

(pp. 80–7), and, not surprisingly, their wonderworking quotient rises with their proximity to Theodoret (p. 90). Chapter 8 is devoted to Symeon Stylites, and Theodoret's rather critical stance towards him (pp. 100–1), and Chapter 9 addresses Theodoret's (surprisingly non-seductive) women (p. 104), whose main rôle 'appears to conform to the theory that women are included in hagiographic texts to allow for the possibility of universal salvation. If even women can be saved, there is hope for everyone' (p. 111). Concomitantly, as U. argues in the concluding chapter, Theodoret's male ascetics are feminized through emphasizing their self-denial and passivity: they, like women, require the guidance that only 'men like Theodoret can give' (p. 145).

This is also the thrust of U.'s final part, 'Interaction with Clerics'. U. points out that according to the *RH* 'the correct and desirable relationship between holy men and cleric is deference from the former and leadership from the latter' (p. 116). Indeed, one of work's most striking moments is the auto-hagiographical story of Th.'s conception through the intercession of Macedonius. This, according to U., is the best example of 'the thread running through the work . . . Theodoret's life, which, being woven into the tapestry of the lives of holy men, takes on a sanctified hue' (p. 142)—a thread that is at the same time also the *RH's* *raison d'être*: to 'harness' unruly monks by writing hagiographies, which 'portray them as defying everyone except bishops' (p. 143).

As I have mentioned above, U.'s book is a welcome contribution to the study of Theodoret and his work. Yet, despite all its many merits, in U.'s rendering, Theodoret the man, his text, and his subjects remain curiously flat. Somehow one does not quite get a feel for the extraordinary sophistication of Theodoret's rhetorical strategies, or the dramatic circumstances of his life and his battles for 'Syrian' pre-eminence. This might simply be a matter of taste, but I cannot help but feel that this book might have gained even more weight had it been allowed to 'rest' a little longer.

University of California, Berkeley

SUSANNA ELM

### AB OVO USQUE AD MALA

A. DALBY: *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z*. Pp. xvi + 408, maps, ill. London and New York: Routledge, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 0-415-23259-7.

What the inhabitants of the ancient Mediterranean world ate and drank, and how they prepared, served, and consumed their meals, have become topics of considerable interest to classicists and archeologists in the last decade or so. Research in the area has been hindered by a lack of basic research tools, and for the professional scholar this volume helps to fill that gap. Dalby's introductory material, on the other hand, is aimed at the intelligent, non-specialist reader with little Greek or Latin, but who might be tempted to try to produce some of the dishes described. Both audiences will find this a useful book, and both would have been better served had more traditional philological care been taken in producing it and a larger editorial team assembled.

D. discusses every sort of food and drink, from acorns (allegedly mankind's first food, but better suited to pigs) to zedoary (a ginger-like root grown in India), as well as ancient authors who touch on gastronomic topics, places with interesting indigenous cuisines, cooking methods, utensils, and the like. Individual entries range in length from a few sentences to a few pages, and offer a wealth of fascinating and often surprising information. Who knew, for example, that carrots were white until the Byzantine period, or that some Greeks believed that truffles were produced by

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

thunderbolts? A collection of primary references is appended to each article, along with modern secondary bibliography from sources as diverse as *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture*, and *Geographical Review*. For the serious reader, these references are the informational core of the book and a point at which scholarly ‘best practices’ ought to be conspicuously on display, given the long shelf-life of encyclopedias and their rôle as a basic means of access to the field for specialists and non-specialists alike.

Of the 100 ancient and modern references I checked at random, only two were patently defective (on p. 113 s.v. ‘Darnel’, for ‘Herodotus 6. 100’ read ‘Herodas 6. 100’; on p. 266 s.v. ‘Pomegranate’, strike the reference to ‘Paus. 7. 17. 11’); but a very large number of these references were also too vague to be helpful, even for readers who control the ancient languages. D. regularly cites the Greek comic poets, for example, by fragment-number only, even when the fragment is many lines long and the item in question is mentioned in passing near the end of it; omits running *PMG*- and *GPh*-numbers; and cites Plutarch’s *Moralia* by extended title and chapter- and paragraph-numbers, but not by page-numbers (which are much more useful). Nor does he always cite authors from the best editions, or even from those most widely available. Thus D.’s note on the third-century B.C. fish-poet Numenius shows that he knows Lloyd-Jones–Parsons’ *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, but for Arcestratus of Gela (*SH* 132–92) he still relies on and refers the reader to Brandt’s long-out-of-print 1888 Teubner. Other fragmentary poets collected in *SH* are handled in a similarly unhelpful manner, just as the fragments of Theophrastus are cited from Wimmer rather than Fortenbaugh, and Epicharmus is cited from Kaibel rather than Kassel–Austin. Non-standard abbreviations are employed throughout, frequently to no point. Thus, D. cites the portions of Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophists* that survive only in an epitomized version as ‘E.’ rather than ‘D.’, a distinction that merely makes matters more confusing for the reader, but also fails to provide book-numbers, which *are* significant. Nor is the citation style even internally consistent; the fragments of the comic poets, for example, are referred to in at least three different ways (‘Aristophanes fr. 581 Kassel’, ‘Eubulus F 65 Kassel’, and ‘Archippus 23 Kassel’), with variations often occurring within the same note. (Why these are called Kassel-numbers rather than Kassel–Austin-numbers, as properly, is unclear; if space was a consideration, the standard abbreviation ‘K–A’ might have served.)

