Joaquim Pinheiro
Carmen Soares
(coords.)

# Patrimónios Alimentares de Aquém e Além-Mar

IMPRENSA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS

ANNABLUME

# "A display for the whole of Greece"? The narrator's relationship with his audience in Archestratus of Gela[1]

Paul S. Martin
University of Exeter
Department of Classics and Ancient History

Abstract: This article examines the relationship between the narrator and the audience in Archestratus' *Hedypatheia*, a relationship that provides us with a better understanding of the poem's didactic and poetic pretensions. I demonstrate that this relationship is founded upon inequality: the narrator is consistently presented as omniscient, while the audience always occupy an inferior position, their very lives less important than the life of luxury which they are expected to pursue. This relationship operates at both a gastronomic and a poetic level. The relationship between the narrator and the addressees situates the poem within Greek poetic aesthetics, espousing a poetics of simplicity. At the same time, the humour and parodic tone of the poem emphasize the poet's art, how he deals with his subject and the subjects he chooses to include or exclude. Far from being a straightforward catalogue of the best foods in the Greek world, the *Hedypatheia* invites us to negotiate our position through the humorously exaggerated assumption that the addressees of the poem are prepared to lay down their lives for a fish, as well as our reception of the poem itself.
Keywords: Archestratus of Gela - food and literary heritage - poetic authority

Archestratus' *Hedypatheia*, a hexameter poem which describes luxurious dishes in epic language, has long been an important source for studies of Greek culinary culture during the fourth century BC.[2] For each dish Archestratus discusses, he gives detailed instructions as to where to find the best examples (the best shrimp, for example, come from Iasos), as well as recipes (e.g. it is best to roast the underbelly of an *aulopias* on a spit). Archestratus' expertise on gastronomic matters was frequently cited by Athenaeus, thanks to whose *Deipnosophistae* approximately 60 fragments of the poem survive, although the *Hedypatheia*'s penchant for fish, a luxury associated strongly with the morally dubious rich of the fourth century BC, aroused the criticism of the Stoics.[3] Rather than examining the specific culinary advice of the poem, which

---

[1] I would like to thank my supervisors, Prof. Matthew Wright and Dr. Karen Ní Mheallaigh, as well as the reviewer, Prof. John Wilkins, Claire Rachel Jackson, and several other colleagues from the University of Exeter for their helpful comments and discussion. All remaining gaffes are my own.

[2] For the dating of the poem, see Olson and Sens 2000: xxi-ii and Dalby 1995.

[3] The fragments and translation of Archestratus are those used by Olson and Sens 2000. All

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.14195/978-989-26-1191-4_6

has been the subject of previous scholarly work, this article is interested in exploring the poem's human relationships. These relationships operate on two levels: when the poem is performed, most likely during a symposium, there exists the interaction between the performer and the audience; within the poem, the narrator addresses two specific individuals, Moschus and Cleandrus, to whom the advice is addressed and who stand in for the external audience. Both of these relationships are premised upon the figure of the narrator, whose persona is adopted by the performer, whether or not this performer was Archestratus himself. The first section of this article, therefore, focuses on the *persona loquens*, the narrator, before turning to examine the relationship between the narrator and the poem's internal narratees. Overall, I demonstrate that this relationship is founded upon inequality: the narrator is consistently presented as omniscient, while the audience always occupy an inferior position, their very lives less important than the life of luxury which they are expected to pursue.

Before we can turn to examine the relationship between the narrator and the audience, we must appreciate the context in which Archestratus' poem was produced, particularly its generic affiliation and performance context. Additionally, it is worth briefly considering Archestratus' poem in the context of the discourse of food in Greek literature.

One of the most conventional generic affiliations for the *Hedypatheia* is that of *paroidia*. This genre consisted of hexameter poems that frequently parody epic poetry, although they often incorporate elements parodying other works. The *Batrachomyomachia*, for example, the only complete surviving example of the genre, combines parodies of epic and fable.[4] Similarly, as we shall see, Archestratus combines his use of epic with the language and style of other literature.[5] However, while *paroidia* was most commonly performed at festivals,[6] the *Hedypatheia* was most likely either read privately or performed during a dinner party or in the symposium that followed.[7] Clearchus provides

other translations are taken from the Loeb Classical Library with the exception of Matro of Pitane, for whom I consulted Olson and Sens 1999.

[4] For the *Batrachomyomachia*'s use of epic and fable, see for example Glei 1984: 18-22.

[5] For Archestratus' use of epic diction, see Olson and Sens 2000: lv-lviii.

[6] Hegemon of Thasos, for example, who according to Aristotle (*Po*. 1448a12-3) was the "first writer of parodies", performed in Athens ("My dear, your husband got 50 drachmas in Athens by his singing", Hegemon fr. 1.16; cf. Chamaeleon fr. 44 Wehrli). Inscriptional evidence also attests to performances in various Greek cities, such as Delos and Eretria, for which see Rotstein 2012.

[7] This setting for the poem is implied by Wilkins and Hill 2011: 13, who discuss how it was common for the Greeks to "[hear] literature recited to them at banquets, in particular at the drinking session (symposium) after the meal," and Olson and Sens 2000: xxxv similarly suggest that "the *Hedupatheia* is most easily understood as intended to be read privately by or to a small literary circle."

the one of the temporally closest pieces of evidence for the use of Archestratus in symposia. He contrasts those who use riddles to show their erudition during drinking parties with those "like people today" who discuss their favourite sexual positions or which type of fish is best during which season, specifying that "such behaviour is, in fact, characteristic of an individual who has spent time with the treatises of Philaenis and Archestratus" (fr. 63 Wehrli ap. Ath. 10.457c-d). An alternative source, Plato Comicus' *Phaon* (produced in 391 BC), suggests both that such gastronomic poems were read privately as well as performed. One fragment begins with a character wishing to read the new cookbook of Philoxenus (possibly of Leucas?) in a nice, quiet spot (fr. 189.1-4), although he is interrupted by a second figure who requests a sample of the poem ("Give me a sample (*epideixon*) of what it's like", 5). The verb, which here means to "read aloud to an audience",[8] is derived from the same root as the noun *epideigma*, "display", which Archestratus uses to characterize his poem in fr. 1. While the noun carries other connotations (see below), the evidence of Plato Comicus suggests that it can be interpreted as highlighting the poem's performativity. These sources, then, clearly reflect the way the *Hedypatheia* was read (out): either as a formal part of the entertainment at dinners or symposia, or read privately, learnt by heart, and regurgitated in the same context when relevant.

Food was an important subject in Greek literature from Homer onwards.[9] However, in the fifth and fourth centuries the topic of food became increasingly important in literature. In particular, several *paroidiai* were written about food and dinners during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, from Hegemon of Thasos to Matro of Pitane.[10] Although we do not possess enough of this generic trend to make strong generalizations, Archestratus' *Hedypatheia* seems to treat the theme differently to other writers of *paroidia*, focusing on the ingredients of the dishes rather than presenting a narrative about a particular dinner. Another important tradition in the background of Archestratus' poem is Greek comedy, in which the role of the *mageiros*, the "cook", developed into a well-established stock character. While these *mageiroi* share features with Archestratus' narrator, such as the element of "showing off" which I shall suggest is important in the opening line of the *Hedypatheia*, they do not usually attempt to impart their knowledge to others. Finally, the gastronomic advice Archestratus imparts recalls that of the cookbooks of the late fifth and fourth centuries, such as those by Mithaecus and Heracleides.

[8] Pirrotta 2009 *ad loc.* translates the verb as "einem Publikum laut vorlesen."

[9] For the significance of food in Homer, see Bakker 2006 and 2013.

[10] Sens 2006 has argued that there are several identifiable categories within the genre of *paroidia*, prominent amongst which is the theme gastronomy. For further on gastronomy in Greek parodic poetry, see Degani 1995.

Although we know little about these works, the one fragment of Mithaecus we possess gives details of how to prepare a ribbon fish in a similar style to Archestratus ("as for the ribbon-fish, after you gut it, cut its head off, rinse it, and cut it into slices, pour cheese and olive oil down over it", Ath. 7.325f). Archestratus' *Hedypatheia* occupies an important position at the crossroads of these different traditions of Greek literature, although the poet adopts a unique stance that combines the parody of didactic epic with the practical instruction of cookbooks and humour of comedy and *paroidia*.

The remainder of this article is divided into two parts, which discuss the presentation of the narrator and his relationship with the poem's internal audience respectively. In the first section, I highlight two elements of the poet's persona, his authoritative and humorous tones. Archestratus constructs his authoritative persona primarily through recourse to literary tradition. The catalogic form, combined with the shift towards knowledge based on personal experience, gives the narrator a firm basis for both gastronomic and poetic authority. The humour of the poem, on the other hand, not only gives the poet a mocking tone when addressing other cuisines but also allows us to reflect on Archestratus' poetic practice, what he chooses to discuss and how he does so. In the second section, which focuses on the relationship between the narrator and the audience, I shall show that the narrator exhibits a high level of authorial control over his audience, literally ordering them what to do, and that this is part of a broader strategy that subordinates the audience to their food, turning them into servants or even worshippers. Part of the joke of the poem is that, while the audience are implicitly expected to be pleasure seekers, travelling the entire Greek world for the best possible dishes, they are treated as far less important than the enjoyment of the life of luxury itself. At the same time, the relationship between author and audience within the poem acts as a foil for the audience's engagement with the poem as poetry. Both food and drink are common metapoetic metaphors in Greek literature, and when read from this perspective the narrator's advice to the audience about how to eat well serves to situate the poem within Greek poetic aesthetics. Although the vast array of foodstuff discussed could be taken as representative of a varied poetic diet, i.e. a gastronomic *poikilia*, Archestratus instead espouses a poetics of simplicity. Thus, through a better understanding of the interaction between the narrator and internal addressees, we gain new perspectives on the poem's didactic and poetic pretensions.

## Part 1: The omniscient narrator

The voice of the narrator is prominent throughout the poem. In this section, I want to draw attention to two features of Archestratus' narratorial persona, authority and its humour. Although Archestratus does not - so far

as we know - take the Herodotean step of naming himself at the opening of the work, Herodotean techniques are found in the opening of the poem as part of an ongoing strategy to situate the narrator within the paradigms of literary stereotypes of authority, both poetic and prosaic. In particular, the catalogue structure gives the impression of an authoritative account of gastronomic pleasure, which is reinforced by the direct and personal basis of Archestratus' own knowledge. At the same time, the accurate account is given not without a humorous vein, which is hinted at in the programmatic opening line. Other humorous elements of the poem, such as its parody of epic, emphasize the poet's manipulation of what he does and does not, can and cannot discuss.

What authority does Archestratus claim to possess? In fragment 1, we are told that the poem will be a *histories epideigma*, a "display of research". It transpires that this research is based on the author's own travels, as Athenaeus frequently claims that Archestratus "circumnavigated the inhabited world for the sake of his belly" (3.116f) or "out of a love of pleasure made a careful circuit of the entire earth and sea" (7.278d-e). It is likely that Archestratus' quest for personal knowledge is derived from the style of Hecataeus and Herodotus, whose works quickly became intimately associated with one particular style of literary authority.[11] We do not know precisely how Archestratus established this within the poem, however. Fragment 2 (*perielthon Asien kai Europen*, "I travelled around Asia and Europe") is unmetrical but likely derives from Archestratus' opening,[12] giving us only a hint of what Archestratus originally said. The phrasing of Athenaeus at 7.278d-e may also be instructive:

> This Archestratus out of a love of pleasure made a careful (*akribos*) circuit of the entire earth and sea because, it seems, he wished to inquire painstakingly (*epimelos*) into matters associated with the belly; and just like individuals who write accounts of their travels by land or sea, he wishes to furnish accurate (*met' akribeias*) information about everything as to "where each food <and drink> is best." (fr. 3)

It is quite possible that the emphasis on the careful (*epimelos*) and accurate (*akribos, met' akribeias*) account Athenaeus accords Archestratus' poem reflects a concern originally expressed in the poem itself. While this

[11] Herodotus' affiliation with literary authority in particular is clear from his early reception. For instance, Thucydides famously challenges the Herodotean style in the opening of his work ("it has been composed, not as a prize-essay (*agonisma*) to be heard for the moment, but as a possession for all time", 1.22). The argument of Goldhill 2002, that "prose takes the stage as a trendy, provocative, modern and highly intellectualized form of writing" (quotation from p. 1) finds confirmation in Archestratus' use of the Herodotean tradition for his own intellectualizing ends.

[12] For a discussion, see Olson and Sens 2000.

emphasis is particularly associated with the intellectual movement of fifth and fourth century, concerns about the "accuracy" or "truth" of poetry can be traced back to archaic epic poetry. Hesiod's Muses, for example, say: "we know how to say many false things similar to genuine ones, but we know, when we wish, how to proclaim true things" (*Th.* 27-8).

Furthermore, Athenaeus here seems to recognize the influence of travel writing, the *periegeseis* and *periploi*, on the *Hedypatheia*, a genre influenced by the writing of Hecateus. Archestratus claims to possess *accurate* information based on *personal* experience. Archestratus' poem is a display of his results, a *histories epideigma*, wording that recalls technical treatises and perhaps specifically Herodotus' own similar phrase, *histories apodexis* (1.1).[13]

At the same time, however, Archestratus flags up his difference from this prose tradition: he is not simply *making* a display of his results, he is *versifying* that display. While the verb *poieô* more neutrally means simply "make" or "do", in the context of a poem it could be read as connoting composition in verse.[14] In particular, the hemistich *poioumenos Helladi pasei*, "making [a display] for the whole of Greece", may evoke Herodotus' description of the cultural significance of Homeric and Hesiodic epic: *houtoi* [sc. Hesiod and Homer] *de eisi hoi poiesantes theogonien Hellesi*, "and these are they who taught the Greeks the descent of the gods" (2.53). Instead of making (in verse) a theogony, Archestratus is making his own display, demonstrating his own intelligence. If this reading is correct, the whole line takes on an interesting Herodotean structure: the first half of the line, recalling Herodotus' own *histories epideigma*, places the poem within the tradition of Herodotean personal inquiry, while the latter half appropriates for Archestratus' *Hedypatheia* Herodotus' own depiction of the significance of epic poetry in Greek culture for their understanding of the gods. The poem is "making a display" of the cultural significance of its two primary literary forebears as much as it is displaying its gastronomic erudition. Thus, in this programmatic opening line, Archestratus binds together his poetic and gastronomic authority.

One of the key techniques Archestratus uses to construct his omniscient persona is the use of the catalogue. Sammons' definition of the catalogue in Homeric poetry provides a useful starting point for approaching Archestratus,

---

[13] The association between Archestratus' opening phrase and Herodotus' work was suggested by Brandt 1888, although, as Olson and Sens 2000 *ad loc.* note, the language may be more generic (cf. Hp. *De Arte* 6.2.2-3, *histories oikeies epideixin poieumenoi,* "making a display of their own research").

[14] LSJ s.v. *poieo* A4. See, for example, Hdt. 1.23, "he was the first man, as far as we know, to compose (*poiesanta*) and name the dithyramb", 4.14, "in the seventh year after that Aristeas appeared at Proconnesus and made (*poiesai*) that poem which the Greeks call the Arimaspeia"; cf. Ar. *Th.* 153, 157, Pl. *Smp.* 223d.

as he draws on epic stylization. "A catalogue is a list of *items* which are specified in discrete *entries*; its entries are formally distinct and arranged in sequence by anaphora or by a simple connective, but are not subordinated to one another, and no explicit relation is made between the items except for their shared suitability to the catalogue's specified *rubric*."[15] In addition to the inclusion of "items", a catalogue can *elaborate* upon these items by telling us some more information, which Sammons calls *elaboration*. As an example, let us take a passage from the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships,* which displays all of Sammon's catalogic elements (2.493-8):

> Now will I tell the leaders of the ships and all the ships. The Boeotians were led by Peneleos and Leïtus, and Arcesilaus and Prothoënor and Clonius; these were they who dwelt in Hyria and rocky Aulis and Schoenus and Scolus and Eteonus with its many ridges, Thespeia, Graea, and spacious Mycalessus.

The rubric appears at the outset: "Now will I tell the captains of the ships and all the ships." The names of the various captains - Peneleos and Leïtus and then Arcesilaus, Prothoënor, and Cleonius - are the items of the catalogue, and some of the locations have short elaborations, such as "rocky" Aulis or Eteonus with its many ridges. While these might formally be elaboration, the standardized nature of the epithet in Homeric poetry might be said nearly to elide the distinction between item and elaboration. If here the elaboration is simple, elsewhere - and in the *Hedypatheia* especially - the elaborations can be much more extended.

Archestratus' rubric has already been touched on, as it is quoted by Athenaeus at 7.278d-e. Archestratus wants to furnish accurate information about everything as to "where each food / and drink is best." The majority of the poem took the form of a catalogue according to this rubric. As in many catalogues, we find structuring elements for the discrete entries. These have been identified by Olson and Sens, who note that most fragments begin with a specific recommendation constructed out of four basic elements:

> 1. The name of the commodity, generally in the accusative case.
> 2. The place where it can or should be purchased, usually in a prepositional phrase and sometimes in the form 'if you happen to come to…' *vel sim.*, but on occasion in the nominative.
> 3. A main verb, most often an imperative or the equivalent instructing the poem's addressees to get the food in question or, less often, a second person singular

[15] Sammons 2010: 9.

> future indicative asserting that 'you will see' the food or the like, or a third person singular indicative specifying that a particular place produces the food.
> 4. A description, sometimes very short, of the distinctive qualities of the food in the place where it has been recommended.[16]

As they note, these occur in different orders, if at all, although the name of the commodity is generally first. They are also frequently followed by: (5) cooking and serving instructions, which can be quite extended, or attacks on the poet's enemies or alternative methods of preparations; (6) a summary or digression, which occasionally occur at the end of the fragment. A clear yet succinct example of Archestratus' catalogic style might be fragment 13:

> As for the gilthead, do not neglect the fat one from Ephesos;the people there call it the "little Ionian". Buy it, the offspring of the august river Selinous, and wash it thoroughly then roast it and serve it whole, even if it is ten cubits long.

In the Greek, the name of the gilthead is placed at the start of the line, followed immediately by the best location to get it, Ephesus, because of its distinctive fatness there. The other directions for this fish are amongst the most common in Archestratus: we must buy it, wash it thoroughly, and then roast and serve it whole.[17]

What is the effect of such catalogic features for our understanding of the *Hedypatheia*? The effect, I suggest, is twofold: to give the impression of authority and narrative. Catalogues in Greek poetry are frequently used to convey a totalizing view of a particular subject. As Sammons says, "a poet or author may strike a particularly authoritative, objective, or reliable pose by presenting facts in their bare form."[18] Thus, for example, in Semonides' iambic poem concerning the minds of women, part of the humour derives from the authoritative stance lent by the catalogic structure which follows the rubric established in the opening line: "in the beginning God made the diverse female mind" (fr. 7.1-2 W).[19] The totalizing function of the poetic catalogue in this case allows Semonides to end the poem, after he has listed all the different forms of the female mind, to reach the apparently only logical conclusion that this is the greatest plague Zeus has created - women (ll. 96-7, emphasized by the repetition of 96 at 115).

---

[16] Olson and Sens 2000: xxvi.

[17] Buying and roasting are the most common. Buying is mentioned in frs. 11, 16-17, 21, 23-9, 33-5, 43, 46, and 48, while roasting mentioned in frs. 14, 23, 24, 32, 34, 36-8, 46, and 57-8.

[18] Sammons 2010: 16-9, quotation from p. 16.

[19] Note that the line is ambiguous. *Choris gunaikos theos epoiesen noon / ta prota* might instead (or additionally) mean "in the beginning God made the female mind (apart from men)."

According to the conventions of epic, the poet requires a source for their authority. At the beginning of the *Catalogue of Ships*, for instance, Homer calls upon the Muses for aid (*Il.* 2.484-92). As a mere mortal, Homer does not have access to such privileged knowledge, and so he must acquire this knowledge through recourse to a higher authority, the Muses. Indeed, the conventionality of the invocation of the Muses and their role in catalogic poetry especially is clear from another poem of *paroidia* from the fourth century BC, Matro of Pitane's *Attikon Deipnon*, in which the narrator describes the dinner laid out at the house of the Athenian *rhetor* Xenocles. This poem begins with a traditional invocation of the Muses, parodying the opening line of the *Odyssey* ("Dinners describe to me, Muse, much-nourishing and very numerous", line 1). The centrality of the Muses to the catalogue in particular is emphasized in what is in fact the final dish in Matro's own catalogue of food, the flat-cake (116-20):

> But, gentlemen, when I saw the tawny, sweet, big, circular, roasted child of Demeter entering - that is, the flat-cake - how then could I keep away from the divine flat-cake?
> Not even did I have ten hands, and ten mouths, and were my stomach impervious and my hear within made of bronze.

Lines which clearly parody the opening of the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* (2.488-92):

> But the multitude I could not tell or name, not even if ten tongues were mine and ten mouths and a voice unwearying, and the heart within me were of bronze, unless the Muses of Olympus, daughter of Zeus who bears the aegis, call to my mind all those who came beneath Ilios.

This parody, deliberately and humorously placed at the end of the catalogue rather than the beginning, clearly demonstrates the influence of the Homeric invocation of the Muses on the later catalogic tradition. Archestratus, however, needs no Muses. His authority comes from personal experience. As we have seen, Athenaeus tells us that Archestratus "made a careful circuit of the entire earth and sea" (7.278d-e). Likely in deliberate contrast to Hesiod, who famously claims to have no expertise in seafaring in the *Works and Days* ("I shall show you the measures of the much-roaring sea, I who have no expertise at all in either seafaring or boats", 648-9), Archestratus' own travels provide the knowledge on which the *Hedypatheia* is founded. Indeed if, as I have suggested, Athenaeus' emphasis on Archestratus' supposed accuracy and care is a reflection of a concern originally expressed within the *Hedypatheia* itself, the contrast between the epic and historiographical/prosaic forms of

authority are made especially clear. The epic poet seeks the help of the Muses, the historian finds out the story directly from others. Herodotus, for instance, when discussing a supposed liaison between the Persian king Xerxes and the city of Argos, says: "I cannot with exactness (*atrekeos*) say; nor do I now declare that I hold aught for truth but what the Argives themselves say... For myself, though it be my business to set down that which is told me, to believe it is non at all of my business; let that saying hold good for the whole of my history" (7.152). This example not only demonstrates the similarities between Archestratus and Herodotus in the concern for accuracy but also the differences. While Herodotus openly expresses concerns about the value of the evidence he presents, leaving the reader with the task of whether or not to believe it,[20] Archestratus, as we shall see, is not so ambiguous. He has travelled around the whole world, trying out these different goods, and his word is final.

The almost totalitarian authority Archestratus' narrator constructs, however, seems to be set humorously against concerns about the limitations of human knowledge itself. The sea especially becomes a locus around which such concerns are aired. Oppian, for instance, in the *Halieutica*, says that "infinite and beyond ken are the tribes that move and swim in the depths of the sea, and none could name them certainly (*atrekeos*); for no man hath reached the limit of the sea, but unto three hundred fathoms less or more men know and have explored the deep" (*H.* 1.80-4). Here, Oppian is drawing on stereotypes about knowledge and poetic authority similar to those of Archestratus, perhaps even on the *Hedypatheia* itself. Again we find an emphasis on accuracy (*atrekeos*), the statement that none could name the tribes of the sea recalls the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships* quoted above. Oppian also emphasizes the "measure of the sea", recalling Hesiod's own lack of nautical knowledge (e.g. "by their arts [the fish] have mapped out the *measures* of the sea", 1.10-2, "the sea is infinite and of *unmeasured* depth", 1.85). The sea is the locus of the unknown. Archestratus' claim to have "made a careful circuit of the *entire* sea and earth" (my italics), then, can be read as humorously exaggerated. Nevertheless, however humorous Archestratus' audacious claims of expertise are, and whether or not we are really expected to believe him, the rhetorical force of his narrator is strengthened by the structure that the poem assumes. The catalogue enforces the impression of an omniscient narrator, systematically laying out the information at his disposal.

Secondly, the ordering of items in a catalogue can express a narrative, as we seek to discern a pattern in the sequence of the catalogue's items.

[20] As Goldhill 2002: 28 notes, "the author's refusal to pass judgement becomes a lure for the reader to adopt a critical position, to engage in the process of *historiê*."

While this might be along temporal lines, in the *Hedypatheia* Archestratus creates the effect of a dinner without the setting of a dinner. One obstacle for understanding precisely how this effect was created is our relative lack of understanding about the structure of the poem. It is clear, nevertheless, that the poem was not structured geographically, like the *periegeseis* or *periploi*, nor was it alphabetical, which is the organizing principle of Athenaeus' catalogue of seafood in book 7 of his *Deipnosophistai.* Instead, frs. 1-3 come from the *prooemium*, which was likely followed by fr. 4, which concerns the correct number of guests. Fragment 5 must have begun the catalogue, since the emphasis on "first of all" at the start of the line is a common self-reflexive marker of openings in epic poetry.[21] This suggests that Archestratus first dealt with grains (frs. 5-6), out of which the remainder of the dishes most likely followed in the order in which they were served at a typical banquet: appetizers and cold dishes are the subject of fragments 7-9, followed by 47 fragments which discuss fish and other seafood, and finally 4 move onto the symposium and second tables (frs. 57-60).[22]

This structure, following the progression of the dinner, would suit performance during the dinner particularly well, and is suggested by two elements contained in the poem. Firstly, many of the fragments begin with the phrase "when you come to…" or similar (e.g. at frs. 16, 26, 35 and 40). While this could be read as a simple exhortation, dinner parties were frequently imagined in Greek literature as (naval) voyages.[23] One anecdote, for instance, tells of a group in Acragas who imagined that they were sailing on a trireme during a storm and so they jettison from the house all the furniture and bedding (Timaeus of Tauromenium *FGrH* 566 fr. 149 ap. Ath. 2.37b-e). This extends even to Athenaeus, who draws upon the traditional links between the symposium and the sea.[24] This creates two levels of meaning: the didactic level at which we are being earnestly encouraged to travel to the locations in question and sample their ichthyic delights, and the performative level at which the audience imagine themselves making that very voyage, prompted by the poem and perhaps the appearance of the fish in question on the table. A similar effect is achieved through phrases such as "you will see" (e.g. frs.

[21] For the use of *protos/primus* to mark primary events in the narratives, see Race (1992) 23; for examples, see amongst others Hes. *Th.* 24, 34, 44, 108, 113, 116, *Il.* 1.6, Hdt. 1.5, Call. *Ap.* 30, Verg. *A.* 1.2, and Prop. 1.1.

[22] Olson and Sens 2000: xxiv-v. For the typical order of service at a fourth century BC Greek dinner, see Matro of Pitane's *Attikon Deipnon* with the notes of Olson and Sens 1999: 24-9.

[23] See, for example, Davidson 1997: 44, speaking of the symposium, although this could apply equally to the dinner: "the arrangement was less a static circle of equality than a dynamic series of circulations, evolving in time as well as in space, with the potential for uncoiling into long journeys, expeditions, voyages."

[24] See, for instance, Wilkins 2008.

14.2, 35.1, 55.2).[25] These are geographically focused (e.g. "in Byzantium you will see"), and may thus invoke a similar element of metaphorical travel, but the emphasis on sight would be well complemented by the actual sights of the dinner. This argument is best exemplified in fragment 16, which combines both the elements of travel and vision ("But *when you come* to the wealthy land of Ambrakia, buy the boar-fish *if you see it*"). Thus, through the structure of the poem's catalogue of dishes, supported by the emphasis on geography and vision, the *Hedypatheia* interacts with its performance context, transforming the dinner and symposium into a metaphorical voyage.

While Archestratus puts much emphasis on the authority of his poetic narrator, grounding his knowledge in personal experience according to historiographical models and constructing a catalogic poem that evokes the authority of the epic poets, the poem is also replete with humour and a marked parodic tone. This is clear from the ambiguity of the opening phrase, which paints the *Hedypatheia* as a self-consciously ostentatious poem, "showing off" the narrator's knowledge as much as "demonstrating" it. This self-consciousness on the part of the narrator is extended in other fragments in which humour plays an important function both in defining the narrator himself and as part of the narrator's reflexivity concerning what he does or does not, can or cannot discuss.

We have seen that the opening words of the poem, which announce the poem as a *histories epideigma*, "a display of research", associate the poem immediately with scientific and historiographical stereotypes of literary authority. There is a hint, however, that this claim to authority should not be taken with a completely straight face. As I have already suggested with reference to Plato Comicus fr. 189, Archestratus' *epideigma* may reflect the poem's performativity. *Epideigma* primarily means a "display", and one of its earliest attested usages in Xenophon's *Symposium* refers to the entertainment during the Greek drinking parties ("the Syracusan, seeing that with such conversation going on the banqueters were paying no attention to his show (*epideigmaton*), but were enjoying one another's company", *Smp.* 6.6). We might thus read this as a reflexive comment on one of the likely performance contexts of the poem, either during the dinner itself or in the symposium. However, the word also carries connotations of "showing off". In Plato's

[25] Note that, like the imperatives discussed in the next section, Archestratus' exhortations are always in the second person singular, implicitly addressed either to Moschus or Cleandrus. While my argument here is primarily interested in the meaning of the poem at the point of performance during the dinner/symposium, these singular addresses would also simulate a direct address to a reader. As I have emphasized, however, these addresses are also part of the poem's play with the didactic tradition, and so these second person singular addresses do not preclude a sympotic performance.

*Hipparchus*, for instance, Hipparchus is said to have inscribed wise sayings in elegiacs upon figures of Hermes as "verses of his own and testimonies (*epideigmata*) of his wisdom" (228d). Archestratus' opening words, then, do not signal a poem that is a straightforward "display of research"; it can also be a bombastic literary *tour de force* by a self-styled smart-arse.

The reflexivity of Archestratus' *epideigma*, which is at once an authoritative "display" and literary showpiece, is paradigmatic for the wit and humour displayed throughout the poem. In two cases in particular, fragments 36 and 40, the humour functions as part of Archestratus' ongoing poetic reflexivity, calling attention to the subjects the narrator does or does not discuss and how he does so. In fragment 36, for instance, Archestratus claims that with regard to the bonito, there is no need for extended discussion (1-6):

> As for the bonito, in autumn, when the Pleiades set, prepare it in any way you wish. Why should I make a long story for you out of this?
> For you certainly won't ruin it, even if you wish to do so.
> But, my dear Moschos, if you nonetheless want to know the best way for you to prepare this fish, the answer is: in fig leaves and a bit of majoram.

After the end of this quotation, Archestratus goes on (and on) for a further ten lines about what not to do ("no cheese, no nonsense!"), how to roast it, and places to get it. So much for not making a long story out of it! The rhetorical *recusatio* of a lengthy discussion parodies Odysseus' similar question ("But why should I tell you this tale?", *Od.* 12.450) concerning his experiences with Calypso. However, instead of ending a long tale as in the Odyssean context, Archestratus ironically uses it at the start of an extended discussion. The parodied rhetorical question draws attention to Archestratus' method. The incongruous jokes, such as that Moschus could not ruin the fish if he tried but that he should nevertheless avoid cheese and other nonsense, heighten the dependence of the audience upon the narrator, his knowledge and skill. Archestratus begins with the position "prepare it in any way you wish", but goes on to provide the best method for preparing it, "if you nonetheless want to know". Even when we are free to do as we please, Archestratus still has a particular method in mind. This is then emphasized further at the end of the fragment with the discussion of location: if we catch the bonito after it has crossed the Hellespontine sea, "it is no longer the same, but brings shame upon the praise previously awarded it" (14-6). Through the parodic *recusatio*, then, we are invited to recognize elements of Archestratus' technique and the extent to which we are dependent upon him, at least according to his rhetoric.

Similarly, in fragment 40, Archestratus raises the question of which foods he can and cannot mention through a parody of the language of mystery cult:

> The very whitest that sail out of the Bosporos. But let none of the hard flesh of the fish that grey up in Lake Maiotis be present, a fish that it is forbidden to mention in verse.

The joke here depends on the two different meanings of "forbidden to mention in verse". On one level, this phrase refers to the impossibility of mentioning the fish at all in hexameters, as the name of the fish does not scan; on another, it makes the pretence that saying the name would violate a religious rule (cf. "those mysteries I am forbidden to sing", A.R. 1.920-1).[26] Like the *recusatio*, the appeal to the limitations of language for poetic expression is familiar from other didactic poetry, such as Lucretius' complaint that the Latin language is too impoverished to express concepts of Greek philosophy ("nor do I fail to understand that it is difficult to make clear the dark discoveries of the Greeks in Latin verses, especially since we have often to employ new words because of the poverty of the language and the novelty of the matters", *DRN* 1.136-9), and this technique may well have been an established trope even by Archestratus' time. This joke, then, draws attention specifically to the limitations of Archestratus' form as well as to Archestratus' choice of foods. This is suggested by the fact that it is not entirely clear to which fish Archestratus is alluding. Indeed, in the context in which the fragment is quoted by Athenaeus (7.284e), the point is precisely to ask: "what is this fish that he claims is not allowed to be mentioned in poetry?" Instead of being a clear allusion to a particular, and instantly recognizable object, I suggest that the joke is deliberately illusive. The very process of determining which fish Archestratus may mean here, a process invited by the joke and explicitly asked by Athenaeus, forces the audience to recognize the many possible fish not mentioned by Archestratus, here or elsewhere. We are thus alerted to Archestratus' own process of comestible selection, his choice of which foods to include or exclude.

