Symposia and Deipna in Plutarch's Lives and in Other Historical Writings

George Paul

In Greco-Roman historiography accounts of symposia and *deipna* often have a cautionary or admonitory effect. The incidents related may range from the merely disquieting to the murderously dire but their effect is to disturb and dissipate the atmosphere of ease and joy that the ideal symposium or dinner is expected to create. Naturally this discordancy is not present in every instance, but it occurs frequently enough—probably in the majority of cases—to warrant some reflection. The symposium in Greek and later in Roman society is one manifestation of that refinement in manners that results from a sense of style in living and from the leisure to devote time, effort, and reflection to interpersonal relations.[1] As such it has a peculiar interest for Plutarch, not only as biographer but also as essayist, especially in the six books of *Symposiaka*. For Plutarch, the dominant characteristic of the symposium is friendship: the *trapeza* is *philopoios*,[2] and the guest comes not only to share in the food and the wine, but also in the conversation, the entertainment, and the *philophrosyne* that ends in *eunoia*.[3] Few of the drinking parties or dinners he records in the *Lives* are like that, however, and the same is largely true of those recorded by other historical writers.

A review of the whole Greco-Roman historiography, even in respect of this one type of incident, would transgress the limits of a short chapter. So in order to set reasonable bounds to the discussion and because of Plutarch's special interests, his *Lives* will be cited as principal source but their evidence will be supplemented by instances drawn from other historical writers. Plutarch, as is well known, claims to be writing not *historiai* but *bioi*,[4] but though this distinction is a valid and important one for some purposes, in the present context we should note that the subjects of his *Lives* are politicians and generals, his subject-matter draws on a wide range of historical writing, and, as a recent writer points out, the *Lives* "contain a high proportion of historical narrative."[5] A concentration on Plutarch, therefore, should not lead to false conclusions about the presentation of

symposia and *deipna* in historiography, particularly if evidence from the historians is cited as well from time to time as a control.

Before the discussion proper, however, three preliminary points should be made. The first concerns a problem in the ancient evidence, namely that writers do not always distinguish clearly in their accounts between *symposion* and *deipnon*, or they use terms such as *synousia* or *convivium* where the meaning is not clear-cut; in some cases what is called by one writer a *deipnon* will be described by another as a *symposion*. No doubt this is partly due to the fact that the distinction that obtained in the Classical period between *deipnon* and *symposion* began increasingly to be blurred in Hellenistic and Roman times, and also because even in earlier times *deipnon* and *symposion* could form successive parts of a single entertainment, governed by similar codes, the drinking of wine being a common element. Such uncertainty as exists, therefore, is perhaps not of great moment, for both dinner and drinking party were expected to provide similar social pleasures and any breach of their codes of manners was likely to be similarly regarded.

The second point is that we tend to think of such entertainments as being universally enjoyed, but there were notable exceptions. According to Plutarch,[6] Pericles consistently declined invitations to dinner and all such *philophrosyne* and *synetheia*. The only exception he made was for the wedding feast of his cousin, Euryptolemos, and he left that when the libations were poured, that is, at the start of the symposium. Plutarch's gloss is that *philophrosyne* and *synetheia* are dangerous to reserve and dignity. Nicias, on the other hand, avoided dinners and similar social occasions because he was so afraid of informers, rather spending all day at the Generals' office or at the *boule*.[7] Sertorius refrained from heavy drinking (*methe*) even when he was at leisure.[8] Such exceptions to the general enjoyment of drinking parties or dinners are rare, however, and indeed it is because of the importance of the symposium in particular as a central social institution that its treatment in historical writings deserves to be considered.

The third point is that though questions may arise from time to time about the historicity of the various reports, such questions are not a major concern of the present discussion. The aim is rather to illustrate the fact that historical writers regard symposia and *deipna* as significant and revealing elements in their narratives, and that they have a particular interest in some of the darker aspects these entertainments may manifest from time to time.