D.’s decisions as to what primary material to cite or pass over are also difficult to make consistent sense of. Under ‘Duck’, for example, he mentions *Ar. Ach.* 875, but fails to note that the bird appears in at least five other comic banquet catalogues, as well as in Matro’s *Attic Dinner-Party* (*SH* 534.95), or even to refer the reader to a commentary that contains the information. Similar odd omissions occur routinely in the secondary bibliography. Thus D’Arcy Thompson’s *Glossary of Greek Birds* is cited repeatedly, but not s.v. ‘Bustard’, ‘Ostrich’, or ‘Pheasant’; García Soler’s *El arte de comer en la antigua Grecia* seems to be almost entirely ignored in the individual entries, despite its inclusion in D.’s list of ‘works frequently cited and widely relevant’; and Amyx’s authoritative study of Athenian cooking and serving vessels (*Hesperia* 27 [1958], 164–307) is omitted from all the relevant entries I checked. D.’s own work, on the other hand, is referred to much more frequently than seems necessary. As for truffles, finally, Theophrastus (fr. 400) and Plutarch (*Mor.* 664a–c) agree that they were thought to result not from thunderbolts but from thunder; while readers interested in the article by Andrews cited s.v. ‘Turnip’ should be warned that it is actually a study of parsnips (and correct the page-numbers to ‘145–52’).

In short, this is a timely book, but less helpful—and less encyclopedic—than it might have been.

*University of Minnesota*

S. DOUGLAS OLSON

## FROM START TO FINISH

M. GOLDEN: *Sport in the Ancient World from A to Z*. Pp. xxiv + 184, map, ills. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-415-24881-7.

It is improbable that many would call G.'s dictionary (or any dictionary) a 'good read', but that is how it seems to me. Although intended as a reference work, to be consulted about specific names or terms, I enjoyed going straight through it, A to Z. This may be a reflection of my own interest in athletics, but it is also due, at least in part, to G.'s writing style, which keeps the pages turning (s.v. Diet, Felix, et al.).

The entries are of use both to the student and to the specialist. G. has confronted the difficult task of deciding which athletes (and gladiators and charioteers) to include; many of the choices are obvious—the athlete had performed some feat that set him apart from the rest—but some are not, and the specialist will still have to consult Moretti's list of Olympic victors. I found particularly endearing the listing of many horses by name.

Problems of orthography will always plague us. G. elects to use Latinate forms for all his words (p. x), but does not always do so: *kappa* is sometimes 'c' as in Cimon, but sometimes 'k' as in *akon*. I would urge that in the next edition one-for-one transliterations be used for Greek words. That practice has proven useful to students who immediately understand the source language when they see, for example, a 'k', or a noun ending in -os as opposed to -us.

At the risk of appearing less than grateful for this wonderful addition to our resources, I would offer a few suggested corrections and additions. I hope to be forgiven if several have to do with Nemea. In this context I must make an observation that goes beyond G.'s book. As the excavations of the past thirty years have shown, and as G. recognizes (p. 108), the Nemean Games were actually at Nemea only for two discrete periods: 573 B.C. to about 415 B.C., and about 330 B.C. to 271 B.C. Hence, athletes successful at other times at the Nemean Games did not win 'at Nemea'. This is, then, an appeal to use expressions like 'at the Nemean Games' or 'a Nemean victory' in reference to victories during those times when the games were actually at Argos.

Agathos Daimon

Add: Wolfgang Decker, 'Olympiasieger aus Ägypten', *Religion und Philosophie in alten Ägypten* (Leuven, 1991), pp. 102–3.

*Apodytêrion*

Add: Stephen G. Miller, *Nemea II: The Early Hellenistic Stadium* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2001), pp. 139–224.

Aratus

Aratus and the Achaians broke the truce, not the Argives who had been holding the Nemean Games and invoking the Nemean Truce long before Aratus came along (Plutarch, *Aratos* 3.2).

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved