

ATHENAEUS THE NAVIGATOR*

Abstract: This study concerns navigation in a geographical sense and in the sense of the reader finding a way through a complex text with the help of points of reference. Recent studies in Athenaeus have suggested that he was a more sophisticated writer than the second-hand compiler of Hellenistic comment on classical Greek authors, which has been a dominant view. Building on these studies, this article argues that Athenaeus' approach to his history of ancient dining draws on traditional poetic links between the symposium and the sea, and expands such metaphors with a major interest in place and provenance, which also belongs to the literature of the symposium. Provenance at the same time evokes a theme of imperial thought, that Rome can attract to herself all the good things of the earth that are now under her sway. Good things include foods and the literary heritage of Greece now housed in imperial libraries. Athenaeus deploys themes of navigation ambiguously, to celebrate diversity and to warn against the dangers of luxury. Notorious examples of luxury are presented – the Sybarites and Capuans, for example – but there seem to be oblique warnings to Rome as well. Much clearer censure is reserved for the gastronomic poem of Archestratus of Gela, which surveys the best cities in which to eat certain fish. The Deipnosophists deplore the immorality of the poet and his radical rewriting of their key authors Homer and Plato, while at the same time quoting him extensively for the range of his reference to geography and fish. This commentary on Archestratus is a good example of the Deipnosophists' guidance to the reader, Roman or otherwise, who wishes to 'navigate' the complicated history of the Greek *deipnon* and symposium.

INTRODUCTION

The *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus of Naucratis is a literary symposium, which loosely follows Plato's model¹ and replaces philosophical debate with two unusual features: (1) an insistent focus on food, wine and sympotic practice; and (2) a dialogue that is packed with direct quotation of earlier sources on any given topic. These features dominate discussion in the work and have also come to dominate modern scholarship on Athenaeus. The present article proposes a new approach to this rich material: in terms of geography. Athenaeus and his diners evoke a strong sense of place. Their quotations are frequently tied to specific locations. Geographical authors play their part, while ethnographies and local histories are extensively used, and some authors are made to appear more geographically focused in quotation than they do when read in full. This geographical feature of the *Deipnosophistae* is particularly suitable for ancient discussions of food and drink, in which provenance is regularly an issue. Athenaeus supports this emphasis on place with nautical metaphors that belong to the symposium. The geographical focus also enabled Athenaeus to allude to anxieties about luxury and excess invading Rome from outside, for the foods of the *Deipnosophistae* are traded goods destined for the court and the rich man's table – the opposite of the subsistence foods traditionally linked with the land and the virtuous life.

The *Deipnosophistae* is structured around the order of the meal followed by the symposium, and is composed in fifteen books.² This article is written in the belief that the *Deipnosophistae* as transmitted to us is a virtually complete work, with some damage to the first three books and other

* I am grateful to the two readers of the *Journal* and to David Braund for their valuable advice; also to colleagues at Exeter and Princeton who commented on an earlier version of the paper.

¹ The influence of Plato's *Symposium* on works of the Roman imperial period like the *Deipnosophistae* is clear. These include Lucian's *Symposium* and *Lexiphanes*, the vast collection of Plutarch's *Sympotica*, and his historical reconstruction, *The Dinner of the Seven Sages*. See Martin (1931), Trapp (2000) 353–4, Romeri (2002).

² I believe that the text of the *Deipnosophistae* transmitted in fifteen books is the complete text and not an abridgement of a longer version in thirty books. The

most influential proponent of the latter is Kaibel (1887–90), followed by Gulick (1927–41) and Desrousseau (1956) – the editors of the three most widely-used editions. See also Mengis (1920). The case rests on marginal notes in the Venice manuscript (Marcianus 447: see next note) and allusions to Athenaeus in Macrobius and the *Suda*. The argument for Athenaeus' composition of the work in fifteen books is set out by Guillen (2000). See also Schweighauser (1801–7) I xiv–xvi; Düring (1936); Letrouit (1991); Arnott (2000) 43; Olson (2006) I xv. Düring (1936) and Dalby (1996) 168–79 and 258–61 respond to much of the detailed argument of Kaibel.

small lacunae.³ This damage to the manuscript together with indications of thirty books and clear statements by Athenaeus that he is compiling material from intermediary as well as direct sources has led a number of scholars to doubt the competence of the author and the integrity of the text.⁴ It is the brief of this article to argue for the authorial control of Athenaeus and to show the navigational aids he provides to guide the reader through the long time period and multiple locations covered by the discussions and quotations of the *Deipnosophistae*.

Certain principles that guide the reader of Athenaeus are already in place.⁵ Christian Jacob has shown (2000, 2001) how Athenaeus works as a librarian might, referring carefully to his texts by author and book, cross-referring where necessary, and creating other links.⁶ In Athenaeus, questions of authenticity are regularly addressed. Authors are assessed according to their scholarly standing in the library. Authors might be quoted directly, or through intermediary sources, or in a summary or paraphrase. Rare authors are valued, and sometimes quoted partly for their rarity. But canonical authors also are given attention. We can see this in the prominence given to Homer, Plato and Aristotle.

Much work has also been done on the *Deipnosophistae* as a repository of fragments. Walbank (2000) and Pelling (2000) raise important issues of selection, quotation and summary in Athenaeus' presentation of historical authors. Lenfant (2007) presents a number of studies of historians quoted in Athenaeus. These discussions, which focus on the context in which Athenaeus places a fragment, show the need for rethinking in standard collections such as Jacoby. A clearer understanding of Athenaeus' priorities will add precision to this debate.

In this article, I am concerned with the navigation of time as well as space. Texts of navigation by sea and movement overland will be found, like Strabo's *Geography*, to have a temporal as well as a spatial dimension.⁷ Like other authors of his day, Athenaeus uses the canonical authors Homer and Plato as reference points to guide his readers through the topographical (and associated historical and moral) detail along the recommended path. At the end of the article, I point to

³ The best manuscript (Venetus Marcianus 447) lacks the first two books and part of the third, and has lacunae later and at the end. The gaps are supplemented by the manuscripts of the Epitome, or the abbreviated edition of the text in fifteen books whose relationship with the Venetian manuscript is disputed. The Epitome carries superior readings to the Marcianus in a number of places, which implies independence: see Letrouit (1991); Arnott (2000) 42-50; Olson and Sens (2000) lxvii-lxx. The present Epitome strips out mainly dialogue between the diners and some bibliographical detail. It does not appear to reorder material. For the sake of clarity, however, in this article, passages surviving only in the Epitome and not in the Marcianus are identified as 'Epitome'.

⁴ Athenaeus' extensive use of scholarly materials, such as the *Lexicon* of Pamphilus of Alexandria, the Homeric commentators and the critique of Plato by Herodicus of Babylon (5.192b, 215f-222b) has provoked much uncertainty over precisely which words are taken from the intermediary source and which belong to Athenaeus. He and his diners are self-conscious users of scholarly materials and seem to enjoy this area of uncertainty: at 15.676f, for example, Myrtilus asks Ulpian to avoid the standard handbook of Aelius Asclepiades on garlands. Many critics have seen the use of handbooks as a further weakness, and would attribute greater quantities of material to other authors. Düring (1941) on Herodicus of Babylon is an extreme example. Düring (1936) suggests

Favorinus as a major figure behind the *Deipnosophistae*. This approach to Athenaeus' inventiveness and use of form contrasts with a number of contributions to Braund and Wilkins (2000), which try to identify Athenaeus' method in its own right. König (forthcoming) has identified the 'compilatory ethic' in Athenaeus as an important and positive feature of the work.

⁵ The approach set out below takes into account the complicated organization of the *Deipnosophistae*. At times the sympotic conversation is recast and summarized by Athenaeus (e.g. 7.227b) in catalogues of items (starters, breads, fish, drinking cups and many more), as if the work were a lexicon or encyclopaedia, to be arranged by lemmata following alphabetical or non-alphabetical order. The catalogues, in turn, frequently incorporate conversation and other interruptions. In book 12, Athenaeus takes over a whole book, and the conversational format is held in abeyance. This combination of conversation and cataloguing reflects the double focus on the meal and the lexicon. Detailed discussion of this complex format can be seen in Mengis (1920), who accepts Kaibel's critique, and Düring (1936), who does not.

⁶ See also Too (2000).

⁷ I have been influenced in particular by Clarke (1999) on the intersection of geography and history in Polybius, Posidonius and Strabo – all three authors used by Athenaeus.

the ambiguous position of Rome in this account. Athenaeus seems to suggest that Rome does not suffer from the excesses that brought low other peoples across space and time, yet his treatment of the themes of luxury and pleasure might lead to the conclusion that Rome is at risk.⁸

I. TOPOGRAPHY AND TOPOGRAPHICAL WORKS

The first geographical point of reference is the setting in Rome. The host of the dinners, Larensis, is a Roman magistrate, and some of the *Deipnosophistae* may well be Roman.⁹ Masurius and Magnus are possibilities. Aemilianus appears to come from Mauretania. Other *Deipnosophistae* are Greek speakers from the eastern part of the Empire. Athenaeus comes from Naucratis in Egypt; the symposiarch Ulpian from Tyre in Syria; Cynulcus the leading Cynic speaker is Thessalian; Plutarch comes from Alexandria, Democritus from Nicomedia, Galen from Pergamum, Rufus from Nicaea, Daphnus from Ephesus. Nearly all the speakers who have a larger part in the discussions refer at times to their home city or country. These topographical references personal to the diners help to shape the hundreds of place names that are attached to the authors quoted and to the topographical references in the quotations. Ulpian gives Syrian colouring to the discussion (for example 8.346c, 14.649c, 15.697c), Athenaeus Egyptian (7.312a-b), Aemilianus North African (see below) and so on.

The *Deipnosophistae* have come to discuss cultural practice and past highlights achieved in other cities, and to argue over civilization and its excesses (where relevant), within the civilized world of the Roman Empire. While they all appear to know Greek and Latin, Larensis in particular is identified as one able to contribute to intercultural understanding (Epitome 1.2c). Ulpian, by contrast, is hostile to the barbarian Latin language (*βαρβαρίζοντες* 3.121f) and threatens to leave the symposium because Latin terms are 'indigestible'. Cynulcus' policy differs from Ulpian's: when living in the Roman imperial capital he speaks the local language, justifying his practice by comparing the use of Persian terms and Macedonian terms in the best Greek and Attic authors of the fifth and fourth centuries BC (3.121f-122a).¹⁰ For the *Deipnosophistae*, language as well as food is located according to place.