These two fragments highlight not only Archestratus' narrative style but also his selection process, what he does and does not discuss. They consolidate the picture I have argued Archestratus presents, of an authoritative narratorial figure. This is achieved in part by emphasizing the audience's dependence upon his narrative and instruction. The joke of fragment 40, meanwhile, threatens to destabilize this image: while the narrator's role in the gastronomic selection process is emphasized, there is a suggestion that Archestratus is somehow limited by his choice of form.

Another function of the humour in Archestratus is to condemn the diets and culinary arts of others. Throughout the *Hedypatheia* we find criticisms

[26] Olson and Sens 2000 *ad loc.*

of "Pythagorean" vegetarianism (e.g. fr. 24.18-20) as well as over-elaborate, over-cheesy dishes (e.g. fr. 57.7-9), and occasionally Archestratus coins new compound words, reminiscent of Greek comedy, such as "emptyheadedbrainlessbullshitartists" (*alazonochaunophlyaroi*, fr. 59.12) or those who have the sense "of a foolish locust" (*kouphattelebode*, fr. 24.14). This satirical vein is reflected in Athenaeus' description of Archestratus as "this poet from Gela - or rather Catagela" (7.314e-f). The name Catagela, "Derisionville", is a pun on the town Gela, which itself recalls *gelan/gelos*, "to laugh" or "laughter", and refers to its coinage by Aristophanes in the fifth century BC (*Acharnians* 606), designed to show off Athenaeus' *paideia*, his "learning".[27] Athenaeus' reference must, however, be motivated either by a linguistic joke in the *Hedypatheia* itself or by Athenaeus' reading of Archestratus. It is possible that Archestratus could have played on the similarity of Gela and "laughter", thus motivating Athenaeus' allusion to the Aristophanic pun and Archestratus would thus be taking advantage of the name of his hometown for the purpose of reflecting on his poetic practice. If, alternatively, it is Athenaeus' own wit at work, then this reflects instead his recognition of the satirical bent of the poem. In either case, this is a useful comment from the perspective of understanding the tone of the poem, either how the narrator framed his own position or how it was read by Athenaeus.

To conclude this section: Archestratus manipulates the traditions of technical prose and catalogue in his own narratorial construction. The catalogue style gives the impression of control and authority, an authority which Archestratus links not with the Muses, who are usually central to the catalogue tradition, but with his own expertise. Within the world of the poem, Archestratus rules supreme. However, this comes not without a hint of ironic or humorous playfulness. The introduction of the poem as a *histories epideigma* provides a perspective of a narrator who is showing off, which is supported by the almost absurd claim to have travelled everywhere and therefore know everything about the land and sea. The parodic humour, such as that used in fragments 36 and 40, is also used to emphasize the manipulation of items in the gastronomic catalogue. Archestratus' poem does not just tell you explicitly what to eat and what not to eat, but through knowing omission rejects some foods outright. In these final examples, we also see how the audience are presupposed to be dependent on the narrator, and it is to this relationship between author and audience to which we now turn.

[27] The importance of *paideia* in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistai* is clear from the opening of the epitome, which describes Larensius' guests (the *deipnosophistai*, including Athenaeus himself) as "the greatest experts in every field of knowledge (*paideia*)" (1a).

## Part 2: The subordinate audience

Although I have formally separated my discussion of the narrator and the narratees of this poem, naturally the two overlap. We have already seen in my discussion of the effect of the catalogic structure how Archestratus invokes travel and his audience's vision as a deictic, performative rhetorical strategy. The assumption within the poem that the addressees will travel to those places mentioned and do precisely what the narrator demands is both an important part of the authority wielded by the narrator and an invitation to the audience to take a metaphorical voyage through the sensory combination of the poem with the food laid before them. In this section, we turn to examine the addressees of the poem in more detail. First, we must establish who precisely the poem's internal audience is and then examine how this relationship is constructed. Two main points emerge: the narrator exhibits a high level of authorial control over his audience, reflected through the consistent use of imperatives; at another level, we see how Archestratus creates jokes at the expense of his audience, subordinating them to a life of pleasure that incorporates not just food as the subject of the poem but also the poem itself. After discussing how this relationship is presented in the poem, I shall explore its implications for our understanding of how audiences are invited to engage with the poem. I argue that the relationship between the author and audience is negotiated not simply on a gastronomic level, but also a poetic one. Archestratus situates the *Hedypatheia* within the metapoetic discourse of food in Greek literature that is particularly common to comedy. The poetics espoused by the poem on this reading is centred on simplicity, *haplotes*, in opposition to the elaborate use of literary sauces/sources.

Who is granted access to Archestratus' knowledge? In fragment 1, Archestratus claims that this is a "display for the whole of Greece", which at least makes the pretence of an intended Panhellenic audience.[28] However, the poem also has internal addressees, Moschus and Cleandrus, whose names also appear in Athenaeus ("he himself announces this [fr. 3] in the opening section of those noble *Counsels*, which he addresses to his comrades Moschus and Cleandros," 7.278d-e) and in the surviving fragments (frs. 5.2, 18.3, 28.1, 36.4). How, then, do we negotiate these two potential audiences of the poem? Is it a "display for the whole of Greece" or an intimate poem addressed to Archestratus' social group? At one level, this double internal audience reflects the influence of different generic associations made by the poem: the "display for the whole of Greece" fits with the invocation of technical

[28] Wilkins and Hill 2011 *ad loc.* note: "he is writing for 'the whole of Greece', that is in international terms the ancient world."

treatises in the phrase *histories epideigma* already discussed, while the address to particular individuals fits with the didactic tradition. Hesiod in the *Works and Days* addresses Perses, Theognis addresses Cyrnus, Empedocles Pausanias, and so on. Although the nature of these relationships differs from text to text, the presence of an internal addressee is a marker of the poem's didactic tone. But how does the poem cater to these two different audiences? The Panhellenic audience is an appeal to culture. As John Wilkins notes at the outset of his influential study of the discourse of food in Greek comedy: "foods, the ways in which they are processed and cooked and the social context in which they are consumed, contribute to the self-definition of a culture and distinguish it from its neighbours."[29] This association between food and culture is particularly prominent during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, where the accusation of being an *opsophagos*, someone who consumes vast quantities of the *opsos* (generally the more exquisite and expensive part of the dinner, most frequently fish), was frequently bandied around from the courtroom to the comic stage.[30] Archestratus' catalogue of "where each food and drink is best" (fr. 3), then, is a catalogue of the best places to eat like a Greek.

At the same time, the address to the whole of Greece is really an address to those who will take Archestratus' advice. Clearly not everyone in Greece will be able to follow this advice, only those people who really matter to Archestratus, i.e. the rich. "The whole of Greece" in this context is a rhetorical stance, the assumption, rather than the realistic expectation, that the whole of Greece will do what he says. Greekness is thus defined by one's ability to eat in luxury, even if you must travel great distances to get there (cf. the references to "when you come to…" vel sim., e.g. at frs. 16, 26, 35 and 40). This rhetorical trick neatly sidesteps, or deliberately ignores, the cultural debates surrounding excessive food consumption that were particularly prevalent in the 4th century, when excessive consumption of *opsos* such as fish could be viewed as a sign of extravagance and moral dubiousness. Through the claim to Panhellenism, Archestratus projects the implicit consensus of the audience into the poem. Moschus and Cleandrus are internal representatives of an imagined social group that includes all who follow Archestratus' advice. Despite this assumption of unquestioning loyalty, however, we shall see that at some points Archestratus actively engages us in negotiating our loyalty to his cause.

[29] Wilkins 2000: xi.

[30] For a significant study of the culture of gastronomy in the fifth and fourth centuries and particularly the rhetoric of *opsophagia*, see Davidson 1997: 3-35. The oft-cited definition of *opsophagoi* defines them as "those who peel back their ears for the market-bell and spring up on each occasion around the fish-mongers" (Plu. *Moralia* 667ff.).

