, see Webb and Frankel 2011. For a terracotta representation dated to the 6th century BC, see Fourrier 2007, 93, fig. 24.

11 Thin-walled jugs used for boiling are well attested in the Roman kitchen pottery repertoire: for example, Hayes 1997, 82.

12 The shape of the Levantine-type cooking pot, with its wide opening, rounded bottom and thick walls, is very close to the modern Cypriot “tavas” pot, used for stewing: Yon 1985, 109, fig. 7c and 114, fig. 12. Thick walls would allow a slower and longer-lasting transmission of heat.

13 Other ways of cooking, which do not require the use of kitchen pottery, are also attested in Cypriot Geometric tombs: roasting was a common practice of the elite, as demonstrated by the eleboi, spits, found in Geometric tombs (Karageorghis 1983, 75). Barbecue is the standard method of cooking in Greek epic (Sherratt 2004).

14 This way of placing the vessel on the fire is confirmed by terracotta representations: Fourrier 2007, 93, fig. 24.

15 This is also suggested by ethnographic parallels: see n. 12 above. For round-bottomed cooking-pots in the Levant, see Lehmann 1996, pls. 83–87.

16 This way of cooking is attested in Cyprus from the Early Bronze Age onwards, for example at Marki-Alonia: Frankel and Webb 1994 and 1997, 99–102.

17 See, for example, Ben-Shlomo et al. 2008, 227: “these vessels reflect distinct cooking practices and eating habits, both of which usually represent conservative behavioural patterns”; Jung 2011, 69: “I find it difficult to suggest that such a radical eclipse of traditional habits and the substitution by foreign habits (…) occurred without the presence of a considerable number of immigrants from the Aegean”.

18 Much progress has been accomplished in the last decades towards a better understanding of the “Aegeanising” fine wares in their Cypriot milieu: see Sherratt 1991 and Fourrier 2008, with references. The recent use made by some scholars of kitchen pottery (as reflected by the proceedings of the Nicosia conference: Karageorghis and Kouka 2011) represents, in many respects, a return to old theories.

19 Cooking pots are remarkably numerous in elite tombs of the Early Iron Age: Karageorghis 1983.

20 Cooking pots figure prominently among the funerary deposits of Salamis “royal” tomb 79: Karageorghis 1974, pls. 1–11. Iron fire-dogs and skewers were found in the same tomb: ibid., pl. XVIII.


22 The “dépôt du rempart Nord”; the kitchen pottery was published in Fourrier 2007, with references.

23 No fish bones have been found in the deposit, though. Bovid, caprid and pork bones from the assemblage show butchery traces: Gardeisen 2006.

24 Chavane and Yon 1978, 129–131 (Nicocedès); 144–146 (Nicocreon).

25 Sherratt rightly insisted that the cauldrons mentioned in the epics were used to heat water for washing and not cooking: Sherratt 2004, 314.


28 Examples are too numerous to be listed and they are found in various media: terracotta figurines (Fourrier 2009, 137, fig. 2b), vase-painting (Karageorghis and des Gagniers 1979, 6–9), funerary reliefs (Pogiatzi 2003, 69), bronze and silver bowls (Markoe 1985, 171–176: Cy 3, Cy 5 and Cy 6). The sole remarkable exception is on a “Amathous Style” amphora from Archaic Amathous: Karageorghis and des Gagniers 1974, 516–517, no. 13. The style of this vase is of East Greek inspiration, and the shape of the cups held by the banqueting men is close to Chiot chalices.

29 To quote the title of Mazarakis Ainian’s book 1997. This is the thesis put forward by M. Iacovou in many seminal articles, for example Iacovou 2007 and 2008.
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