The speakers spend little time eating. Practically the whole work is devoted to discussion and quotation of texts that mention the food in front of them. The *Deipnosophistae* draw their material from their reading in a number of libraries. We are not told which, but they surely include the library of Larensis, who 'surpassed all who have been wondered at for their collection' (Epitome 1.3a-b), including Aristotle, Theophrastus, Ptolemy Philadelphus and the kings of Pergamum. Larensis has transported many Greek texts to a new home in the imperial capital, just as Ptolemy moved (Epitome 1.3b *μετήγαγε*) the books he had collected in Athens to their new home in the Mouseion in Alexandria. Larensis' hospitality also competes with such predecessors as Alexander the Great, Conon and Alcibiades (Epitome 1.3d-e) who organized feasting on a vast and international scale. His hospitality makes his guests feel that they have a new homeland so that they no longer pine for home (Epitome 1.3c): *καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἐστιάσεις δὲ παρακαλῶν πατρίδα, φησί, τὴν Ῥώμην πᾶσιν ἀποφαίνει, τίς γὰρ τὰ οἴκοι ποθεῖ τούτῳ ζυγῶν ἀναπεπταμένην ἔχοντι τοῖς*

⁸ To illustrate the point briefly, compare Epitome 1.9d-e and *Deipnosophistae* 8.330f-331b. In the first passage, Homer, for Athenaeus the touchstone of virtue and simplicity, is said to refer to the Phaeacians as avid sailors (*πλωτικώτατοι*), to the marine life contributing to the prosperity of Ithaca, and to the Phaeacians' crops never failing. For all this wealth based on land and sea, the Epitome tells us, Homer never describes the consumption of fish or fruit. In the later passage, Larensis is said to have provided such lavish dishes that he has made Rome as rich

as Polybius' description of Lusitania with its teeming fish stocks and long growing seasons for crops. Larensis' guests do eat the most lavish meals of fish and fruit. Are they somehow immune from luxury?

⁹ On the role of Rome in the *Deipnosophistae* see Braund (2000). Zecchini (1989) 20-2 identifies the 'filoromanesimo' of Athenaeus.

¹⁰ For non-Greek words in the *Deipnosophistae* see Dalby (forthcoming).

φίλοις τὴν οἰκίαν; The Deipnosophistae do not pine; they recall the Greek past at these Roman meals, to remind the imperial capital of the strengths of the Greek cities. Ion of Chios¹¹ acted similarly (Epitome 1.3f = *TrGF* 19 T3): when victorious at the tragic competition in Athens, he gave every Athenian a jar of wine – from Chios.

Larensis has invited his guests to contribute extracts from the papyrus rolls that they have found in the libraries. The guests (Epitome 1.4b) ‘were present at the dinner, and provided, as dinner-contributions, writings bundled up like bedding’. The contents of the library are thus closely related to the stages of the meal, and as each course comes in, the diners quote voluminously from books while they recline on couches. The Deipnosophistae are to make their contributions by naming dishes and sympotic materials, and quoting texts in which they were discussed or mentioned over a period of a thousand years, before eating or using them. In the place of the menu (γραμματείδιον) that was normally given to the diner after he had reclined (Epitome 2.49d), these meals have more extensive written analogues in the mass of quotation. The lexicon, glossary, encyclopaedia and learned monograph contribute the details which the menu would normally provide – of bread from Eresos, tuna from Byzantium, cakes from Syria and so on. The authors, texts and words cited often have a geographical setting, just as the foods have a provenance and the dining practices a host culture.

The diners present all this material at their meals in Rome, the ‘ouranopolis’ (Epitome 1.20c) that embraces all the other cities in the Empire. In Athenaeus’ words (Epitome 1.20b and c), ὁ σύμπαξ δῆμος τῆς οἰκουμένης (‘the whole demos of the civilized world’) was located in Rome. The response of Aelius Aristeides to the cosmopolis (26.11-13) was that nobody now needed to travel anywhere for the purposes of tasting the diversity of Empire. He later adds (26.102) that there is no further need for *periêgêseis* since the Romans have made the benefits of their civilization available to all, and rendered local differences obsolete. Athenaeus’ response to empire is more subtle: the foods of empire are indeed available to them at their meals in Rome, but the identification and validation of those foods come from local detail found in the *periêgêseis*, *paraploi*, *periploi* and local histories of the past. The *periêgêsis* still has its uses.¹²

Texts of travel offer details about the location of particular foods and practices and reveal the full geographical range of dining and of luxury. Athenaeus devotes certain books to topographical surveys. The fourth book, on styles of dining, begins with Macedon and proceeds to Athens, Sparta, Crete, Persia, Egypt, Arcadia, the Celts, Thrace, Parthia, India, Rome, the Etruscans and others, before addressing general questions of excess and restraint. Book 5 directs these questions to the Hellenistic courts, in particular to elaborate processions in Antioch and Alexandria; and book 6 concludes with the development of wealth in Rome. The survey of luxury in book 12 identifies the Persians as the originators, and goes on to Lydians, Etruscans, Sicilians and many others.

The evidence for these specific places that are picked out to illustrate the general theme is extremely varied, as befits the bibliophile diners. Ethnographic writers such as Posidonius on the Celts (4.151e-152f, 154b-c), Megasthenes on the Indians (4.153d-e) and Herodotus on the Persians (4.143f-144b) find themselves in the company of the epistolographer Hippolochus on the Macedonians (4.128a-130d) and the parodist Matro of Pitane (4.134d-137c), along with comic poets, on the Athenians (4.130e-134d). As we shall see in the next section, Athenaeus and his speakers draw on both ‘ethnography’ and ‘history’; they take their geographical data from authors with strong claims in the field as well as giving authors with no such claims a strong topographical colour. It is entirely characteristic that the contrasting descriptions of the processions of the Hellenistic kings in book 5 are taken from Polybius (an author made by Athenaeus’ selection of

¹¹ A further author whose most geographical work, the *Epidemiai* or *Travels*, is reported by the diners.

¹² For Strabo’s treatment of the movement of people and goods to the Roman centre, see Clarke (1999) 210-28, and esp. 220-1.

quotations to appear more topographically focused than in his complete work) and Callixenus of Rhodes, whose local history on Alexandria was ideal for the Deipnosophistae both for its focus on a specific city and for its bibliographical rarity (as far as we know).¹³

When reviewing foods and wines in detail, the Deipnosophists often find that their research in the library leads to uncertainty over both product and terminology. Locating a food aids the process of pinning down, clarifying and classifying. I have taken the entries on the *kinara*, one of the edible thistles (Epitome 2.70a-71c), and the citron (3.83a-85c) to illustrate the Deipnosophists at work.¹⁴

Since the identity of the *kinara* or *kunara* is unclear, the diners resort to the texts of the *periêgêsis* and *periplous*, along with the botanists, for clarification. They want to know about the plant, the place of origin and the technical name; and they also comment on the text providing the information, where relevant. They begin with the *Women of Colchis* of Sophocles¹⁵ and *The Periëgesis of Asia* of Hecataeus of Miletus (if that work is genuine).¹⁶ Hecataeus links the plant with the area of the Caspian Sea, specifically with the Chorasmii, east of the Parthians, and with the region of the Indus. Scylax (the diners also doubt the authenticity of his work, which may be by Polemon of Ilium)¹⁷ adds further support for the Indus. They turn to Theophrastus, who says that the *kaktos* is a Sicilian but not a Greek plant. A possible conclusion is reached with the suggestion that this Sicilian *kaktos* is what the Romans in the area in Athenaeus' own day call *kardos*. Libyan evidence is added from the *Hypomnemata* of Ptolemy Euergetes (*FGrHist* 234 F1). Geographers, botanists and other commentators are all called upon in the attempt to link the ancient *kinara* with the modern (Latin) *cardus*, in other words to make the leap from the Greek past to the Roman present.¹⁸

The second example is the citron (*kitrion*: 3.83a-85c). The plant is problematic, like the thistle family, because lexical as well as botanical clarity is lacking. Even if the term *kitrion* is used, as apparently it is by Hegesander of Delphi, a different plant might be signified by the term. The diners Myrtilus and Plutarch dispute this point, followed by Aemilianus, who quotes King Juba's *History of Libya* (*FGrHist* 275 F6) and the *Egypt* of Asclepiades of Mendes (*FGrHist* 617 F1) for apparent reference to the citron in myth. The diner Democritus adopts a different approach. Theophrastus referred to the plant, but not the term *kitrion*:¹⁹ among other identifying features, the plant comes from Media and Persia and is a good antidote to poison. Democritus adds evidence for experiments with the antidote in Egypt. These identifications amaze (θαυμάσαντες 85c) the Deipnosophistae, who are thus incited to eat up the citron in front of them. Athenaeus adds in a final note that Pamphilus in his *Glossae* says that the Romans call the plant *citrus* (*fr.* 14 Schmidt).

¹³ See Rice (1983).

¹⁴ The similarity between these examples suggests that the Epitome preserves an abbreviated but essentially close version of the original text, as it does where it can be checked against Marcianus 447.

¹⁵ *Women of Colchis fr.* 348 Radt, *Phoenix fr.* 718 Radt. The diners are here interested in a lexical issue, but a tragedy with an interest in a distant place, such as the *Women of Colchis*, was a possible source for a reference to a plant that was difficult to place lexically and geographically. The *Triptolemus* of Sophocles, a play with geographical interests as other authors attest (see *fr.* 598, 601, 602, 604 Radt), is used by Athenaeus' speakers to help locate rice (3.110e = *fr.* 609 Radt) and beer (10.447b = *fr.* 610 Radt). Strabo's comment (1.2.20) that Sophocles' *Triptolemus* and Euripides' *Bacchae* reveal inferior geography to Homer's anticipates Athenaeus' scholarly use of authors not primarily identified as geographical.

¹⁶ It is characteristic of the *Deipnosophistae* that a botanical or other scientific enquiry should commence with issues of terminology, vocabulary and the authenticity of Hecataeus' work. Sophocles' term, *kunara*, is similarly tested against a discussion by Didymus of Alexandria, who links the plant with the foundation of Opuntian Locri.

¹⁷ On Polemon and his geographical interests, see below.

¹⁸ Amigues in her commentary on Theophrastus, *History of Plants* 6.4.10, applauds the identification achieved by the Deipnosophistae. The connection between ancient Greeks and contemporary Romans is not always as explicitly made. Sometimes it is sufficient for Ulpian or another to demand the ancient evidence for the food, and once it has been quoted the Deipnosophistae can tuck into what has been served.

¹⁹ See *History of Plants* 4.4.2, with Amigues.

The diners bring together linguistic, mythical and botanical evidence in an attempt to locate the plant in time and place, from its first appearance in the Greek record (with and without the term *kitrion*) to its current appearance on a Roman plate, where Larensis and his compatriots would call it *citrus*, if they were speaking in Latin.²⁰

For the present we may note a large topographical interest; the citation of both the *Periegesis of Asia* by Hecataeus and the *Periplous* of pseudo-Scylax, both with careful warnings over authenticity; an interest in language and vocabulary; and the use of local histories.²¹

Athenaeus' discussions of the edible thistles and citron are taken from the catalogue of fruits, vegetables and other appetizers that runs from Epitome 2.49d to 3.85c. This catalogue of starters, as I mentioned above, is introduced as a linguistic equivalent of the menu handed to the guest after he had reclined (Epitome 2.49d), and begins with the provenance of damsons – from Damascus. Similar topographical concerns are to be found in the other catalogues.

The items in the main catalogue of fish in book 7 are presented with reference to zoological categories and to the cities in which they were sold after being caught. There are standard entries on edible fish, and curiosities and anomalies. An example is the far-travelling tuna, linked (7.301e-304d) with the Black Sea, Samos, Sicily and Spain, on the authority of, among others, Aristotle,²² Arcestratus (*fr.* 35 Olson and Sens), and Polybius (34.8.1). Among the curiosities (7.297d), Agatharchides of Cnidus in his *Europaika*, book 6 (*FGrHist* 86 F5), attests eel-sacrifice in Boeotia, and Antigonus of Carystus tuna-sacrifice in Attic Halae.²³ Sacrificed smoked fish at Phaselis are noted in the *Chronicles of Colophon* of Heropythus (*FGrHist* 448 F1), supported by Philostephanus of Cyrene in his *Cities of Asia* (*fr.* 1 *FGH* III 29).²⁴ In book 8 (331d-332a), Philostephanus is quoted in a further work, *On Strange Rivers* (*fr.* 20 *FHG* III 32), on fish that speak like thrushes, while Mnaseas of Patrae in his *Periplous* (*fr.* 6 *FHG* III 150) mentions the speaking fish of the River Cleitor in Arcadia. Other curiosities are cited from the *Periplous* of

²⁰ In mediating foreign plants to a Graeco-Roman audience in the imperial period, with the support of authorities from previous centuries, Athenaeus resembles two classes of author. The medical author Dioscorides in the first century AD insisted in the preface to his *De materia medica* on autopsy – that is travelling to the place where a plant grows – in order to identify a medical plant accurately (Scarborough and Nutton (1982)). Together with travel and careful observation, an understanding of botany and relevant technical vocabulary was essential to underpin good pharmacology. It is his practice to mention the best place in which a plant is to be found, since medical properties vary. In the next century, Galen wrote at length on plants and animals in works of pharmacology and nutrition (*On the Mixtures and Powers of Simple Medicines*, *On Compound Medicines according to Type*, *On Compound Medicines according to Place*, *On the Powers of Foods*, among others). He shared Athenaeus' interest in place and draws on previous authorities to identify regional differences in plant properties and terminology. A particularly good example is Galen's location of different species of wheat and different terms for them in Asia Minor, Macedonia and Thrace in *On the Powers of Foods* 1.13, 234-41 CMG. These medical authors make much of gathering evidence from their own travels and observations. Such claims are limited in the *Deipnosophistae*. At the same time, Galen's method in matching botanical categories against earlier authors and a variety of local names shares much with Athenaeus: see Wilkins (2007). The second class of author is the writer of the encyclopaedia.

Pliny the Elder exemplifies the author of the imperial period with a strong sense of place that is founded on extensive research. He provides a useful contrast with Athenaeus, for he shows considerable interest in the strange peoples at the periphery of the known world and Athenaeus does not (see below). Pliny also emphasizes Italy as the best place of all. Despite these differences, he shares Athenaeus' interest in the provenance of foods and other cultural practices. Murphy (2004) provides an excellent review of Pliny's treatment of similar sources and materials.

²¹ See Zecchini (1989) 25-6 and 123-5 for Athenaeus' use of Hecataeus. Asclepiades of Mendes is not otherwise cited by Athenaeus despite subject matter and length – his *Aiguptiaka* ran to at least 60 books on Athenaeus' own testimony (Zecchini (1989) 191 and 193). Juba is a good example of an outsider who mediated the world of the Greeks and beyond to Rome. Athenaeus uses him much more frequently (Zecchini (1989) 193-4).

²² *History of Animals* 598b19, a passage on the migration of fish. Athenaeus picks up from Aristotle the use of the verb *πλεῖν* (to sail) to signify the journey of the tuna. Reference to migratory fish 'sailing', and the eels known as *πλωταί* ('sailors' or 'floaters') (1.4d) helps to link the riches of the natural marine world with wealth created by maritime trade.

²³ *Fr* 56A Dorandi. The text *Ἀλαιεᾶς* is a correction of Toepffer.

²⁴ The context is the foundation myth of Phaselis.

Nymphodorus of Syracuse (*FGrHist* 573 F8) on the Sicilian river Helorus, Semos of Delos (*FGrHist* 396 F12) on sacrifice at Delos, and Polybius (34.10.1-4) on the rivers of the Pyrenees. Athenaeus draws heavily here, as so often, on the authors of local and regional histories (Zecchini (1989) 122-96).

The key point about the catalogues is that they are based on words, on specific terms for foods, cups, garlands and so on. Terminology, like food, is often tied to place. Ancient lexicography had a large interest in dialect and regionality, and there is good evidence that lexical authors on whom Athenaeus drew, such as Aristophanes of Byzantium and Pamphilus of Alexandria, addressed issues of place. Aristophanes certainly wrote treatises on Attic glosses and Laconian glosses (*frs* 337-53 Slater). Callimachus, who wrote works on cities and fish names, is quoted on local variations of the latter at 7.329a (*fr.* 406 Pfeiffer).

Many of the terms for cups and other vessels listed in the catalogue in book 11 raise regional differences. Crates of Mallos, a grammarian with geographical interests (Strabo 2.5.10), recorded a Persian word for a cup, *sannakra*, in his *Attic Dialect* (11.497f). The term *olpê*, we are told (11.495c), was used by the Corinthians, Byzantines and Cypriots of the *lêkuthos*, while the Thesalians used it of the *prochoos*. In the list of breads (3.111c), *panos* is bread in Messapian, while the Romans call bread *pan(is)*. Garlands in book 15 have regional names. Philetas in his *Irregular Terms* (*fr.* 42 Kuchenmüller) identifies the *hupothermis* as a myrtle garland on Lesbos (678d), while Sosibius *On Sacrifices* (*FGrHist* 595 F5) says that *thureatikos* is a Spartan term for a certain type of garland. Again words, as well as foods and eating practices, have a topographical reference for Athenaeus and his Deipnosophistae. (This is additional to arguments over Attic purity, which they also pursue.)

Style of eating, organization of the meal, entertainments, songs and music are frequently seen to have a particular place and origin, even if the practice is later widely diffused through the Mediterranean world. A good example is the wine-flicking game of *kottabos* (15.665d-668f). The Deipnosophistae do not play the game themselves. An elegy of Critias (*fr.* B2 West) suggests a Sicilian origin (see below), supported by linguistic evidence for Sicily in Dicaearchus of Messene's work *On Alcaeus* (*fr.* 95 Wehrli). This treatise mentioned special rooms that were designed for playing the game.

Place remains at the centre of the sympotic interests of the Deipnosophistae, along with linguistic accuracy and that eye for the paradoxical that we saw in the catalogue of fish. The diners frequently manage to amaze each other. As we saw above, Democritus' account of the citron amazed his companions and stimulated their appetite, 'as if they had not eaten or drunk anything before' (3.85c). Amazement is part of the experience of these learned meals, whether at the learning displayed (the accuracy of Aristotle, for example, 8.352d), or the manipulation of that learning in an ingenious way. The fish course provokes amazement at 6.224c.

It is notable that while the geographical range of the conversations is very great, with some account being made of India, Scythia, the Celts and Libya, there is little engagement with the strange peoples encountered in Herodotus and in the *periplois* texts, such as the fish eaters and the milk drinkers.²⁵ Unlike Pliny, the Deipnosophists tend not to note the amazing peoples and wonders at the peripheries of the known world, but rather to concentrate on the paradoxes and absurdities of dwellers in cities.²⁶ They reserve the writers of *periplois* for references to food plants and cultural practice, as we have seen.²⁷ Athenaeus' *paradoxa* are more likely to be of the

²⁵ See Herodotus 3.19, Strabo 16.4.4, 15.2.1 and Pausanias 1.33.4 for the fish-eaters and Herodotus 1.216, 4.186 and Strabo 17.3.8 for the milk-eaters, with Longo (1987). Athenaeus mentions certain fish-eating slaves in Egypt (8.345e), but in the context of eating fish as a glutton's activity rather than as a geographical marker.

²⁶ On Pliny and the wonders at the end of the world, see Murphy (2004) 77-128.

²⁷ There are occasional exceptions to the avoidance of strange stories from the borders of Empire. A gorgon was killed by the troops of Marius, for example, in the late second century BC, which is discussed by Ulpian and

zoological kind exemplified above, or the witticisms of a sympotic entertainer, such as Stratoniceus the harp-player.²⁸ Stratoniceus of Athens, like many parasites and hangers on at the tables of the powerful, had to sing for his supper. Cynulcus (8.347f-352d) brings out his geographical range, citing witticisms delivered in Mylasa, Pella, Abdera, the Pontus, Corinth, Rhodes and elsewhere. Stratoniceus even had a witty response to the question, ‘why do you travel all over Greece?’ (350e). His clever phrases disparaged numerous cities (351c-352c), and he was eventually forced to take poison at the court of Nicocles in Cyprus for a royal joke too far (352d). Athenaeus’ version of the anecdote, which is so important to the miscellanists of the period, such as Aelian and Gellius, is the incident at table in this city or that as the subject of interest travelled. The subject might be Stratoniceus the jester, Philoxenus the glutton (Epitome 1.6a) or the great courtesans and their lovers (13.576c-577a).

Geographiae are used sparingly. Strabo’s is only mentioned twice (and his *Historiae* not at all).²⁹ Writers of *periplooi*, too, are more common in their number than in the number of quotations per author. Hecataeus appears ten times, Scylax of Caryanda even less. More common is the use of a specialist author such as Ctesias (fourteen) on the Persians, Agatharchides of Cnidus on Asia and on Europe (fifteen) or a local historian on a particular city. Much more frequently, Athenaeus gives a particularly geographical slant to general histories. This is clear in his well-documented use of Herodotus (43 references: Lenfant (2007)) and Polybius (34 references: Walbank (2000)). It is true also of Timaeus (21 references: Zecchini (1989) 175) and Theopompus (76 references: Zecchini (1989) 50). The diners draw on the *Constitutions* of Aristotle to show a more geographically focused philosopher than would normally appear.³⁰ The same could be said of comic authors.³¹

Several conclusions can be drawn from this review. First, we are shown the Greek authors brought to Rome and laid before us in all their geographical diversity. We might compare Columella or Pliny. The former (Preface 24) lists good overseas soils alongside Italian soils and (1.1.7-10) Greek authors and their places of origin (Sicily, Athens, the islands) along with Roman authorities. Pliny’s index in book 1 lists Greek sources after Roman sources. Where the Roman authors concede excellence elsewhere but praise Italy in particular, Athenaeus’ reading list is almost entirely focused on Greek authors.³² Then these authors are often put through the filter of scholarly rigour: Homer as read by Hellenistic scholars; Plato as read by Herodicus. Thirdly, historians are made to speak of the all-important past but with a new geographical focus. And that focus points to the table and to the symposium.

II. NAVIGATING THE TOPOGRAPHICAL RECORD

Athenaeus has certain organizing principles to guide the reader through this mass of quotation. The first is the division into fifteen books, at the beginnings and ends of which (with exceptions: Guillen (2000)) Athenaeus makes certain remarks to his interlocutor Timocrates. These breaks sometimes coincide with the end of the day’s dining.

The second organizing principle is the order of the dinner-symposium. First (Epitome 1.25f) comes a review of wines. Water follows, then the vegetables and fruits, bread and starters, fish, meat, entertainments and desserts.

confirmed by Larensis (5.221a-f) as extraordinary (*παράδοξον*) and verifiable. But the gorgon lived in north Africa and its skin was kept in Rome so it hardly belongs to the strange periphery.

²⁸ See Gilula (2000).

²⁹ Strabo’s *Geography* was rarely mentioned in the first five centuries after its composition (Clarke (1999) 194) so Athenaeus’ references, though few, reflect characteristic scholarly diligence.

³⁰ On the treatment of the *Constitutions* in the *Deipnosophistae* see Bollansée (2007).

³¹ A passage in book 10 (417b-418e) specifically surveys entire peoples satirized in comedy.

³² At 4.160b, Varro is mentioned for his grasp of both Greek and Latin, a rarity among Roman grammarians, it is claimed.

To these principles Athenaeus adds other guiding features. In book 1 (Epitome 27d-28d), Athenaeus quotes from fifth-century poetry examples of the distinctive products or *idiômata* of each city.³³ Antiphanes the comic poet (*fr.* 233 K-A) lists a cook from Elis, a cauldron from Argos, wine from Phlius, fabrics from Corinth, fish from Sicyon, girl pipers from Aegion, Sicilian cheese, myrrh from Athens, eels from Boeotia. Next follows Hermippus *fr.* 63 K-A, Pindar *fr.* 106 Snell-Maehler and Critias *fr.* B2 West.³⁴ These authors evidently list places and their products within particular strategies in their poems.³⁵ Athenaeus, for his part, early in the *Deipnosophistae*, establishes place as important; as linked conventionally with certain products; and as identifiable in different literary genres. The products are brought to a central location, whether a royal court,³⁶ a market place or an imperial capital. He continues in similar vein for fifteen books, composing at 15.688e a list of perfumes according to place, iris root from Elis and Cyzicus, roses from Phaselis, Naples and Capua, and so on. The phenomenon is familiar in Greek and Roman literature.³⁷

Guidance also appears to be offered in the arrangement of dining customs that I referred to above in book 4 and of luxury in book 12. The review of dining customs begins with a Macedonian feast, the most lavish seen up to that date (3.126e), while the first people famous for luxury, Athenaeus tells us in book 12 (513e-f), were the Persians. The Persians and Macedonians, in this account, had a major effect on dining in the Mediterranean world, and are accordingly singled out to head these sections.

The Macedonian meal at the beginning of book 4 is the wedding of Caranus, taken from the little-known author Hippolochus the Macedonian,³⁸ who exchanged ‘dining letters’ with Lynceus of Samos.³⁹ These letters described any sumptuous meal (δεῖπνον πολυτελές) that one of the correspondents attended. The meals mentioned were given in Athens by the *hetaira* Lamia in honour of Demetrius Poliorcetes, by Antigonus (I?), and by Ptolemy (Philadelphus?). These meals, together with the Macedonian banquet that Athenaeus quotes at length, contrast with the ‘simple’ meals of the Athenians and other Greeks, which Athenaeus mentions after the Macedonian banquet (4.130d-e). From the outset, book 4 compares the sumptuous meals of the Hellenistic rulers of Macedonian descent with earlier simplicity. The Hellenistic period has set up a new level of international competition in dining and feasting.

The Hellenistic monarchs are the centre of attention again in book 5. The procession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (5.194c-195f) establishes that king’s notorious attempts to compete with the Roman games set up in Macedonia by Aemilius Paulus (194c), while Ptolemy II’s procession (5.196a-203b) reflects all the wealth of Egypt. Antiochus’ procession ends with comment on the madness of the monarch, Ptolemy’s with the observation that nowhere on earth can compare with Egypt (5.203b-e). Ptolemy’s procession is able to reflect the agricultural richness of Egypt, together with the import of exotic foods and animals from Asia, and a power base in the Greek world. The

³³ There is an earlier list at 1.4c-d which links specific foods with specific places. It is implied that both the foods and the terms with their specific locations are ‘in the mouth’ (διὰ στόματος).

³⁴ Hermippus the comic poet lists food and sympotic products brought to Athens in the ship of Dionysus from Cyrene, the Hellespont, Thessaly, Syracuse, Corfu, Egypt, Syria, Crete, Libya, Rhodes, Euboea, Phrygia, Arcadia, Pagasae, Paphlagonia, Phoenicia and Carthage. The Pythian ode of Pindar for Hieron says a hunting dog from Sparta is the best; nanny-goats from Scyros are the best milkers; weapons come from Argos, a chariot from Thebes, and a decorated wagon from fruitful Sicily. In elegy, Critias’ verse identifies the *kottabos* game in Sicily (see above), the beautiful wagon of Sicily, the Thessalian throne, the

bed of Miletus and Chios, the Etruscan cup (*phialê*), Phoenician letters, a Theban chariot, Carian boats, ceramics from Marathon. More comic fragments follow from Eubulus and Antiphanes.

³⁵ The Hermippus fragment blends trade with sympotic pleasures (see Wilkins (2000), ch.4; Gilula (2000a). The Pindaric fragment looks like a priamel, or the introduction to the item that is best of all.

³⁶ On foods brought to the Persian court, see below, p. 141.

³⁷ Dalby (1996) lists many foods linked to place in the Greek world, and Dalby (2002) the same in Latin literature.

³⁸ See Dalby (1988).

³⁹ On whom see Dalby (2000).

reader's response to these contrasting monarchs in book 5 is further shaped by special interpretations of Homer and Plato as advisers on correct dining.⁴⁰

Books 4 and 5 cover as much topographical material as the books that are more closely attached to the sequence of the meal, with their catalogues and encyclopaedic interest in words. This is evident in the next three books (6-8), at the centre of the work, which concentrate on fish. Larensis gets his fish from Campania and Etruria, and the quality is such that Poseidon and Neptune appear to have supplied them (6.224b-c). With possible divine support, Larensis displays his lavishness and wealth (πλοῦτος and πολυτέλεια), as the Homeric king did with the support of Zeus (Epitome 1.9, referring to *Odyssey* 19.109-14). The fish at Larensis' table reflect his wealth, just as the Nile reflected the wealth of the Ptolemies (5.203b-e). Detailed discussion of fish is delayed until book 7 by debate about Roman and Athenian fish-merchants, parasites and slaves (the last two of which are key issues for Rome: see below). When detail comes, the catalogue of fish reflects the wealth of the sea in its variety, its discussion of habitat, and in linking certain fish with certain cities. For all its zoological detail, the focus is on edible species, so that there is no mention of the sea monsters mentioned, for example, by Oppian and Pliny. The sea that Athenaeus is guiding us over is the sea represented by the fishmonger's stall that delivers tasty food to the rich man's table, rather than a dangerous and inhospitable element.⁴¹ Numerous texts identify the best places for buying the different species of fish, the most helpful for this purpose being the *Life of Luxury* of Archestratus of Gela. I discuss this work below, addressing in particular the distinction Athenaeus and the diners make between Archestratus' major contribution to topographical precision and his deplorable incitement to indulge pleasure.

It is worth stressing that the conversations and lists of the Deipnosophistae allow them to avoid many dangers of indulgence, since they talk rather than eat and collect words as well as exotic foods. Words are explicitly on the menu. They do not sail to foreign cities in search of exotic foods, like Apicius (1.7a-d) and Archestratus, but stay, sometimes hungrily (6.270a-b), at the tables of Larensis. The novelties they seek exist in words and texts, and ingenious uses to which they might be put, rather than in savouring special foods brought to the table, as they were to the court of Persia (2.67a, quoting Ctesias, *On the Tributes from Asia*; 4.144b-c, quoting Xenophon, *Agésilas*) or the tables of the Sybarites (12.521c). Larensis has brought many good things to his lavish table, but does not appear to share the failings of the Persians or the Hellenistic kings. Rather, he addresses the scholarship that their patronage made possible, and excels his predecessors in his restraint as well as in his library.

Similarly, there is no drunkenness, even though there are many books devoted to the symposium, and book 10 lists notorious drinkers. Where the standard Greek symposium seems to have ended in pleasant drunkenness or stupefaction according to occasion, the Deipnosophistae simply quote from books and talk about the symposium in 'Dionysiac chat' (11.463c Διονυσιακὰ

⁴⁰ Homer is declared the better witness to sympotic practice, in numerous respects, among them the different kinds of symposia (5.177b), the kind of person who needs no invitation (177c), various practical details (178e), sacrifice (179b), and the mixing of wine (179f). This is a special reading of Homer, which derives from Hellenistic scholarship (5.177e, 188f) and ignores the fact that the full symposium with reclining diners post-dates the Homeric poems. An equally special reading of Plato is adopted from the sympotic work of Herodicus of Babylon (192b, 215f). Plato is charged with sometimes making false claims and setting a bad example. This is reinforced by a further attack in book 11 (504e-509e), where Plato is declared jealous, ill disposed and of bad character. The reader is thus able to interpret the multitude of texts with

a special eye to favourable guidance from Homer and unreliable advice from Plato. Outside these special passages, Plato is treated as a good sympotic source. Aristotle too is sometimes treated to carping criticism (see below). Virtuous aspects of Homer are set out, among others, in the orientation in the first book (Epitome 8e-25e), which introduces the reader to eating, drinking, dancing and games, all according to Homer. We are also told that Homer's good ordering of dining was followed by the rich meals of the Sicilians and Chians (Epitome 25e-f), and matters have (implicitly) been in decline ever since.

⁴¹ Compare the 'catalogue of ships' (5.209e-f) which turn out to be the leisure craft of the Hellenistic kings rather than vessels of war or commerce (5.203e-209e).

λαλιαί). This Dionysiac discussion includes the traditional navigational motif of the symposium. The *Deipnosophistae* quote Timaeus (Epitome 1.37b-e = *FGrHist* 566 F149) on the young men of Agrigentum, who became so drunk in a house that they thought they were facing shipwreck at sea and threw all the furniture out of the windows, as if ordered to do so by the steersman. They recite the elegy of Dionysius Chalcous (*fr.* 4 West) on the image of rowing at the symposium (15.669a), and they list a number of boat names for cups in book 11 on drinking cups. They never succumb to being ‘all at sea’ over their wine, but reflect on the familiar motif⁴² as part of their navigation of the sympotic space. The link of Dionysus with navigation is brought out further in an allusion to the myth of his flight into the sea (Epitome 1.26b), in his navigating the ship of Hermippus bringing good things to Athens (Epitome 1.27e-28a; see nn.34 and 35), and in a marine aetiology for mixing wine with water (Philonides *On Myrrhs and Garlands*, quoted at 15.675a-c).

Athenaeus combines this traditional motif of sympotic navigation with another, running aground on the shoals of luxury. Foreshadowed in book 4 with the decline in Spartan valour (4.141f τὴν δὲ τῆς διαίτης τῆς τοιαύτης σκληρότητα ὕστερον καταλύσαντες οἱ Λάκωνες ἐξώκειλαν εἰς τρυφήν), the metaphor of shipwreck marked the likely destination of the luxurious state. Athenaeus picks out the image when citing Heraclides Ponticus on the Sybarites (12.521d), Phylarchus on the Colophonians (12.526a) and Polybius on the Capuans (12.528b). Similar shipwreck befell the citizens of Croton (12.522a) and of Siris (12.523c), while the imprecation ‘may you sail to Massilia’, Athenaeus tells us, was a proverbial reference to the moral decline of that city (12.523c). This pattern of the rise and decline of cities is particularly prominent in book 12 and prompts the question whether Rome stands in any danger of such a shipwreck given her extraordinary wealth and success.

The dangers of faulty navigation at the symposium and of the perils of the shoals of luxury bring us to a particular author who is considered far from harmless, as far as the diners are concerned. Archestratus of Gela wrote his *Ἡδυπάθεια*, or the *Life of Luxury*, in the early or mid-fourth century BC.⁴³ The poem appears to be an ideal source for Athenaeus, who introduces Archestratus very early in the *Deipnosophistae* (Epitome 1.4e = testimonium 2 Olson and Sens) with a discussion of the title⁴⁴ and first line ἱστορίας ἐπίδειγμα ποιούμενος Ἑλλάδι πάσῃ.⁴⁵ The fragment (1 Olson and Sens) promises research with a geographical range over the whole of the Greece world – a brief close to Athenaeus’ own. Immediately afterwards the Epitome quotes fragment 4 Olson and Sens:

πρὸς δὲ μιᾷ πάντες δειπνεῖν ἀβρόδαιτι τραπέζῃ,
ἔστωσαν δ’ ἢ τρεῖς ἢ τέσσαρες οἱ ζυνάπαντες
ἢ τῶν πέντε γε μὴ πλείους· ἤδη γὰρ ἄν εἴη
μισθοφόρων ἀρπαξιβίων σκηνὴ στρατιωτῶν.⁴⁶

An elegant meal, that does not wish to resemble a soldier’s mess, should have no more than five guests. The Epitomator compares a Platonic meal – perhaps his *Symposium* where far more guests are present. But Plato’s is not the only symposium that is before us. The diners at Larenensis’ table

⁴² For which see Slater (1976) and Lissarrague (1987).

⁴³ For the date see Dalby (1996) and Olson and Sens (2000) xxi-iv.

⁴⁴ Callimachus and Lynceus record the title *Ἡδυπάθεια*, *Life of Luxury*. The term was comparatively new in the fourth century BC (Olson and Sens (2000) xxiv n.12) and seems to reflect ethical concerns over luxury. (Athenaeus tells us that other titles of the poem were

known, *Gastronomia* according to Chrysippus, *Deipnologia* according to Clearchus, *Opsopoiia* according to others.)

⁴⁵ ‘Making a display of my research to the whole of Greece’.

⁴⁶ ‘All should dine at a dainty table. Let them be three or four in all, or at least no more than five. Otherwise it would be a tent full of mercenary soldiers, grabbers of their livelihood.’

number more than twenty. We might suppose that this is entirely unproblematic, since theirs is a Roman meal. However, Athenaeus refers to the issue twice. First, after listing the Deipnosophists present, the Epitomator says (1.1f) this guest-list is more military than sympotic. And towards the end of the *Deipnosophistae*, 15.671a, Democritus of Nicomedia says, ‘I know that at the start we said that no more than five should dine together’. There seems to be a connection between the words of Arcestratus and the dinners of the Deipnosophists.

For much of its content, the poem of Arcestratus describes a large number of fish and other foods and wines and connects them closely with many different places. He urges the reader to sail from place to place in search of the best foods. Here is an example:

ἦν δέ ποτ' εἰς Ἴασον Καρῶν πόλιν εἰσαφίκηαι,
καρῖδ' εὐμεγέθη λήψει, σπανίην δὲ πρίασθαι.
ἐν δὲ Μακεδονίῃ τε καὶ Ἀμβρακίῃ μάλα πολλάί.⁴⁷
(3.105e = *fr.* 13.1-2 Olson and Sens)

The poem is written in hexameters in the didactic style of Hesiod.⁴⁸ It appears to be a *jeu d'esprit* by a poet who adopts the persona of an exclusive diner, and writes the poem apparently for recitation as sympotic entertainment.⁴⁹ It thus falls squarely within Athenaeus' interests in sympotic entertainment and poetry. At the same time it was available to him with comments from Callimachus, Lynceus,⁵⁰ Chrysippus and Clearchus, all regular commentators in the pages of the *Deipnosophistae*. These last two are hostile critics, and prompt a number of criticisms by Athenaeus and his fellow diners. Arcestratus is thus one of those authors, like Homer and Plato, whom the *Deipnosophistae* mediate to the reader. Sometimes such authors are simply quoted, at others a comment is attached.

Athenaeus makes one such comment after quoting Arcestratus on the sword-fish and its excellence in Byzantium and northern Sicily (7.314f; see *fr.* 41 Olson and Sens).

τίς οὕτως τακτικός ἀκριβῆς ἢ τίς οὕτως κριτής ὄψων ὡς ὁ ἐκ Γέλας, μᾶλλον δὲ Καταγέλας, οὗτος ποιητής; ὅς ἀκριβῶς οὕτως διὰ λιχνεῖαν καὶ τὸν πορθμὸν διέπλευσε καὶ τῶν μερῶν ἐκάστου τῶν ἰχθύων τὰς ποιότητας καὶ τοὺς χυμοὺς διὰ τὴν λιχνεῖαν ἐξήτασεν, ὡς τινα πραγματεῖαν βιωφελῆ καταβαλλόμενος.⁵¹

For Athenaeus, the precision (ἀκρίβεια), critical qualities, autopsy on site (sailing through the strait), testing of properties (ποιότητες) and flavours (χυμοί) and establishing a useful treatise are desirable objectives.⁵² But the motive of gluttony attributed to Arcestratus twice in the same sentence is strongly critical. Athenaeus finds Arcestratus to be an excellent traveller by sea, but guided by deplorable motives. This is the problem identified by Chrysippus, as we shall see shortly.

⁴⁷ ‘If you ever arrived at Iasos, the city of the Carians, you will get a nice large prawn, but few are available for sale. In Macedonia and Ambracia, though, there are a good many.’

⁴⁸ Athenaeus quotes other descendents of Hesiodic didactic, for example at 3.116a-d where some lines on salt fish attributed to Hesiod are declared inauthentic because cities are mentioned which were not founded until long after Hesiod's death.

⁴⁹ Olson and Sens (2000) xliv.

⁵⁰ The letter-writer who compared notes on the meals of the Hellenistic kings: see p. 140 above.

⁵¹ ‘Who is such a precise tactician or critic of fish as this poet from Gela or should I say Katagela? With precision did he thus, impelled by gluttony, sail through the Bosphorus and test the properties and flavours of the parts of each fish, impelled by gluttony [sic], as if establishing a treatise that was useful for life.’

⁵² They are in fact close to those that Galen set himself at the beginning of his treatise *On the Powers of Foods* (201-2 CMG), a work which shares much research interest in the Hellenistic library with Athenaeus (Wilkins (2007)).

Similar comments on Archestratus' excellent travels but woeful motives are widely distributed. At 3.116f (see *fr.* 39 Olson and Sens), the Deipnosophist Daphnus of Ephesus introduces Archestratus' advice on salt fish with the words,

Ἀρχέστρατος μὲν ὁ περιπλεύσας τὴν οἰκουμένην γαστρὸς ἕνεκα καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν γαστέρα ...⁵³

At 7.326d (see *fr.* 55 Olson and Sens), Athenaeus introduces Archestratus' comments on the squid of Dion and Ambracia with the note,

Ἀρχέστρατος δὲ ὁ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν διὰ γαστριμαργίαν περιελθὼν.⁵⁴

A further passage suggests the nature of Archestratus' enquiry. After quoting his views on the bonito from Byzantium and the Hellespont, Athenaeus adds (7.278d),

οὗτος ὁ Ἀρχέστρατος ὑπὸ φιληδονίας γῆν πᾶσαν καὶ θάλασσαν περιῆλθεν ἀκριβῶς, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, τὰ πρὸς γαστέρα ἐπιμελῶς ἐξετάσαι βουλευθείς· καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ τὰς περιηγήσεις καὶ τοὺς περίπλους ποιησάμενοι μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐθέλει πάντα ἐκτίθεσθαι ὅπου ἐστὶν ἕκαστον κάλλιστον βρωτὸν τε (ποτόν τε). τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ ἐπαγγέλλεται τῶν καλῶν τούτων ὑποθηκῶν.⁵⁵

Archestratus uses the tradition of the *periêgêsis* and *periplous* to encourage travel to the places where the best foods are to be found. Once again he is said to use care and precision, and so meets nearly all the criteria for an authority in Athenaeus' catalogues and elsewhere. Hence he is quoted some 54 times in the fish catalogue of book 7, with more fish, the shellfish, contributing two more quotations in book 3. But Archestratus is not perfect. Driven by pleasure, his otherwise excellent methods produce testimony that is 'fine' only in a modified or ironic sense.⁵⁶ This need not be an overriding problem for Athenaeus. He criticizes his most cited source, Aristotle, for example (8.352d), for numerous unconvincing details (8.352d-354d) and for the high cost of his research, which is not always comprehensive (9.398e). Archestratus' fault, though, cannot be overlooked because it derives from greed or gluttony, precisely that area of pleasure and desire, linked with sexual pleasure, which Plato addressed in his teaching on self-control.⁵⁷ Athenaeus and his diners generally confine themselves to ironic comments on Archestratus, but several passages preserve much harsher comments by those closer to Archestratus' own period. The passage last quoted continues, 7.278e-f = testimonium 6 Olson and Sens,

Χρύσιππος δ' αὐτὸν ὁ ὄντως φιλόσοφος καὶ περὶ πάντα ἀνὴρ ἀρχηγὸν Ἐπικούρωι φησὶ γενέσθαι καὶ τοῖς τὰ τούτου ἐπισταμένοις τῆς πάντα διαλυμηναμένης ἡδονῆς.⁵⁸

Chrysippus then refers to Epicurus' statement that contemplation of the good is impossible if the pleasures of food and sex are removed. At 8.335b-e, Athenaeus quotes two passages of Chrysippus from the work *On the Good and Pleasure* (= testimonium 5 Olson and Sens), in which *The Life of*

⁵³ 'Archestratus, who sailed round the known world for the sake of his stomach and the parts below the stomach.'