Though in Greek and in Roman society many symposia and *deipna* were no doubt unexceptionable, it will perhaps occasion little surprise that those

described by historical writers frequently commemorate discordant behavior of one kind or another; the historian is seldom concerned with the events of ordinary life, being drawn more to record the unusual, extraordinary, or outrageous. Four types of discordant and even extreme behavior, jarring with the ideal of friendliness and pleasure, are well represented in Plutarch's *Lives* and in other historical narratives of symposia and *deipna*. While there is no intention to deny the existence of others, it is these types that are here presented (in a scale of increasing violence) as the most common, namely (1) disorderly or unmannerly conduct, (2) displays of excess and extravagance, (3) treachery and plotting, and (4) murder and decapitation.

Disorderly Conduct

We should hardly need to be told, though Plato does tell us,[9] that a certain amount of rowdiness was not uncommon in symposia, but some kinds of disorderliness called for special comment. The behavior of the Centaurs at the wedding of Peirithous and their brawl with the Lapiths may be regarded as a classic representation in myth of such disorder;[10] attempts to prevent actual disorderly conduct in a banquet setting are attested by various regulations for *collegia*.[11] At the earliest symposium (other than mythical ones) reported in a historical source, the one held by Cleisthenes of Sicyon and reported by Herodotus,[12] the dancing of Hippocleides caused increasing offense culminating in his standing on his head on a table and beating time with his legs. Dancing perhaps encouraged the display of uncongenial talents: Polybius tells us that when Deinocrates of Messenia was visiting Rome in 184 B.C. he was seen by Flamininus at a drinking party in a drunken dance and wearing long (i.e., women's) robes and was rebuked for it the next day.[13] In the very same year, however, as we shall see, Flamininus had to deal with the consequences of a much graver breach of the rites of the table by his brother, Lucius. One of the offenses attributed to Alcibiades was to turn up late, in a drunken *komos*, at a dinner given by his lover, Anytus, and—without even entering the *andron*—to order his slaves to carry off half of Anytus' gold and silver cups.[14] The other guests were outraged, but Anytus himself was more complacent, for Alcibiades, he said, might have carried off all the cups. The emperor Claudius was likewise lenient, though he responded more pointedly in the face of theft at the table, for when T. Vinius stole a golden cup from the emperor's table (the story is told by Tacitus as well as Plutarch[15]), the emperor, who was aware of the theft, invited him back the following day and ordered the servants to provide Vinius alone with an earthenware service. According to Plutarch's

reports, Macedonian entertainments were frequently the locus of jarring incidents, ranging from quarrelsome disputes among the scholars attendant on Alexander[16] to the brawl at the wedding of Philip and Cleopatra: Alexander threw a skyphos at Attalos, and Philip drew his sword against Alexander, but fortunately he tripped and fell.[17] One of the most celebrated stories told how Alexander, inflamed at a symposium by the impassioned speech of the *hetaera,* Thais, led out his companions in a *komos* and set fire to Persepolis.[18] Demetrius, the presumptuous freedman of Pompey, created offense by reclining at table in a slovenly manner while Pompey was still receiving the other guests.[19] Yet even unmannerly behavior might sometimes be tolerated: Favonius, who prided himself on his "Cynic" boldness and frankness, gate-crashed a party given by Cassius and attended by Brutus and, when directed to the uppermost couch, forced his way past the servants and reclined on the middle one; nonetheless, says Plutarch, over the wine there was *paidia* that did not lack grace or philosophy.[20] Gate-crashing, however, was a potential source of disorder: according to Polybius, Antiochus Epiphanes frequently broke up parties by his gate-crashing.[21]

