now E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 158–60; 570–80, see *Pallas* 54 (2000), 86–7.

An appendix includes a farrago of short essays, etc.: on the Menander finds (but only up to the early 1970s, and so omitting *Karchedonios*, *Leukadia*, and the new Oxyrhynchus and Michigan fragments of *Epitrepontes*), metre, and modern stagings of *Samia* (but without mention of, for example, the radio broadcasts of Turner's English translation in 1971 and of Hurst's French in 1975), together with (i) some other scholars' critiques of the play (D. Lanza, D. Del Corno, P. A. Cavallero), (ii) a repeat of the Italian translation, and (iii) a translation of the epitome of Plutarch's *Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander*. There is also a small collection of illustrations of comic masks, the Mytilene mosaic, and a modern production of the play.

*University of Leeds* W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

## ARCHESTRATOS' GOOD FOOD GUIDE

S. D. Olson, A. Sens: *Archestratos of Gela. Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Pp. lxxiii + 261. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-19-924008-6.

Both editors and publishers are to be congratulated on bringing out a substantial commentary on an author who does not belong to the canon of great writers from the fourth century B.C. Archestratos has received some attention over the past decade, but nothing on the present scale or sophistication. The authors are well placed to edit the *Hedupatheia*, having edited the rather different parodic poem of the same period, the *Attikon Deipnon* of Matro of Pitane (Atlanta, 1999), and (Olson only) the *Acharnians* and *Peace* of Aristophanes. Argumentation on everything from date (taking issue with Dalby) to manuscript affiliations in the tradition of Athenaeus (agreement with Arnott's latest view in *Athenaeus and his World*, ed. D. Braund and J. Wilkins [Exeter, 2000], pp. 48–50) is sharp and persuasive. This is true both of the substantial introduction of some seventy pages and of the commentary on each fragment (the fragments are introduced individually with their context in Athenaeus included, with Greek text, translation, and notes). Other topics dealt with at length in the introduction are structure and contents; literary background and genre; audience and reception; food; dialect, language, and style; metre; and scholarly editions. Every reader comes with his or her own preoccupations, not all of which are likely to be shared by the authors. One of my current interests, in the *Hedupatheia* as a form of travel literature, is not covered extensively, but even this demand is met with sensible comment on p. xxx. The work of Archestratos deserves treatment on this scale partly because it is the product of a Greek world (including Sicily and southern Italy) in transition. Its author appears to come from the city of Gela, which was destroyed by the Carthaginians. Whatever his personal circumstances, the poem is a hymn to mobility. Dozens of cities are mentioned, but the journey is for the pleasure of eating good food rather than enforced displacement. Archestratos also anticipates later scholarly concerns—this is why he is such a valuable author for Athenaeus. From Athenaeus' extensive engagement with the poem we discover that it was of interest to

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.26 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Callimachus (T2) and Lycophron (T7), and that it was denounced by Chrysippus and Clearchus (T3–6). If we consider the work of Callimachus and later scholars on homonyms and dialect differences as lexical concerns, we might compare the cases in the note on fr. 5.12–13, on the possibility of an emerging scholarly interest in local glosses. The poem is also of interest within the epic tradition. The poem is a pastiche of Homer, and was translated into Latin by another south Italian poet, Ennius, whose version is discussed in an appendix. Archestratos is the poet who put the fish into Homer. The editors are particularly strong on his adaptation of the language and rhythms of Homeric verse. As far as content is concerned, Archestratos considers which fish are best in which cities (the editors believe that Archestratos confines himself almost exclusively to Greek cities and firmly reject the reading Carthage [MSS, Dalby; Calchedon Schweighauser] in fr. 14.1 [13.1 Brandt]). The commentary on cities, fourth-century politics in Magna Graecia, Greece, and the Aegean, the identification of fish and other foods, dining, and drinking practices seems to me exemplary, given the limitations of the commentary format. Three fragments may illustrate the interest of the work. The first, fr. 4, is fr. 61 in Brandt and 191 in *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. The argument that this fragment should come at the beginning of the *deipnon* (l. 1) and not the end appears unanswerable. Archestratos envisages three to five diners eating at one table. We are given excellent context for the diners but not for the single table, which appears to remain anomalous. In characteristically lively language, Archestratos claims that a larger group would create a tent of mercenary soldiers who snatch their livelihood. The commentary on mercenaries is adequate, and the editors add that the epithet '*harpaxibio*' may remind us of the fish that the audience is urged to snatch if they have no other way to acquire them. The fragment thus distinguishes rapacious travel for military benefits from rapacious travel for dining purposes. The moral code proposed is ambiguous, is frequently commented upon by Athenaeus, and probably contributes to the playful pitch made by the title and comic features in the text. The commentary on one of the longer fragments, fr. 5 (135 *SH*), on breads, has much valuable information on cities, cereals, and the broader Greek diet beyond Archestratos' special emphasis on fish and wine for the élite. It brings out too poetic features of prosody and kenning or riddling speech, which was Archestratos' offering in the field of entertainment where Juvenal or Petronius would use more theatrical forms of dining. The commentary is particularly effective on riddling speech on fr. 16 (146 *SH*), where Lloyd-Jones and Parsons marked l. 8 as corrupt. Our editors make a slight change, adding *kai* in crasis in l. 9, and identify the strange pebbles as dice and the sheep's limbs as knucklebones. Building on arguments from Casaubon (on the lack of interest in fishermen in such a text) and Wilamowitz (on gambling), they illustrate their flair in both textual scholarship and understanding of Greek culture. Thus Brandt is taken to task for believing that shooting dice was an exclusively lower-class habit. Fr. 16 is also notable for the location discussed—Archestratos chooses Ambraciot fish with surprising frequency—and for the fish, the *kapros* or 'boar fish'. The data on Ambracia is more from the fifth century as the fourth, perhaps reflecting the focus of a modern reader, though Hammond and Head are included. The editors give the ancient data on the fish—from Aristotle and Athenaeus—but do not comment on the fact that it is a freshwater species, which would have interested an ancient medical author at least.

*University of Exeter* JOHN WILKINS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.26 Published online by Cambridge University Press