⁵⁴ 'Archestratus, who went around every land and sea, impelled by gluttony.' Brandt, supported by Olson and Sens, detected a further possible fragment of the poem, lying behind the unmetrical paraphrase (9.383b, *fr.* 2 Olson and Sens) περιῆλθον Ἀσίαν καὶ Εὐρώπην ('I went round Asia and Europe').

⁵⁵ 'This Archestratus, through his love of pleasure, went round every land and sea with precision, wishing, as it seems to me, to test carefully the foods that concern the stomach. And like those who write *Periegesis* and *Periploi*, he wishes to set out precisely where each item of

food and drink is best. He himself announces this in the preface of those fine *Notes*.'

⁵⁶ The notes of Archestratus are repeatedly said to be *καλά* in the same passage that pleasure is deplored: the advice is fine in one sense but not in another. See 3.101f, 104b.

⁵⁷ For example at *Philebus* 65c and *Republic* 559a, both quoted (apparently without criticism on this occasion) by Athenaeus at 12.511d-512a.

⁵⁸ 'Chrysippus who really was a philosopher in every respect, says that Archestratus became the forerunner of Epicurus and of those who know his teaching of pleasure the corrupter of everything.'

Luxury is condemned along with the sex manual of Philaenis, and Arcestratus is compared with the Assyrian King Sardanapallus, a ruler of legendary luxury in Greek thought.⁵⁹ Before Chrysippus, Clearchus of Soli condemned the works of Philaenis and Arcestratus for their incitement to the wrong kind of pleasure at the symposium (cited by Athenaeus at 10.457c-e = Testimonium 4 Olson and Sens).

Clearchus criticizes knowledge of which fish are in season as the wrong kind of knowledge to display at a symposium, a charge with which many ancient authors, certainly doctors, zoologists and sympotic writers, would not concur.⁶⁰ But there are elements in Arcestratus' poem which many ancient moralists would find problematic, namely the title (and implicitly the subject matter), and the incitement to fulfil one's desire, even if it means stealing (see Olson and Sens on *fr.* 22.2). Arcestratus in these passages seems to be writing consciously against those who urge self-control, ἐγκράτεια, as a virtue. If the ethical code of the poem of Arcestratus is overtly anti-Platonic, his versification and poetics are a violent re-working of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, as Olson and Sens demonstrate throughout their commentary. Arcestratus, I suggest, confronts two key authors of Athenaeus – Plato and Homer – in most arresting terms.

I address this issue shortly, but first wish to comment on the distribution of the fragments of Arcestratus within the *Deipnosophistae*, and the significance of that distribution for the mediation of the Greek world to the Roman.⁶¹ As we have seen, Arcestratus offers Athenaeus excellent information linking certain fish with certain places. All but 20 of the 77 references occur accordingly in book 7. Arcestratus is a valuable source of information, though for the Deipnosophists he needs a health warning, and this is supplied, as we have seen, in book 7, among other places. Other references are distributed through books 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10, with the final allusion to the numbers at table in fifteen. This may be a deliberately restricted distribution, unlike that of, say, Herodotus, Plato, or Theopompus, who are cited in most books. It seems clear that Athenaeus used Arcestratus heavily in book 7, and referred to him over widely distributed passages in seven other books. But in certain books he did not refer to him at all. We cannot explain this distribution with certainty, but the books in which Arcestratus is not quoted include four of the six sympotic books (11-14), even though Arcestratus refers to wines and to the dessert, or 'second tables', which belong to the symposium. I suggest that Athenaeus chose to put these sympotic references earlier in the work, in books 1 (Epitome) and 3, for two possible reasons. First, the poem of Arcestratus, for all its failings, may have remained an important source of reference for him. Secondly the choice may have been influenced by the Roman character of the meal. Athenaeus appears to shape *The Life of Luxury* to the meals of Larenensis in a number of ways.

At 4.162b and 163c-d, the Deipnosophist Magnus attacks the Cynics, among many other philosophers, suggesting (162b) the only epic poetry they like is the gastronomic kind. Continuing at 163c, Magnus narrows the attack on the Cynics to his fellow Deipnosophist Cynulcus, charging him with worshipping Arcestratus in the place of Homer – because of his stomach. The fragment of the poem that Magnus quotes refers to Diodorus of Aspendus and the Pythagoreans, and so is particularly suitable to the critique of philosophers pursued in book 4 (see Olson and Sens on *fr.* 24).

⁵⁹ Compare, for example, Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1095b20-22.

⁶⁰ See for example Hippocrates, *Regimen* 3.68; Galen *On the Powers of Foods* 1.18, 245 CMG, 2.2, 266-8 CMG.

⁶¹ Testimonium 1: Ath 9.405b; 2: Epitome 1.4e; 3: 8.337b; 4: 10.457c-e, cf. 7.314; 5: 8.335b, d-6a; 6: 104b and 7.278e-f; 7: 7.278a-b; 8: 7.295f; 9: -; 10: 7.322e; *fr.* 1: Epitome 1.4d-e; 2: 9.383b; 3: 7.278d-e; 4: 1.4d-e; 5: 3.111e-12b; 6: 3.112b-c; 7: 3.92d-e; 8: Epitome 2.56c; 9: 2.64a; 10: 7.298e-9a; 11: 7.285b-c; 12: 7.300d-e; 13: 7.328b; 14: 7.320a-b; 15: 7.315f-6a; 16: 7.305e-f; 17: 7.312f-3a; 18: 7.322c; 19: 7.293e-f; 20: 7.294a; 21:

7.295c; 22: 7.285e-6a and 7.294f-5a; 23: 7.326f-7a; 24: 7.310a and 4.162b, 163c-e; 25: 3.104f-5a; 26: 3.105e; 27: 7.327d-e; 28: 7.301c-d; 29: 7.321e; 30: 7.320f-1a; 31: 7.328a; 32: 7.306b; 33: 7.288a-b and 7.330a-b; 34: 7.326b; 35: 7.301f-2b; 36: 7.278a-d and 7.313e-4a; 37: 7.321c-d; 38: 7.303e-f; 39: 3.116f-7b; 40: 7.284e; 41: 7.314e-f; 42: 7.320a, 325d-e; 43: 7.307d; 44: 7.307b; 45: 7.313e-4a; 46: 7.311a-c; 47: 7.319d-e; 48: 7.286c; 49: 7.314d; 50: 7.286d-e; 51: 7.304d; 52: 7.311e-f; 53: 7.313e-4a; 54: 7.318f; 55: 7.326d; 56: 7.324b; 57: 9.399d-e; 58: 9.384b; 59: Epitome 1.29a-d; 60: 3.101b-e; 61 dub: 7.285c-d; 62: 7.294e-f.

Other links are made between the *Life of Luxury* and the Rome of Larensis. In fragment 62 O and S = Athenaeus 7.294e-f, a paraphrase which Olson and Sens consider of doubtful authenticity, Arcestratus is said to have considered the Rhodian *galeos*, probably a thresher shark, the same fish as ‘the one carried round in Rome with pipes and garlands to banquets, with the bearers also garlanded – and it is named *akkipêsios*, or sturgeon’. Olson and Sens consider that Athenaeus is either mistaken or at least misleading, since Arcestratus is most unlikely to have included Rome among the cities he journeyed to. The only places on the Italian mainland referred to in the surviving fragments are Rhegium and Hipponium a little to the north. It seems to me, rather, that Athenaeus’ point is this. Arcestratus suggested a similarity between the *galeos* and the *akkipêsios* (the latter differently named to fit into hexameters), but was mistaken: the *elops* (not the *galeos*) is to be identified with the *akkipêsios*; however Arcestratus’ description of the Rhodian *galeos* does identify a highly prized fish that is worth dying for. It is Athenaeus, not Arcestratus who has the interest in comparing the Rhodian *galeos* with a Roman fish. The possible connections are two, namely the biological similarity between the sturgeon and the *elops* (according to Apion), or the sturgeon and the Rhodian *galeos* (according to Arcestratus); and the high valuation of certain fish, one of which is serenaded in Rome, another worth stealing in Rhodes.

There is a similar example in book 3. At 101b-e, Ulpian quotes a long fragment of Arcestratus (60 Olson and Sens), with this preamble: ‘but the ancients – all of them – did not serve the wombs of sows or lettuces or anything else, before the dinner, as now happens. Arcestratus at least, the inventive cook, says that they served them after the dinner and the toasts and the anointing with myrrh.’ It seems certain from Ulpian’s comment that the fragment of Arcestratus came late in the poem, in the sympotic section after the meal. It comes early in the *Deipnosophistae*, I suggest, because Athenaeus is underlining the differences between Roman and Greek (at least earlier Greek) practice. The sow’s wombs are brought in to the *Deipnosophistae* at 3.96e, with mutual accusations of gluttony between Ulpian and the Cynics. Arcestratus and Lynceus are quoted to show that the ancients ate them at the end of the meal, and not at the beginning. The order of appetizers, like the order of drinking, thus follows Roman practice at the tables of Larensis. Arcestratus can be used to point up the divergence from ancient practice (just as Homer can be so used).

Arcestratus has his uses for Athenaeus, particularly in practical matters that concern the number of guests, the order of the meal, and the identification and location of the main ingredients. But there are also those in-built moral concerns alongside the details vital for the civilized life. And there is the literary and philosophical casing of the poem. This is how Athenaeus’ symposiarch Ulpian puts it (3.104b = Testimonium 6 Olson and Sens):

εἰκότως ἂν ἐπαινέσειεν τὸν καλὸν Χρῦσιππον κατέχοντα ἀκριβῶς τὴν Ἐπικούρου φύσιν καὶ εἰπόντα μητρόπολιν εἶναι τῆς φιλοσοφίας αὐτοῦ τὴν Ἀρχεστράτου Γαστρολογία, ἣν πάντες οἱ τῶν φιλοσόφων γαστρίμαργοι Θεόγνιν τινα αὐτῶν εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν καλὴν ταύτην ἐποποιίαν.⁶²

Place for the *Deipnosophists* is culturally and historically determined. *The Life of Luxury* can tell them a great deal about it, but in a form which anticipates Epicurus. In fact, it is the ‘mother city’ of Epicurus. The mother city sending out colonists to found a new city had long since become a metaphor for Athens and Rome as cultural parents of their dependants.⁶³ The diners, as we

⁶² ‘A person would rightly praise the excellent Chrysippus who grasps with precision the ‘nature’ of Epicurus and says that the ‘metropolis’ of his philosophy is the *Gastrologia* of Arcestratus, a work which all philosophers who are gluttons say is their Theognis, this fine piece of epic poetry.’

⁶³ Arcestratus himself uses the metaphor of the metropolis, with reference to the tuna. Olson and Sens on *fr.* 38.2 offer illuminating comments, and LSJ s.v. have further examples.

have seen, do not always treat philosophers with great respect, not even Plato, and cynicism remains a point of contention between them. Even in this context, however, Epicurus remains a particularly negative point of reference throughout the work.

The link that Ulpian seeks to maintain between Epicurus and Arcestratus places Arcestratus firmly among the bad philosophers. We are reminded of this link in books 4 and 10. The sarcastic reference to him as the new Theognis echoes an earlier comment in Ulpian's speech, about Hesiod (3.101f, attached to *fr.* 60 Olson and Sens):

the fine advice that Arcestratus transmits to us is worthy of our wonder. He led the wise Epicurus to pleasure, with wise sayings in the manner of the poet of Ascrea, telling us to listen to nobody, but to pay attention to him.

Arcestratus is thus a very dangerous influence. His thought has inspired Epicurus, and his beautiful verse, far from following the austere principles of Hesiod, incites us to pleasure. As we have seen, in describing Arcestratus as the *metropolis* of Epicurus, the *kathêgemôn* (3.101f) and the *archêgos* (7.278e-f = testimonium 6 Olson and Sens), Athenaeus uses the metaphors of place and authority to establish important stages in the development of pleasure.⁶⁴ The *Deipnosophistae* reminds us constantly that Arcestratus is a bad guide, a bad *periegete*, because he was subject to the (uncontrolled) demands of his stomach.

III. CONCLUSIONS: THE MESSAGE FOR ROME

The ambivalent presentation of Arcestratus by the *Deipnosophistae* helps us to describe the work that Athenaeus has produced, and in particular to draw some conclusions about the message that is brought to Rome. Athenaeus and the diners focus on the food, the drink and the many place names mentioned by Arcestratus, who makes a valuable contribution. Arcestratus wrote within a poetic form that was reminiscent of Homer but ignored heroic values and filled the verses with fish instead, a subject matter studiously avoided by Homer, as Plato and the Hellenistic critics had pointed out (Heath (2000)). His title *The Life of Luxury* also trumpeted a way of life that was potentially if not avowedly immoral. The submission to pleasure and desire reversed the teaching of Plato and incurred a dismissive commentary from Chrysippus. The reception of the poem thus ties in Athenaeus' interest in Homer and Plato with commentaries from Hellenistic scholarship and philosophy.

The poem of Arcestratus is an object lesson for the *Deipnosophistae*. As we have seen, he provides an ambiguous model for the meals in Rome. Larensis himself produces potentially disturbing evidence about Rome to add to the moral concerns. In an important passage at the end of book 6 (272e-275b), Larensis reflects on the large number of slaves now owned in Rome, in contrast with the time of Scipio Africanus and even Julius Caesar. These new resources might have diverted Romans from their early prudence and virtue (273a), and they now emulate their subjects in pernicious as well as useful ways (273e-274a). Ancestral customs enshrined in religious festivals keep the Romans close to traditional ways, but there is always the threat posed by imported goods (274b-c). Sumptuary laws played their part in the Republic (274c-e) but τῆς δὲ πολυτελείας τῆς νῦν ἀκμαζούσης πρώτος ἡγεμὼν ἐγένετο Λεύκολλος ὁ καταναυμαχῆσας Μιθριδάτην.⁶⁵ Larensis concludes with Cato's views on imports (from Polybius 34), Posidonius' comments on Rome's pristine simplicity in eating, and Theopompus' comment on πολυτέλεια

⁶⁴ In one of the passages under discussion, 101e-f, the Hellenistic kings Antigonos and Ptolemy are also mentioned as significant players. (See above on their role in book 4.)

⁶⁵ 'Lucullus was the first to introduce the lavishness which now flourishes, after the sea-battle against Mithridates.'

(‘lavishness’, presumably in the Greek cities) in his *Philippika*. Larensis sees Lucullus guiding the Romans to lavishness, as Archestratus was said to have led Epicurus to pleasure. He adds (274f) that ὄκειλεν⁶⁶ εἰς πολυτελῆ δίαιταν (‘he ran aground on a lavish style of life’). Larensis uses Nicolaos of Damascus as evidence for Lucullus’ downfall, as Athenaeus does in reference to the same passage in book 12 (543a), where Lucullus is said to have led the Romans to luxury (τροφή).

The reader is likely to wonder whether Larensis himself is at risk of such a shipwreck, since his lavishness is highlighted at 6.224b, compared with the riches of Spain (8.330f-331c) and picked out by the Epitome (1.1b). Athenaeus and the diners make no such suggestion in their discussions, but the possibility remains since the *Deipnosophistae* maintains the idea of progression to luxury from pristine simplicity against the background of diverse dining across the Greek Mediterranean. Larensis may be immune from this danger, especially if he is protected by the learning of his library and guests. This ambiguity echoes others in the relations between the Greek and Roman worlds.⁶⁷

Larensis and his guests thus reflect on the dangers of this metaphorical navigation for Rome, as shown by the ‘leadership’ and maritime activity of Archestratus and Lucullus. They sometimes use the language of navigation of themselves (9.386d-e). There is however no bad behaviour at the tables of Larensis, as there is in the symposia among philosophers in other literary symposia of the period, such as those of Lucian, and in the many philosophical symposia reviewed in books 4, 5 and elsewhere. The *Deipnosophistae* exchange accusations of gluttony, but there are no descriptions of food being consumed greedily, no mention of courtesans present, nor of the sympotic riddles and games deplored by Clearchus and Chrysippus.⁶⁸

Rather, the meals end with Larensis singing the traditional cult hymn to Hygieia by Ariphron of Sicyon. The provenances of the foods identify the materials. The names of the foods and methods of preparation provide the cultural framework within which the foods are used, and the arguments between the diners and their commentaries on Homer, Plato and Archestratus provide the testing ground within which the foods will be understood. A clear ethical framework is provided for the imperial metropolis which had access to all the fruits of empire.

Athenaeus brings together themes of navigation that belong to the symposium, and places them within an ingenious review of dining in Greek culture that focuses relentlessly on topography, history and the relation of past to present. Where Aelius Aristides declared the *periêgêsis* dead, Athenaeus brings it triumphantly to life, with a special reading of the travel literature. He puts Polybius and Herodotus to new uses, accentuating their topographical and ethnographic interests.⁶⁹ He quotes from many a *periplous* and many a regional or local history, as we have seen. In principle, he is likely (though not certain) to draw a topographical element from virtually any source. Many more could be added: I add just one, which takes us back to the Roman centre. In the abbreviated section on ‘boundaries’ (ὄροι) that was mentioned above in the context of the ‘ouranopolis’ (Epitome 1.20b-c), Athenaeus quotes a phrase of Polemon of Ilium, without mentioning his name (perhaps because the Epitomator deleted it as he was accustomed to do). Polemon⁷⁰ called Rome the ἐπιτομήν τῆς οἰκουμένης (‘the epitome of the world’) because, says the Epitomator, all the cities were established there. Polemon of Ilium is widely quoted in the *Deipnosophistae*,⁷¹ and had strong geographical interests, with works on buildings, cities and epigrams city

⁶⁶ C (Parisinus Supp. Gr. 841): οἴκει μὲν (Marcianus 447).

⁶⁷ See Whitmarsh (2000) on the *Deipnosophistae* in the perspectives both of clients of Larensis and as ambassadors from the strongholds of Greek scholarship.

⁶⁸ Though it must be said Cynulcus and Ulpian sometimes thump their cushions in fury (e.g. 3.121f). Cynulcus has an erotic interest in boys, but in private (if Kaibel’s text is right at 13.602f).

⁶⁹ See Clarke (1999) 79-97 on the debate among Polybian scholars on geographical ‘digressions’ within his work.

⁷⁰ Galen identifies him (*De humero iis modis prolapsos quos Hippocrates non vidit* 18a.347.15-16 Kühn).

⁷¹ For Athenaeus’ use of Polemon see Zecchini (1989) 227-31 and (2000) 156 and 159.

by city.⁷² Here was a predecessor who could provide topographical detail of a high order, to rival that of Pausanias, for example.⁷³ He provides information on many cities, and is the object of a comment himself from the Deipnosophist Plutarch of Alexandria (6.234d). Polemon, says Plutarch, may prefer to be known as Samian, Sicyonian, Athenian or from numerous other cities (according to Heracleides of Mopsuestia).⁷⁴ The diners hear such comment on other occasions: Aristophanes the comic poet might come from Naucratis as well as Athens, and Apollonius Rhodius also from Naucratis. The evidence for Aristophanes is taken (6.229d-e) from Heliodorus of Athens *On the Acropolis* and for Apollonius (7.283d) from his own book on the foundation of Naucratis. These examples show the Deipnosophistae playing with topography as part of their enormous engagement with the topic.⁷⁵ At the same time, the Deipnosophistae have an interest in Naucratis and North African affairs in general, as befits their author and the home of the library in Alexandria.⁷⁶

The Deipnosophistae have arrived in Rome to eat with Larensis. Once there, they recline at table but do not travel anywhere, except in their disquisitions. With some exceptions, such as the sea journeys of Apicius and Arcestratus, they focus on place rather than the movement of a journey over land or sea.⁷⁷ The sea implicitly brings trade and wealth, but there is no attempt to highlight the traditional perils of sea travel that contrast with the virtues of agriculture. Instead, the land can contribute to luxury just as well as the sea: Polybius (7.1.1-3), for example, is quoted at 12.528b to show that the Capuans were shipwrecked in luxury because of the excellence of their soil. Virtue, for the Deipnosophistae, with the exception of the library and tables of Larensis, is located in the past rather than in a particular kind of space, and it is to the pristine antiquity of Homer in particular that we must look for ethical guidance at the symposium, as we have seen. If there are aspects to Homer which appear excessive (10.412b-d), then there are commentators to hand who will clarify the interpretation (12.513a-e).

Homer gives the perspective of time, which in this text is navigated alongside space. The scholarly apparatus, the topographical focus and the theme of luxurious decline are all available for deployment. In the section on thistles cited above, luxury was not invoked. It could have been, and it is in Pliny (*Natural History* 9.43). As I have shown, Athenaeus, Dioscorides, Galen and Pliny relate the many regions and their peoples, flora and fauna to the imperial capital with all available scholarly resources as part of the process of classifying and cataloguing on a grand scale.

Originality has not always been the quality that critics would apply to the *Deipnosophistae*. For many, as noted at the outset, Athenaeus is a 'mere' compiler, with a disorganized structure that gives every indication of being a summary version of a better work. Even if that were true, the content and the critique of sources remain of a high order. The originality in part lies in the use of topography to reveal the diversity of the Greek world; in the application of it to the sympotic material where it is immediately at home; and in the advanced use of sources. These are used in great number; they are reshaped for 'navigational' purposes; and they are presented with advanced

⁷² The Deipnosophistae refer to Polemon as the 'Periegete' at 5.210a, 9.372a, 387f, 13.602f, and 15.696f, as had Strabo at 9.1.16.

⁷³ Arafat (2000) shows that Athenaeus has interesting material on monuments from Polemon that Pausanias does not mention, perhaps because he preferred autopsy or because he wished not to display his learning. Pausanias writes an overt guide, Athenaeus a learned symposium. Comparison between the two is instructive. Elsner (2001) has shown that Pausanias does not discuss everything that one could see if one walked through the streets of a city he describes. He selects some monuments, omits others, and leaves gaps between cities that would have to be travelled if he really were describing a journey. Rather, he uses the

idea of a journey to give a structure to the selected monuments, which are set within a context of myth, religion and artistic design. The monuments that Pausanias describes existed, and could be inspected by his readers, for whom he gives a very special topographical and cultural commentary.

⁷⁴ Of whom little is known: see Preller (1964) 12.

⁷⁵ Note that the monograph on the acropolis is used not for an architectural point but for a biographical surprise.

⁷⁶ Too (2000).

⁷⁷ Compare the interesting comments of Clarke on Strabo's greater interest in place than space ((1999) 192-293, esp. 292-3).

bibliographical aids, so that Aristotle is (surprisingly) read with Epicurus (8.354a-d), Plato with Herodotus (see above) and Homer with Aristarchus, Megacleides (12.512e-513e) and others.

The shipwreck of a city or people through its wealth and extravagance is the most striking application of the navigational metaphor in the *Deipnosophistae*. Overall, Athenaeus' treatment of this theme is delicately done.⁷⁸ Many geographical writers are quoted but for references to place and not for their extensive journeys. The Epitomator tells us at the beginning of the work (1.1a-b) that among the topics treated, there will be the names and uses of fish, the wealth of kings and the size of ships. Fish take up much of books 6 to 8, and with the help of Arcestratus, reflect a lavish style of life. The link between the sea and wealth is explicitly made at 6.224c (when the fish course comes in). The *Deipnosophists* link the wealth of the Ptolemies with the Nile (5.203b-d), as we have seen, and they also review the great ships of the Hellenistic kings in book 5 (203c-209f), in an explicit rerun of Homer's Catalogue of Ships. These ships were better designed for what the *Deipnosophistae* discuss – on-board libraries, dining rooms and other displays of wealth – than for literal navigation: Hiero's 'Syracosa' was in fact too vast for almost any port to receive (209a-b).

The reader of this vast work is left with an impression of comprehensiveness (many of the Greek cities of the Mediterranean world are here); of much history seen through a geographical frame; and of geography as it had not been seen before. Larensis and Rome can now receive all this data that is stored in their libraries: the books are still needed, the foods are still in need of explanation. Their uses and receptions are all recorded. Any excess is in quotation rather than appetite, so there is no grossness or indulgence. This contrasts strongly with Horace's, Juvenal's and Petronius' receptions of Greek dining in Rome (all in Latin), where foods are artfully presented, power is abused and knowledge is treated with ignorance.⁷⁹

JOHN WILKINS
University of Exeter

⁷⁸ Gorman and Gorman (2007) suggest that this idea belongs more to the world of Athenaeus than to that of the sources he cites.

⁷⁹ Compare Horace, *Satires* 2.4 and 2.8, Juvenal, *Satire* 5 and Trimalchio's dinner in Petronius, *Satyricon*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arafat, K. (1996) *Pausanias' Greece* (Cambridge)
- (2000) 'The Recalcitrant Mass: Athenaeus and Pausanias', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 191-202
- Arnott, W.G. (2000) 'Athenaeus and the Epitome: texts, manuscripts and early editions', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 41-52
- Bollansée, J. (2007) 'The Aristotelian *Politeiai* in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*', in Lenfant (2007) 175-90
- Brandt, P. (ed.) (1888) *Parodum Epicorum Graecorum et Arcestrati Reliquiae* (Leipzig)
- Braund, D. (2000) 'Learning, luxury and Empire: Athenaeus' Roman patron', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 3-22
- and Wilkins, J. (eds) (2000) *Athenaeus and his World* (Exeter)
- Canfora, L. et al. (ed) (2001) *Ateneo: I Deipnosophisti* (Rome)
- Casaubon, I. (1621) *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Lyons)
- Clarke, K. (1999) *Between Culture and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World* (Oxford)
- Dalby, A. (1988) 'The Wedding Feast of Caranus the Macedonian by Hippolochus', *Petits Propos Culinaires* 29, 37-45
- (1996) *Siren Feasts* (London)
- (2000) 'Lynceus and the anecdotists', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 372-94
- (2002) *The Empire of Pleasures* (London)
- (forthcoming) 'Salty Words', in Wilkins (forthcoming)
- Desrousseaux, A. (1956) *Athénée de Naucratis. Les Deipnosophistes* (Paris)
- Düring, I. (1936) 'De Athenaei Dipnosophistarum indole atque dispositione', in *Apophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata* (Göteborg), 226-70
- (1941) *Herodicus the Crateteian. A Study in anti-Platonic Tradition* (Stockholm)
- Elsner, J. (2001) 'Structuring Greece: Pausanias's *Periegesis* as a Literary Construct', in S. Alcock, J. Cherry and J. Elsner (eds), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford)
- Gilula, D. (2000) 'Stratonicus, the witty harpist', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 423-33
- (2000a) 'Hermippus and his catalogue of goods', in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins (eds), *The Rivals of Aristophanes* (London) 75-90
- Gorman, R.J. and Gorman, V.B. (2007) 'The *tryphê* of the Sybarites: a historiographical problem in Athenaeus', *JHS* 127, 38-60
- Guillen, L.R. (2000) 'Are the Fifteen Books of the *Deipnosophistae* an excerpt?', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 244-55
- Gulick, C.B. (1927-41) *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists* (Cambridge, Mass. and London)
- Heath, M. (2000) 'Do Heroes eat fish? Athenaeus on the Homeric lifestyle', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 342-52
- Jacob, C. (2000) 'Athenaeus the Librarian', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 85-110
- (2001) 'Ateneo o i dedalo delle parole', in Canfora (2001) xxxi-cxv
- Kaibel, G. (ed.) (1887-90) *Athenaeus: Dipnosophistae* (Stuttgart)
- König, J. (forthcoming) 'Festival Ekphrasis and the compilatory ethic in Athenaeus, book five', in Wilkins (forthcoming)
- Lenfant, D. (ed.) (2007) *Athénée et les fragments d'historiens* (Strasbourg)
- Letrouit, J. (1991) 'A propos de la tradition manuscrite d'Athénée: une mise au point', *Maia* 43, 33-40
- Lissarrague, F. (1987) *Un flot d'images* (Paris)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P. (eds) (1983) *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin and New York)
- Longo, O. (1987) 'I mangiatori di pesci: regime alimentare e quadro culturale', *Materiali e Discussioni* 18, 9-53
- Martin, J. (1931) *Symposion: Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form* (Paderborn)
- Mengis, K. (1920) *Die Schriftstellerische Technik im Sophistenmahl des Athenaios* (Paderborn)
- Murphy, T. (2004) *Pliny the Elder's Natural History* (Oxford)
- Nutton, V. (1995) 'Galen and the traveller's fare', in J. Wilkins, D. Harvey and M. Dobson (eds), *Food in Antiquity* (Exeter)
- Nyikos, L. (1941) *Athenaeus quo consilio quibusque usus subsidiis Dipnosophistarum libros composuit* (diss. Basel)

- Olson, S.D. (2006-) *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters* (Cambridge, Mass. and London)
— and Sens, A. (2000) *Archestratos of Gela* (Oxford)
- Pelling, C. (2000) 'Fun with fragments: Athenaeus and the Historians', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 171-90
- Preller, L. (1838, reprinted 1964) *Polemonis periegetae fragmenta* (Leipzig, Amsterdam)
- Rice, E.E. (1983) *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford)
- Romeri, L. (2002) *Philosophes entre mots et mets* (Grenoble)
- Scarborough, J. and Nutton, V. (1982) 'The Preface of Dioscorides' *Materia Medica*: introduction, translation, and commentary', in *Transactions and Studies of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia* 4, 187-227
- Schweighaeuser, J. (ed.) (1801-7) *Athenaei Deipnosophistarum libri XV* (Strasbourg)
- Slater, W.J. (1976) 'Symposium at Sea', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80, 161-70
- Too, Y.L. (2000) 'The Walking Library: the performance of cultural memories', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 111-23
- Trapp, M. (2000) 'Plato in the *Deipnosophistae*', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 353-63
- Walbank, F. (2000) 'Athenaeus and Polybius', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 161-70
- Whitmarsh, T. (2000) 'The Politics and poetics of parasitism: Athenaeus on parasites and flatterers', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 304-15
- Wilkins, J. (2000) *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Oxford)
— (2000a) 'Dialogue and comedy: the structure of the *Deipnosophistae*', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 23-37
— (2007) 'Galen and Athenaeus in the Hellenistic library', in T. Whitmarsh and J. König (eds), *Ordering Knowledge* (Cambridge) 68-87
— (ed.) (forthcoming), *Athenaeus and his Philosophers at Supper* (Exeter)
- Zecchini, G. (1989) *La cultura storica di Ateneo* (Milan)
— (2000) 'Harpocration and Athenaeus: historiographical relationships', in Braund and Wilkins (2000) 153-60