Displays of Excess

"In ritual and mythology there is obviously a no to every yes, an antithesis to every thesis, order and dissolution, inside and outside, life and death."[22] To offset the strife of Centaurs and Lapiths on the west pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia there stands in the center Apollo, figure of order and peace. This aspect of Apollo is frequently associated with the symposium.[23] For Plutarch certainly, refined order and simplicity in the conduct of *deipnon* or symposium is an ideal, a mark of humane living. The emphasis on *kosmos* and *taxis* is well brought out in a saying attributed to Aemilius Paulus. When the Greeks marvelled at his courtesy and attention to detail, he responded to the effect that the same spirit was required both in marshalling a line of battle and in presiding at a symposium.[24] References to simplicity in entertainment constitute a topos in the *Lives*: Dion of Syracuse was modest at his table as if dining with Plato in the Academy;[25] Agesilaos made no innovations in his dining habits when he returned to Sparta from abroad;[26] Cleomenes usually dined in modest state, though when ambassadors or *xenoi* were present, the dishes were more generous and the wine *philanthropoteros*, and at the ensuing symposium the chief entertainment was conversation.[27] Moreover, Crassus generally invited ordinary people to his entertainments, which were marked by refinement and

philophrosyne rather than extravagance;[28] Cicero in his province entertained daily with generosity but without extravagance;[29] Ti. Gracchus kept a simple and inexpensive table, but Gaius by comparison was extravagant and overfastidious and was blamed for purchasing silver dolphins, presumably as a table ornament, at a price of 1250 drachmae per pound;[30] an anecdote contrasts Pompey's simplicity at table with the luxury of Lucullus;[31] Caesar's indifference to food is contrasted with the offensive extravagance of Valerius Leo, who had myrrh rather than olive oil poured on his guests' asparagus.[32]

Greek myth and folktale recount gross and horrible stories of excess in meals, especially the presentation of children, killed and cooked, as a meal to their unsuspecting parents or others. Famous examples included Thyestes' children, Pelops son of Tantalus, and Itys son of Tereus. The motif enters historiography with the story of Astyages and Harpagus' son;[33] Thucydides reports the story of Tereus as if it were a series of actual happenings.[34] Such stories, whatever else they mean, serve to define the limits of proper human behavior. Generally, of course, the entertainments narrated by the historians do not include events so gross, though as we shall see some reported incidents come close to them in their contempt for human life. In Plutarch, reports of simplicity, good order, and refinement at dinner or at drinking parties are more usually offset by his (and other writers') accounts of excess and extravagance; these too are types of behavior unacceptable or unwelcome in normal human society. In the eighth century B.C. the prophet Amos inveighs against the luxury and excess attendant on the *marzeah,* a Middle Eastern precursor of the symposium.[35] In the Greek world, where it originated in aristocratic circles, the symposium perhaps by its very nature lent itself to luxury and the display of wealth; reclining at table, it has been argued, was itself a symbol of luxury[36] and is one of the objects of Amos' wrath. From the day he learned of the defeat at Pharsalus, Cato the Younger, in token of mourning, adopted a sitting posture at table and refused to recline except when sleeping.[37] The introduction or at least rapid spread of drinking parties among the young nobles at Rome is linked by Polybius with the extravagance and dissoluteness acquired during the war against Perseus.[38] Plutarch inveighs against the vulgarity of introducing silver-footed couches, purple coverlets, gold cups, and similar extravagances into a simple and common house: he reports an anecdote of the elder Leotychidas, reared in Spartan simplicity, who when dining at Corinth and gazing at the expensive, coffered ceiling, asked his host if trees grew square in that country.[39] Excess and extravagance at entertainments took many forms, most obviously in the consumption of

wine itself. Phocion's son, Phocus, was notorious for *asotia*. According to Plutarch, when Phocus won a victory at the *Panathenaea* and Phocion was invited to the victory celebration, he found that *footbasins* of spiced wine were being carried round to the guests as they entered.[40] The Macedonians in particular were reputed to be heavy drinkers. Alexander, returning from the funeral pyre of Calanus, invited many of his friends and officers and proposed a contest in the drinking of unmixed wine. The winner, Promachos, drank as many as four choes, but he died three days later. Chares, Alexander's court usher, reported that forty-one other guests died of a chill consequent on their drunkenness.[41] Plutarch is interested in Alexander's drinking habits[42] and the version of his death the biographer prefers attributes it to the combination of heavy drinking and fever following upon a splendid entertainment and *komos*.[43] Sulla the Dictator would spend all day on couches drinking along with actresses, kithara players, and theatrical people, and spent lavishly on symposia.[44] Demetrius Poliorcetes and Antony, whose *Lives* form a pair in Plutarch's scheme, were notorious for their excessive drinking and the extravagance of their parties.[45] Demetrius' mistress, the *hetaera* Lamia, prepared a *deipnon* for him so widely renowned for its extravagance that it was written up by Lynceus of Samos (the brother of Duris),[46] while Cleopatra's increasingly lavish generosity on one occasion is described by Socrates of Rhodes, a historian probably of the first century B.C.[47] who calls it a *basilikon symposion*. Sallust describes the excessive and extravagant setting and rare foods provided for a *cena* in honor of Metellus Pius in Spain, at which a statue of Victory was lowered to place a wreath on Metellus' head.[48] Descriptions of luxurious *deipna* and symposia were now, it seems, established as a historiographical motif. Plutarch also makes biographical capital out of the anecdotes that circulated about the luxury and extravagance of Lucullus' dining arrangements.[49] Not only the parties but even the halls in which they were held are described in grander and more extravagant terms: Agathocles' Hall of Sixty Couches was said to have incurred the wrath of the gods,[50] while Alexander, it is reported, had a tent prepared to hold a hundred couches that he took with him on his expedition and used for the lavish entertainment associated with the weddings of the Persian women.[51]

Treachery and Plotting

As Circe ensnared the men of Odysseus, preparing them "a mixture of cheese, barley-meal, and yellow honey flavoured with Pramnian wine" into which she introduced "a powerful drug,"[52] so in historical writers symposia and *deipna* frequently appear as a cover for plots and treachery. The ease and enjoyment, harmony and fellow feeling at which symposia and *deipna* aimed, made them a welcome cloak for deception by the unscrupulous. The only entertainment of this kind to appear in the pages of Thucydides is the one at which the Athenian envoys are hoodwinked about the extent of Segestan wealth. In fact in this instance Thucydides may incautiously have accepted a popular tale, for Dover notes some of the difficulties in the report, and Aly points to similarities between this account and a popular *Wandermotiv* concerning deceptive displays of wealth.[53] On Plutarch's evidence one of the most pressing reasons for declining an invitation to a party might well have been the hope of circumventing the plots of one's fellow diners or symposiasts. A saying attributed to Epaminondas declares that (simple) meals such as he provided offered no scope for treachery.[54] Yet any meal or symposium with the traditional aims might be exploited as a cover for dark deeds. According to Plutarch, Aratus, when plotting the overthrow of Nicocles, threw the tyrant's spies off the scent by making public and obvious preparations for a symposium.[55] Pompey when a young man concealed his knowledge of a plot against his father and himself by acting with *philophrosyne* towards and drinking more freely with the plotter, Terentius, at supper.[56] When Sex. Pompey was entertaining Antony and Octavian on shipboard at Misenum, at the height of the revelry his lieutenant, Menas, offered to cut the cables and secure the mastery for Sextus; the story is also told by Appian and Dio.[57]

Plots in some cases led to killings. When Pelopidas and his companions undertook to dispose of the Theban tyrants, one of their associates proposed a symposium for the tyrants to throw them off guard, and the plotters turned up with women's clothes over their armor and wearing garlands of pine and fir.[58] Alexander, the son of Cassander, plotted to kill Demetrius Poliorcetes over the wine, but the plot was forestalled and he himself became the victim of Demetrius' counterplot as he left the dinner table.[59] Cleomenes had four of the ephors killed while they were dining.[60] Parysatis, the mother of Artaxerxes II, poisoned the king's wife, Stateira, at dinner after a supposed reconciliation; Plutarch derives his account from Ctesias and Dinon.[61] The plot against the life of Sertorius in Spain culminated in a banquet at which the plotters first tried to provoke the restrained and decorous Sertorius by dissolute behavior and then killed him, the signal for the attack being the dropped wine cup.[62] Diodorus tells the story of the murder of the younger Agathocles at a sacrificial banquet, followed by the poisoning of the king at dinner by his slave, Menon, who handed him a poisoned toothpick; Justin's quite different account of the king's death makes no