Beyond naming two of his companions, however, we are told little about the personalities or etiquette of the dinner table, save that, beyond five guests, a pleasant evening is wont to turn into a "rapacious group of mercenary soldiers" (fr. 4). Archestratus' pronouncement is not wholly unusual for a Greek dinner. Varro, for instance, suggests between 3 and 9 diners (*Sat. Men.* 333), with other writers usually being at the top or bottom end of this scale. Thus, Plutarch suggests that it would be better to have only 3 or 4 (*Moralia* 679c) while Sopater fr. 20 Kaibel implies a party of 9. Nevertheless, Archestratus' ideal of only 3 to 4 is deliberately conservative and reflects the strict order and control he commands over his guests. Archestratus only directly addresses two guests, however, Moschus and Cleandrus, whom he frequently calls "my friend", *phile* (5.2, 18.2, 19.1, 36.4). The close bond between narrator and narratees throughout the poem places emphasis on their camaraderie, which implicitly excludes a figure increasingly common in the Greek literary dinnerscape, the parasite, who was well known for his gluttony.[31]

This construction of the audience fits well with the envisioned banqueting order at Archestratus' (literary) table (fr. 4):

> Everyone should dine at a single table set for an elegant (*habrodaiti*) meal.
> Let the total company be three or four, or at any rate no more than five; for after that you would have a mess-group of rapacious (*harpaxibion*) mercenary soldiers.

The image here contrasts the small, refined group with an unruly rabble, enhanced through the *hapax legomenon harpaxibion*, "rapacious". The military imagery, and the invocation of plunder, was a stereotype of certain Greek diners. We find a good example of the rapacious scoffers in another gastronomically themed *paroidia*, Matro of Pitane's *Attikon Deipnon*. When the flat-fish and the red mullet are placed before these diners, it is a rush to get to it first (27-9):

> And the cartilaginous flat-fish, and the carmine-cheeked red mullet.
> I was among the first to put a strong-clawed hand to it, but I did not wound it before the others; for Phoebus Apollo led me wrong.

Matro's narrator complains that he wasn't the first to "wound" it, blaming divine intervention. The military imagery is supported by the parody of *Iliad* 19.424 ("he spoke, and with a cry drove among the foremost his single-hoofed horses"). In the original context, Achilles is driving his horses amongst the front lines, prepared to do battle with Hector despite Xanthus' prophetic

[31] On the figure of the parasite in comedy, see Wilkins 2000: 71-86, and more generally Corner 2013a and b.

warning. The shift from Achilles' horses to Matro's hand is clearly intended to be humorous, particularly with the incongruous adjective *monychas*, lit. "strong-hoofed".

Archestratus' vision of dining, then, tends towards the tiny - perhaps even reflecting Archestratus' pretensions of a graceful poem through the invocation of a "delicately adorned", *habrodaiti*, table. The adjective *habros*, "graceful" or "delicate", in addition to its use to describe song (e.g. Stesich. fr. 37, Pi. *O.* 5.7), carries overtones of extravagance, especially that of the East (e.g. Hdt. 1.71; compare the negative overtones of *habros* in Sol. 24.4, Thgn. 474). Here, extravagance is conspicuous by its absence as the *habrodaiti* table is portrayed as implicitly positive, the ideal dinner table. This supports my suggestion that, at some points, Archestratus glosses over 4th century debates of excessive food consumption, *opsophagia*, by assuming an implicit consensus. This pointed absence may even invite us to question the apparently seamless gastronomic bliss Archestratus presents.

Archestratus carefully establishes who can partake of his poem and how they should be arranged. This kind of insistent narratorial intrusion is present throughout the poem. Several times, for example, the narrator forces his own voice into the advice he gives. A clear example of this is fragment 37, in which we find two important ways in which Archestratus treats his audience, both through narratorial presence and by treating the audience as slaves or worshippers:

> And when, as Orion is setting in the sky, the mother of the wine-producing grape-cluster begins to shed her hair, then get a roasted sargue, sprinkled with cheese, nice and big, warm, and pierced by pungent vinegar; for it is naturally (*physei*) hard. I urge you (*moi*) to remember (*memnemenos*) and treat (*therapeue*) every touch fish in this same fashion. But as for that which is good and naturally (*physei*) soft and rich-fleshed, (treat it) by sprinkling it with fine-ground salt only and basting it with olive-oil; for it contains the height of pleasure (*terpsios*) within itself.

In this fragment, the narrator's voice shines through the advice he gives. While elsewhere in the poem this narratorial presence is achieved through orders, such as in fragment 32 ("As for the lyre-fish, I order you... to stew it"),[32] here Archestratus uses the ethic dative, *moi*, lit. "for me", translated by Olson and Sens more naturally as "I urge you".[33] The fragment also highlights the other key way Archestratus treats his audience, as slaves to pleasure. As far as Archestratus is concerned, there is nothing the audience

[32] Trans. adapted from Olson and Sens 2000.

[33] The ethic dative is also used in frs. 21.1 and 39.9.

cannot be subjected to in their quest for the best food. Thus in fragment 37, the instruction is: *therapeue.*[34] Although the natural meaning in the context must be referring to the "treatment" of food, it carries with it connotations of subservience or even worship.[35] Indeed, Archestratus occasionally refers to fish as either "august", *semnos*, themselves (fr. 21) or as the offspring of an august river (fr. 14), and once we are warned that we might incur *nemesis* from the immortals if we do not acquire the boar-fish (fr. 16).[36] These descriptions are also in line with Archestratus' occasional use of hymnic language (fr. 5, discussed below) and the language of mystery cult (fr. 40, discussed above, cf. fr. 16.5). The divine associations of the fish fit particularly well with the image here of the audience member as (pseudo-)worshipper.

The insistent presence and controlling narratorial voice in this fragment also constantly reminds us of the role of the poet, which here is supported by the use of *memnemenos*, "remember": we must recall the poem, at the insistence of the poet himself, every time we want to enjoy this fish properly. This in turn invites us to read the description of the tough fish against what follows. Archestratus must intrude personally into the narrative to instruct us how to treat a hard fish, but by contrast the fish which is good, soft, and rich-fleshed, like Archestratus' own poem, takes us to the peak of pleasure. This final phrase carries both erotic and poetic overtones. *Terpsis*, "pleasure", is used in Hesiod's *Theogony* in both erotic ("sweet delight", *glykeren terpsin*, is apportioned to Aphrodite at *Th.* 203-6) and poetic contexts ("the Muses… who delight in festivities and the pleasure of song", 916-7).[37] Food, especially fish, is frequently associated with sexual desire, sometimes aphrodisiacs, and the *Hedypatheia* itself was frequently mentioned alongside Philaenis' didactic work on sexual behaviour.[38] Furthermore, as we shall see, Archestratus metapoetically writes the *Hedypatheia* itself into the enjoyment of sweet things (note that *hedone* (hence *hedypatheia*), "enjoyment" or "pleasure", is a near synonym for *terpsis*). The various connotations of the "height of pleasure" evoked by the sargue blurs together the different pleasures of the symposium – gastronomic, sexual, poetic.

---

[34] cf. frs. 14.4 and 36.7.

[35] For the primary meaning of the verb in this context, see Olson and Sens 2000 *ad loc.* For the religious connotations of *therapeuo*, see Hes. *Op.* 135, Hdt. 2.37, E. *Ba.* 82.

[36] Compare Pl. Com. fr. 189.14-5: "And do not slice up the sea perch… or shark, lest Nemesis from the gods breathe on you."

[37] Cf. Archilochus fr. 196a.13-5W, "many are the delights (*terpsies*) the goddess offers young men" for the erotic connotations of *terpsis* and see Ar. *Ra.* 675-6, "embark, Muse, on the sacred dance, and come to inspire joy (*epi terpsin*) in my song", for its poetic affiliations.

[38] Matro of Pitane, for instance, frequently plays on the double meaning of *phileo*, "love", e.g. at fr. 1.6, 1.24, and 3.6. Philoxenus' cookbook in Pl. Com. fr. 189 discusses gastronomic aphrodisiacs. For Archestratus and Philaenis, see Clearchus fr. 63 Wehrli, Chrysippus Treatise XXVIII frs. 5, 11, Justin *Apologia* 2.15.3.

Further, the emphasis on the "natural" (*physei*) state of the fish may be designed to evoke the cultural discourse, prevalent during the fifth and fourth centuries, which contrasted *physis*, "nature", with *nomos*, "law" or "convention".[39] *Physis* is elsewhere evoked in association with positive traits ("I think the king of everything associated with a feast and the foremost for pleasure is the eel, the only fish with a naturally (*physei*) minimal bone-structure", fr. 10.7-9) and Archestratus' recommendations for preparation tend to eschew elaborate sauces (e.g. "the other ways of preparing [the hare] are, in my opinion, much, much too elaborate - sauces made of sticky things and over-rich in oil and cheese, as if they were preparing the dish for a weasel", fr. 57.7-9). Although *nomos* does not appear in the surviving fragments of the poem, Archestratus clearly contrasts the *nomos* or art (*techne*) of cooking, particularly elaborate cuisines, with the natural (*physei*) qualities of the ingredients.[40] Implicit in Archestratus' rhetoric is the notion that, "naturally", the natural state of a good quality fish should be preserved.

Although the narrator's orders to "treat" or "serve" fish in a particular manner are amongst the most common in the poem, at other times, such as in fragment 22, even more drastic measures are called for:

> And in Rhodes, if someone is unwilling to sell you the thresher shark, even if you are likely to die as a result, steal it - the Syracusans call it the "fat sea-dog" - and then after that suffer whatever fate has been allotted you.

If we cannot buy the fish, we must steal it, even if the consequences for doing so are death. While this presentation of the role of the audience is tongue-in-cheek, we do see through this the consistent presentation of the (supposed) ultimate goal - the life of luxury itself. We should be prepared, Archestratus' rhetoric implies, to undergo anything, be it subservience or even death, in our pursuit of this goal. This reaches its most explicit moment in the poem in fragment 60 when Archestratus says: "this is how a free man ought to live, or else go down unto destruction beneath the earth and beneath the Pit and Tartaros and be buried countless stades deep" (ll. 19-21). The clearly overblown exaggeration of these passages invites us to reflect critically about how far we really will go for our food. The joke thus engages the audience in an active assessment of their eating habits.

Thus far, I have shown that Archestratus' audience are carefully regulated in number and behaviour and are given specific, sometimes extreme, instructions about what to eat, where, and how, which they are expected to follow to the letter. But how do the roles of poetic audience and gastronomic

---

[39] See particularly Heinimann 1945; cf. Goldhill 2002: 7 with further bibliography.
[40] For cookery as an art, *techne*, see the boast of the *mageiros* at Sotades fr. 1.34-5.

consumer overlap? The answer is in their pursuit of pleasure that is common to the poem's gastronomic and poetic pretensions. This is encapsulated in the very title of the poem, the *Hedypatheia*, since sweetness (*hedone*) frequently from Homer onwards can refer to poetics (e.g. "sweet song", *Od.* 8.64, "their tireless voice flows sweet from their mouths", Hes. *Th.* 39-40). This metaphor, equating the enjoyment of food and poetry, I suggest, is activated primarily through humour, which invites the audience to read their role as consumer in a metapoetic manner. This joke suggests that the poem itself is a vital part of the life of luxury, the *hedypatheia*, enjoined in the poem, the *Hedypatheia*. This is especially clear in fragment 5 (ll. 1-7):

> First of all then, my dear Moschos, I will mention the gifts of fair-haired Demeter; and you must internalize all of this.
> The best one you can get and the finest of all, all sifted-clean from highly productive barley, are in Lesbos, on the wave-girt breast where famous Eresos is located, whiter than heavenly snow. If the gods eat barley groats, it is from here that Hermes goes and gets them for them.

The humour of this fragment can be usefully understood through the Semantic Script Theory of Humour developed by Raskin.[41] This theory relies primarily on the recognition of the opposition between two overlapping scripts, defined as the information associated with a concept. The fragment begins, for instance, by parodically opposing a hymnic register with the poem's fundamental script, food. The opening line brings to mind the opening of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* ("I begin to sing of Demeter, the holy goddess with the beautiful hair") through the evocation of the goddess and her epithet, *eukomos* or "fair-haired", and elements of the original hymnic line are replaced with language still reminiscent of the hymnic register, such as *memnesomai*, "I will mention" (cf. *Hymni* 3.1, 7.2). This language is brought into humorous contrast with the subject, not mentioned until line 4. This hymnic tone prefigures Archestratus' presentation of the food, both in this fragment ("If the gods eat barley groats, it is from here that Hermes goes and gets them for them") and throughout the poem, as quasi-divine.

The epicizing language of the first line is continued into the second with the phrase "you must internalize all of this" (*su d' en phresi balleo seisin*). Similar phrases are found several times in archaic Greek epic, although particularly instructive for this context, given the shared didactic tone, is Hesiod's *Works and Days*, "you lay it up in your spirit" (*o Perse, su de tauta meta phresi balleo seisin*, 107; cf. 274). Olson and Sens suggest that since *phresi*

[41] Raskin 1985. Both the applicability and limitations of this theory to humour, particularly in antiquity, is well discussed by Ruffell 2011: 54-111

can refer not just to the mind but also the midriff, and thus by extension perhaps the stomach, there is a play on two different meanings: Moschus must learn what Archestratus has to say and he must eat what the poet advises.[42] The internalization and the *phren* thus bring out the opposing scripts at work here: one opposition is intertextual, between the moral didacticism of the original and the gluttonous consumption of the parody; the other is between the didactic function of the poem (internalization = learning) and the object of the didactic message (internalization = consumption). Thus, our consumption, or internalization, of the food and our consumption of the poem are interlinked.

The humour and parodic tone of this passage, prominently placed at the start of the catalogue, highlights the relationship between poet and audience and invites us to read the catalogue of comestibles metapoetically. Food is frequently used in both Greek and Latin literature as a metaphor for literary style or quality. For example, Athenaeus tells us that the comic poet Pherecrates claimed that up to his own time his spectators never went hungry (Ath. 464f). Archestratus' poem is no exception to this trend.[43] A metapoetic reading of the poem is suggested by Archestratus' emphasis on simplicity, *haplotes*. Several times Archestratus advises treating the fish simply (*haplos*, frs. 36.7, 57.4, 59.19). The praise of simplicity here is fundamental to Archestratus' gastronomic (and by extension his poetic) endeavours, and is contrasted with the excessive, cheesy sauces (e.g. fr. 57.7-9). But what precisely makes Archestratus' poem simple? Simplicity is defined in a wide range of ways in the ancient world. In the context of literature, Plato refers to "simple narration", *haplei diegesei* (*R.* 3.392d) and later in the same book Socrates suggests that it would be right to compare foodstuffs and other kinds of lifestyle to the composition of different types of poetry. He then goes on to say that: "embellishment (*poikilia*) brought about licentiousness (*akolasia*), and here illness is the result, while a straightforward approach (*haplotes*) in the arts gives rise to moderation (*sophrosyne*) in the soul" (*R.* 3.404d-e). In Archestratus, however, the emphasis is not on simplicity by contrast to a variety (*poikilia*) of cooking methods, but simplicity is rather defined by how little is added to the original ingredients. It is the quality of the ingredients, that is the natural or innate qualities of the dish, rather than any added extras that makes for the best taste.

This understanding of simplicity might help us to make sense of Archestratus' parodic tone, since, by comparison with the majority of paro-

[42] Olson and Sens 2000 *ad loc.*

[43] For Greek literature, see particularly Wright 2012: 129-40, who argues that this metapoetic metaphor is first attested in Athenian old comedy. Cf. the studies of metapoetry and food in Latin literature, and especially satire, such as Gowers 1993 and Bartsch 2015.

dists during the fourth century, the *Hedypatheia* makes far less use of epic models.[44] Instead of relying on his literary muses, Archestratus emphasizes his own ability and knowledge. A fragment of the comic poet Strato lends credence to this suggestion that excessive reference to other literary sources, and to Homer in particular, could be viewed as excessively convoluted. In this fragment (*Phoenicides* fr. 1), a patron complains that the *mageiros*, the "cook", whom he has hired speaks in excessively riddling language. In particular, when the chef asks if he will sacrifice sheep-flocks (the question, *ta mela probata*, can also mean "apples are sheep?")[45] the patron finally replies: "I don't know, *mageiros*, anything about them, nor do I wish to. I'm much too much the peasant, so converse with me simply (*haplos*)" (ll. 23-5).[46] He later says: "go suck someone's cock, or say more clearly what you want" (36-7). The rustic patron's problem with the cook's language is particularly the excessive use of Homeric language. Thus, at the end of the fragment, the *mageiros* is painted as "a slave son of some godless rhapsodizer who filled himself with the phrases of Homer" (48-50). While Olson is doubtless correct to say that "the humour depends on the audience understanding them [the Homeric phrases] even if his unsophisticated employer does not,"[47] the patron's complaints nevertheless demonstrate how an overly Homeric style could be portrayed as negative in contrast to a "simpler" manner. Indeed, this fragment of Strato may reflect a response to the poetics of simplicity espoused in authors such as Archestratus, portraying those who favour such simplicity as mere rustics, unable to comprehend "more advanced" intertextual humour. If I am correct to associate simplicity with a less densely intertextual poetic style, Archestratus' praise for simplicity refers to his natural, unembellished style; we should avoid ruining the poetic dish by adding too much of others' work, relying instead on the poet's own knowledge and skill.

At the same time, there is an element of irony to the Archestratean *haplotes*, particularly when read against the Platonic passage. In the *Republic*, Plato notes the oft-cited fact that fish are entirely absent from Homeric poetry, which Plato reads as a sign of the moral rectitude of Homeric heroes. Achilles would not be caught dead eating something so luxurious (at least by fourth-century Athenian standards) as fish. For Plato, Homer's simplicity derives from the very absence of morally dubious grub such as fish and sweet meats; Archestratus, on the other hand, avoids the excessive addition of Homeric poetry into a poem dedicated to the consumption of the most luxurious dishes. Indeed, Archestratus' poem may be read as a reaction, at least

[44] e.g. Olson and Sens 2000: xxxv-vi.
[45] Olson 2007 ad D3.18.
[46] Translation from Wilkins 2000: 406-7.
[47] Olson 2007 ad D3.

in part, to the passage of Plato. Not only is Archestratus from Sicily, a style of cuisine singled out for its luxuriousness by Plato, but fragment 60 of the *Hedypatheia* also praises the Athenian flat-cake, the *plakos*, also mentioned in the *Republic*, to such an extent that without its delights, Archestratus claims that we might as well be dead! Even without the specific reaction to Plato, however, through his emphasis on *haplotes* Archestratus interconnects his gastronomic and poetic agendas. By connecting the style of the poem with the style of cuisine he recommends, Archestratus implicitly locates the *Hedypatheia* into the experience of the good life, the *hedypatheia*.

## Conclusions

Many readers of Archestratus have struggled to pinpoint the tone of the poem. Should it be taken as a “serious” treatise on the best methods to acquire and prepare different types of fish?[48] If so, why is it written in verse, indeed even as an epic parody, rather than in prose as authors such as Mithaecus did? If it is instead supposed to be entirely humorous, why does Archestratus in general maintain advice on food accurate enough to be cited as an authority by Athenaeus, many centuries later?

This article has adopted a primarily literary approach to the poem, focusing on the performance of the poem at the dinner or symposium, and as such it is no surprise that my conclusions are primarily literary. None of my arguments, however, contravene a straightforward reading of the poem as “serious” advice for “serious” foodies. When Archestratus says “seek out <the> parrotfish from Ephesos” (fr. 42), it is entirely possible to take Archestratus at his word. Instead, I suggest that the *Hedypatheia* can also be read on another level through an examination of the interaction between the narrator and the internal addressees of the poem. I have drawn out two features of the narrator’s persona, his authority and humour. The narrator is consistently presented as an authoritative figure, whose knowledge is drawn from personal experience after the manner of works such as Herodotus’ *Histories* and those of Hecataeus. At the same time, Archestratus borrows the form of the epic catalogue, a form also intimately associated with knowledge and authority. The poet derives humour from the replacement of the more traditional epic Muse as the *fons et origo* of the poem’s knowledge with the more personal, historiographical form of authority. This humorous side of the poem takes two forms: on the one hand, humour is used to emphasize the poet’s art, how he deals with his subject and the subjects he chooses to include or exclude;

[48] The question of seriousness in humorous Greek poetry has been well tackled by Silk 2000 and Ruffell 2008 suggests, *contra* de Ste Croix 1972, that in comedy it is through humour rather than “straight talking” that comedy engages its audience in “serious” questions.

on the other, Archestratus' narrator mocks anyone whose culinary philosophy differs from his own.

Although in antiquity the poem met with a range of different responses from audiences, I have demonstrated that in the poem itself Archestratus has a very specific kind of audience in mind. While the poem is addressed, in the manner of much didactic poetry, specifically to Moschus and Cleandrus, who are the primary internal addressees, Archestratus envisions a small and refined dinner table with no more than five diners. Although he addresses Moschus and Cleandrus fondly, his expectations show little concern for their wellbeing. They are expected to serve or worship their food, valuing their own wellbeing and sometimes even their lives at nought in comparison with the pursuit of pleasure. The pleasure, *hedone*, consistently commended by the poem is not simply a gastronomic one. We cannot enjoy the comestibles without also enjoying the *Hedypatheia* itself. Archestratus espouses a diet as well as a poetics of simplicity, relying on his own ingenuity, skill, and knowledge rather than an over-reliance on literary sources/sauces. By connecting the style of the poem with the style of cuisine he recommends, Archestratus demonstrates that the poem, the *Hedypatheia*, is not just *about* the good life, the *hedypatheia*, it *is* the good life.

Both aspects of the relationship I have studied in this article, the figure of the narrator and his construction of the audience, provide us with a better understanding of the poem's didactic and poetic pretensions. The poem always assumes that the life of pleasure is the ultimate goal in life; if you do not live this kind of life, you might as well be dead. However, the poem's humour occasionally threatens to destabilize Archestratus' didacticism. Far from being a straightforward catalogue of the best foods in the Greek world, the *Hedypatheia* invites us to negotiate our position through the humorously exaggerated assumption that the internal addressees, Moschus and Cleandrus, are prepared to lay down their lives for a fish, as well as our reception of the poem itself.

## Bibliography

Bakker, E.J. (2006), "Homeric epic between feasting and fasting", in Montanari, F. and Rengakos, A. (eds.), *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire*. Geneva, 1-39.

Bakker, E.J. (2013), *The meaning of meat and the structure of the Odyssey.* Cambridge.

Bartsch, S. (2015), *Persius: a Study in Food, Philosophy, and the Figural.* Chicago.

Brandt, P. (1888), *Corpusculum poesis epicae Graecae ludibundae.* Leipzig.

Corner, S. (2013a), "The politics of the parasite: part 1", *Phoenix* 67.1-2. 43-80.

Corner, S. (2013b), "The politics of the parasite: part 2", *Phoenix* 67.3-4. 223-36.

Dalby, A. (1995), “Archestratus where and when”, in Wilkins, J.M., Harvey, D., and Dobson, M. (eds.), *Food in Antiquity.* Exeter, 400-412.

Davidson, J. (1997), *Courtesans and Fishcakes: the Consuming Passions of Classical Athens.* London.

Degani, E. (1995), “Problems in Greek gastronomic poetry: on Matro’s *Attikon Deipnon*”, in Wilkins, J.M., Harvey, D., and Dobson, M. (eds.), *Food in Antiquity.* Exeter, 413-28.

Goldhill S. (2002), *The Invention of Prose.* Oxford.

Gowers, E. (1993), *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature.* Oxford.

Heinimann, F. (1945), *Nomos und Phusis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen denken des 5 Jahrhunderts.* Basel.

Olson, S.D. (2007), *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy*. Oxford.

Olson, S.D. and Sens, A. (1999), *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Atlanta.

Olson, S.D. and Sens, A. (2000), *Archestratos of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE*. Oxford.

Pirrotta, S. (2009), *Plato Comicus: die fragmentarischen Komöidien. Ein Kommentar.* Berlin.

Race, W.H. (1992) “How Greek poems begin”, *YClS* 29: 13-38.

Raskin, V. (1985) *Semantic Mechanisms of Humor*. Dortrecht.

Rotstein, A. (2010), *The idea of iambos*. Oxford.

Rotstein, A. (2012) “*Mousikoi agones* and the conceptualization of genre in ancient Greece”, *ClAnt* 31.1: 92-127.

Ruffell, I. (2008), “Audience and emotion in the reception of Greek drama”, Revermann, M. and Wilson, P. (eds.), *Performance, iconography, reception: studies in honour of Oliver Taplin.* Oxford, 37-58.

Ruffell, I. (2011) *Politics and Anti-Realism in Athenian Old Comedy: the Art of the Impossible.* Oxford.

Sammons, B. (2010), *The art and rhetoric of the Homeric catalogue.* Oxford.

Sens, A. (2006), “‘τίπτε γένος τοὐμὸν ζητεῖς;’ the *Batrachomyomachia*, Hellenistic epic parody, and early epic”, in Bakker, E.J. *et al.* (eds.), *La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d’un genre littéraire.* Vandoeuvres-Genève, 215-44.

de Ste Croix, G.E.M. (1972), *The origins of the Peloponnesian war*. London.

Silk, M. (2000), *Aristophanes and the definition of comedy*. Oxford.

Wilkins, J.M. (2000), *The boastful chef: the discourse of food ancient Greek comedy.* Oxford.

Wilkins, J.M. (2008) “Athenaeus the navigator,” *JHS* 128: 132-52.

Wilkins, J.M. and Hill, S. (2011, 2nd ed.), *Archestratus: fragments from the Life of Luxury*. Totnes.

Wright, M. (2012), *The comedian as critic: Greek old comedy and poetics.* London.