mention of a banquet.[63] Plots of this kind seem to be peculiarly appropriate to entertainments within royal courts or family gatherings: there are several examples in Josephus; Phakeas (Pekahiah) is "treacherously murdered *in a symposium with his friends*" where the words emphasized are Josephus' addition to the narrative of 2 *Kings;*[64] in his rendering of an incident from Jeremiah, the words "and those who reclined with him in the symposium" are also Josephus' addition to the biblical account.[65] For Josephus at least, treacherous murder at a symposium is a topos that may be used to flesh out a spare narrative. The Hasmonaean High Priest, Simon, dies at the hands of his son-in-law "after a plot against him in a symposium";[66] Malichus bribes Hyrcanus' wine pourer to poison Herod's father, Antipater;[67] Herod responds by having Malichus killed under cover of an invitation to a *deipnon.*[68] According to one account, Herod has Hyrcanus strangled after ensnaring him at a symposium;[69] Herod's brother, Pheroras, is said to have been poisoned at dinner.[70]

Murder and Decapitation

The fact or belief that a murder had been committed at a symposium or banquet added to the horror of the act. In the case of the killing of Clitus by Alexander, that it was carried out in a banquet setting, though not stressed by Plutarch, is underlined by other elements of the tradition and by moralizing commentators such as Seneca.[71] The cruelty of the deed in such a setting was enough to turn it into an exemplum.[72] Alexander had acted in a drunken rage; other killings at symposia or *deipna* reported in the historical tradition were more cold-blooded. Agathocles is said to have slaughtered his enemies, "five hundred in number," at a banquet after previously learning their real opinion about his rule while they were under the influence of wine,[73] while Alexander Jannaeus reputedly, as he feasted in a conspicuous place with his concubines, ordered "about eight hundred" of his Jewish enemies to be crucified, slaughtering the wives and children of his still-living victims before their eyes, "a deed," says Josephus, "most cruel of all."[74] One of the most notorious killings at a symposium, though it concerns only a single victim, was an action by L. Quinctius Flamininus, for which he was expelled from the Senate. There are various versions of the story, some of them intended to palliate L. Flamininus' offense, but Livy's version claims to be based on a speech of Cato the Censor giving the reason for Lucius' expulsion. According to this Lucius, while on campaign in Gaul, in order to gratify a young male favorite, had executed by his own hand, *inter pocula atque epulas,* a Boian chieftain who had come

seeking Roman protection.[75] Examples of similar cruelty at symposium and *deipnon* continue to be reported from later days. The Roman knight Vedius Pollio, while entertaining Augustus, would have had a slave who had broken a prized crystal cup thrown to the *muraenae* to be torn to pieces, had not Augustus intervened.[76]

According to Suetonius, the emperor Gaius not only conducted judicial examinations by torture while dining or drinking but had an expert headsman on hand for the execution of prisoners.[77] Later emperors are alleged to have watched displays of gladiators, criminals, and wild beasts just before or during dinner.[78] Nicolaus of Damascus refers to the Roman practice of introducing two or three pairs of gladiators as an after-dinner entertainment, and Strabo attributes this practice to the Campanians.[79] The assassins sent by Nero killed Faustus Sulla when he was reclining at supper; Sulla's severed head was brought back to Nero, who mocked it as he did that of Rubellius Plautus.[80] The display of a severed head at a banquet or drinking party constitutes a motif in itself. The *locus classicus* is the presentation of the head of John the Baptist at the birthday feast of Herod Antipas; Josephus in his report of the Baptist's death makes no mention of the feast or of Salome's request, while the Gospel accounts contain folktale elements, e.g., the rash oath and the boon at a banquet.[81] Plutarch recounts that after the Roman defeat at Carrhae, the head of Crassus was brought to the Parthian king, Orodes (Hyrodes), as he was banqueting with the Armenian Artavasdes. When the tables had been removed, Jason, a tragic actor, was about to sing the scene from Euripides' *Bacchae* in which Agave enters with the head of Pentheus; at that point the head of Crassus was thrown into the midst of the company and picked up by Jason, who substituted it for the mask of Pentheus and recited Agave's lines:

> We bring from the mountain
> a tendril fresh-cut to the palace,
> a wonderful prey.[82]

The historian Appian, surely in this case a victim of Augustan propaganda, reports the allegation that Antony placed the head of Cicero before his table at meals until he was satiated with the evil sight.[83] Even earlier, Seneca—no historian—had descanted on how the heads of *principes civitatis* were brought to Antony as he dined, and how in the midst of the most elaborate banquets and royal luxury he had examined the faces and hands of the proscribed.[84]

The foregoing makes no pretension to provide an exhaustive list of

symposia and *deipna* in the historical writers, but enough has been said to illustrate how Plutarch and other writers frequently choose to record, as caution or admonition, aspects of symposium or *deipnon* that offended against the code of ease and friendliness. Certain motifs recur and point to exaggerations, distortions, and even sheer inventions in the record. Though much of the material has been drawn from Plutarch, he himself was heavily dependent on earlier historical writings; the evidence of surviving works proves the interest of historians in symposia and *deipna* as important social institutions, especially perhaps in those incidents that offend against the social code governing these institutions. The appearance of disturbing symposia and *deipna* in myth may suggest that these institutions were seen or felt to be bastions of civilization in a war against barbarism that constantly threatened to overwhelm it. Likewise, since such entertainments may be seen as a microcosm of society, the orderly conduct of symposium or *deipnon* may be held to reflect the good order and discipline of *polis* or *respublica*. Whether such ideas remained uppermost in ancient thinking or sank from recollection, the readiness of historians to report examples of discordant behavior at symposia and *deipna* and the moral outrage that frequently colors their reports attest the strength of their conviction that a properly conducted symposium or *deipnon* was an index of civilized behavior.

NOTES

1. Cf. A. Dihle, *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*[2] (Göttingen 1970), 43 ff.
2. Cf. *Mor.* 612D; *Cat. Ma.* 25.4. Note the emphasis on *koinonia*, *Mor.* 643B.
3. *Mor.* 660B; cf. 660A fin.
4. Plut. *Alex.* 1.2.
5. A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius: The Scholar and His Caesars* (London 1983), 8 and n. 13.
6. *Per.* 7.5 ff.
7. Plut. *Nic.* 5.1.
8. Plut. *Sert.* 13.2.
9. Plato, *Lg.* 2.671A, 3; cf. 1.640A, 1.
10. Cf., e.g., Hom. *Od.* 21.295ff.; Ov. *Met.* 12.210ff.
11. E.g., *ILS* 7212, pag. II.25—Lanuvium; *SIG*[3] 1109.73ff—Iobacchi.
12. 6.130.
13. Polyb. 23.5.7–13; cf. Plut. *Flam.* 17.6.
14. Plut. *Alc.* 4.4–6; Athen. 12.534E-F (with additional detail).
15. Tac. *Hist.* 1.48; Plut. *Galba* 12.4 (silver cup); Suet. *Claud.* 32 (without naming Vinius).

16. *Alex.* 52.8–9; cf. Nero's enjoyment of the wrangles of philosophers *post epulas*, Tac. *Ann.* 14.16.
17. *Alex.* 9.6–14; Athen. 13.557D (Satyros).
18. *Alex.* 38; Cleitarchus, *FGrH* 137 F 11 (= Athen. 13.576D-E); Strabo 15.3.6, 730C (no mention of Thais); Arrian's account is altogether more sober, omitting the romantic element, 3.18.11–12.
19. Plut. *Pomp.* 40.7.
20. Plut. *Brut.* 34.8.
21. 26.1.4; cf. Diod. 29.32; Athen. 10.439A.
22. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. J. Raffan (Cambridge, MA 1985), 248.
23. Cf. W.J. Slater, *ICS* 6, 1981, 205ff.
24. Plut. *Aem.* 28.9; *Mor.* 615E-F; Polyb. 30.14; Liv. 45.32.11; Diod. 31.8.13.
25. Plut. *Dio* 52.3; cf. 13.3: after Plato's arrival in Sicily, the *aidos symposiôn* at the court of Dionysius led the citizens to entertain hopes of a change for the better; but at the beginning of the reign Dionysius was alleged to have had a drinking party for ninety consecutive days, and at the court in this period drunkenness and jesting and music and dancing and buffoonery held sway, ibid., 7.7.
26. Plut. *Ages.* 19.6; cf. Xen. *Ages.* 8.7.
27. Plut. *Cleom.* 13.4–7.
28. Plut. *Crass.* 3.2.
29. Plut. *Cic.* 36.3
30. Plut. *Tib. Gr.* 2.4; Plin. *H.N.* 33. 147; Tacitus, however, dates the spread of *luxus mensae* to the century after Actium, *Ann.* 3.55; cf. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte* 2[10], 284ff.
31. Plut. *Pomp.* 2.11–12; cf. 1.4; *Luc.* 40.2.
32. Plut. *Caes.* 17.9–10.1 (from Oppius?); cf. Suet. *Caes.* 53 (= Oppius fr. 7 P), taking *conditum* from *condire*.
33. Hdt. 1.107–20.
34. 2.29.3
35. 6.4–7; see the important discussion by Philip J. King, *Amos, Hosea, Micah—An Archaeological Commentary* (Philadelphia 1988), 137ff.
36. Cf. J.-M. Dentzer, *RA* 1971, 215–58. On luxury and extravagance at table see, in general, Athenaeus, bk. 4.
37. Plut. *Cat. Mi.* 56.7, 67.1; App. *BC* 2.98, 407.
38. 31.25.4ff.
39. Plut. *Lyc.* 13; 607; *Mor.* 227C; also told of Agesilaus in Asia, *Mor.* 210D.
40. *Phoc.* 20.3; Athen. 4.168F gives a somewhat different version.
41. Plut. *Alex.* 70.1–2; Chares, *FGrH* 125 F 19b; 19a (= Athen. 10.437A-B); Ael. *VH* 2.41.
42. *Alex.* 23.1; *Mor.* 623E-F.
43. *Alex.* 75.4–5; cf. Diod. 17.117; Justin, 12.13.7; Arr. 7.24.4ff.
44. Plut. *Sull.* 36.1, cf. 2.4; *Comp. Lys. et Sull.* 3.5.
45. *Demetr.* 19.4, 7; Diod. 20.92.4; Plut. *Ant.* 9.5–6; Cic. *Phil.* 2.61; Dio

45.28.1–2; note esp. Antony's association with Cleopatra, Plut. *Ant.* 28.2–6; 71.4–5.

46. Plut. *Demetr.* 27.3; cf. Athen. 3.101E, 4.12A-B.

47. *Ant.* 26.6; Socrates, *FGrH* 192 F 1 (= Athen. 2.147E–148B): cf. I. Becher, *Das Bild der Kleopatra in der griechischen and lateinischen Literatur* (Berlin 1966), 143–45, on the doubtful aspects of Socrates' description.

48. Sall. *Hist.* 2.70 M, *ultra Romanum ac mortalium etiam morem curabant;* Plut. *Sert.* 22.3 (with embellishments).

49. Plut. *Luc.* 40–41.

50. Diod. 16.82.2.

51. Diod. 17.16.4; Athen. 12.538C, 539D.

52. Hom. *Od.* 10.234–236, Penguin trans. E.V. Rieu (Harmondsworth 1946).

53. Thuc. 6.46; A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes, and K.J. Dover, eds., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* vol 4. (Oxford 1970), 313; W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novellen bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen,* 2nd ed. by L. Huber (Göttingen 1969), 35.

54. Plut. *Lyc.* 13.6.

55. *Arat.* 6.4–5.

56. Plut. *Pomp.* 3.2.

57. Plut. *Ant.* 32.3–8; App. *BC* 5.73, 308–11; Dio 48.38.

58. Plut. *Pel.* 9.4–11; *Mor.* 594E–597C; Xen. *HG* 5.4.4–7.

59. Plut. *Demetr.* 36.4–12; cf. the plotting and counterplotting of Neoptolemos and Pyrrhos at dinner, *Pyrrh.* 5.7–14.

60. Plut. *Cleom.* 7–8; cf. the attack of Damon and his associates on the magistrates of Chaeronea, *Cim.* 1.5.

61. Plut. *Art.* 19.107; Dinon, *FGrH* 690 F 15b; Ctesias, *FGrH* 688 F 29b.

62. Plut. *Sert.* 26.7–11.

63. Diod. 21.16.3–5; Justin 23.2.3–12.

64. *AJ* 9.233–234; cf. 2 *Kings* 15.25.

65. *AJ* 10.168–69; cf. *Jer.* 41.1–2.

66. *BJ* 1.54; cf. *AJ* 13.228, 20.240.

67. *BJ* 1.226; *AJ* 14.281.

68. *BJ* 1.233–34; *AJ* 14.291–92.

69. *AJ* 15.174–76.

70. *AJ* 17.62.

71. Plut. *Alex.* 50–52.7; Curt. 8.1.20–2.12; note esp. 8.1.51, 8.2.3, 8.6, 8.8; Justin 12.6.1–16, esp. 6.3, .6, .12, Arr. 4.8.1–9.4; Sen. *Ep.* 83.19; *De Ira* 3.17.1.

72. Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 38; Homeyer ad loc. cites Ps.-Aristid. *Rhet.* A 162 (*Rh. Gr.* 5.61.13 Schmid).

73. Diod. 20.63.6.

74. *AJ* 13.380.

75. Liv. 39.42.5–43.5; Cato *ORF*[3] fr. 71; Plut. *Cat. Ma.* 17.1–6; *Flam.* 18–19.5; Cic. *De Sen.* 42; Auct. *De Vir. Ill.* 47.4; Val. Max. 2.3. Valerius Antias and

"many others" (Plut.) had given versions of the story. For discussion see A.E. Astin, *Cato the Censor* (Oxford 1978), 79ff. A line from a much-quoted passage of Ennius' *Telamon* (*scen.* 314V[3]) points the contrast between *epulae* and *mortiferum bellum.*

76. Dio 54.23.1–4; Sen. *De Clem.* 1.18.2; *De Ira* 3.40.2–4.

77. Suet. *Cal.* 32.1.

78. *SHA: Verus* 4.9; *Elagab.* 25.7.

79. Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 78; Strabo 5.4.13, 250C.

80. Tac. *Ann.* 14.57.4, 14.59.3; Dio 62.14.1; [Sen.] *Oct.* 437.

81. *Ev. Marc.* 6.14–29; *Ev. Matt.* 14.1–12; Jos. *AJ* 18.119. For other examples see reports of Marius' dealings with the orator Antonius, Plut. *Mar.* 44.1–7; App. *BC* 1.72, 333–35; Val. Max. 9.2.2; Flor. 2.9.14; cf. also Diog. Laert. 9.10.58.

82. Plut. *Crass.* 33.1–7 (Eur. *Bacch.* 1169); Polyaen. 7.41. I should like to thank Dr. Eric Csapo for helpful discussion of the passage in Plutarch.

83. App. *BC* 4.20.81.

84. Sen. *Ep.* 83.25; cf. Sen. *Suas.* 6.7; Dio 47.8.1–2.

Dining in a Classical Context

Edited by William J. Slater

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS