

councillors ‘if someone does x and does not do y’ is made to mean ‘if there is anyone doing x who does not do y’. F. cites no parallel and frankly I do not believe it, when it would have been so simple for the legislator to avoid ambiguity.

F. has in my view failed to shake the conventional view of this clause, namely that it reflects an earlier clause in the decree which aimed to suppress non-Athenian silver coinage. How many other earlier clauses were there? Perhaps one other of substance, which laid down what it is that the officials of (iii) are punished for not doing; but note that if one restores, e.g., *ka[ta ta logizo]mena*, a suggestion I make only to show that the possibilities are nearly limitless, we might be lacking only the one substantive clause referred to in (xii), which comported as a corollary declarations of public money, leading to (ii) [*to argurion to pasôn tôn poleôn (?)*], and of private money, leading to (iii). In any case, since the *hellenotamiai* are not a kind of official in the communities, F.’s casual insertion of *allos* at the beginning of (iii) cannot be right. (Probability theory might have something to say about how much is likely to be missing at the beginning and the end of our text.)

F.’s view, then, of the Coinage Decree does not convince, of the Athenians as nice cuddly administrators simply concerned to make the wheels run smoothly, of the Coinage Decree as a piece of administrative tidying-up in the interest of the allies (pp.236-9, after a series of attacks on straw men), imposing acceptance of Athenian coins (and weights and measures) only where communities still had their own coins (and weights and measures), alongside them (if they did not, they presumably used Athenian coins (and weights and measures (?)) anyway).

The book also operates on a very narrow front, despite its length. The discussion of loss of metal in re-coining is feeble, F.’s knowledge of work on Athenian mines (p.224 n.20) is very out of date, the problem of what kind of measure can have led (uniquely, up to this moment, as far as we know) to a change in the oath sworn by Athenian councillors is never really faced. The act of diffusion of the decree, quite apart from its content, involved substantial influence: the copy from Aphytis, on one level unproblematic (see above), is engraved with the vertical alignment of letters characteristic of Attic fifth-century official inscriptions.

I come back to the fragment in Attic lettering from Cos: to Pritchett’s picture of an Athenian

mason retiring to Cos (for the lettuce (?)) and being summoned to engrave the decree when it arrived, to Tod’s and Meiggs’ picture of ready-cut decrees, with invoices, being shipped all over the Aegean area to communities that did not want to inscribe the decree themselves, we now have added F.’s picture of Athenian masons packing their hammers and chisels and setting off hot-foot (hot-oar (?)) in pursuit of the heralds looking for business. Yet if we know anything of ancient marble-working, it is that marble, tools and men went together (the men from Athens who perhaps cut grave stelae elsewhere after losing their citizenship at the hands of Antipater presumably did so in desperation); and that looking at a piece of marble and saying that it is Parian is about as scientific as looking at a plate of ice-cream and saying that it contains no synthetic ingredients. Meritt’s suggestion remains interesting, that a Coan mason mechanically copied a papyrus text (another of the things that we do not know is what fifth-century Athenian writing on papyrus looked like: note p.437 n.27). The vertical alignment of the letters is wobbly and insecure; and the engraving of the *sigma* with only three bars is idiosyncratic and variable. One can just hear the Coans saying ‘We’ve done what we were told *and* no one can read it.’

M.H. CRAWFORD
University College London

GARNSEY (P.) **Food and Society in Classical Antiquity**. Cambridge UP, 1999. Pp. xiv + 175. 0521641829 (hb); 0521645883 (pb). £35 (hb); £12.95 (pb).

Originating as a lecture course to senior undergraduates, this is a survey of generous range and wide reference, drawing its emphases from the trends of modern research. Chapters are entitled: ‘Diet’; ‘Food and the economy’; ‘Food crisis’ (famine, etc.); ‘Malnutrition’; ‘Otherness’ (barbarian and heroic diets, or rather, classical views of these); ‘Forbidden foods’; ‘Food and the family’; ‘Haves and havenots’ (foods for rich and poor); ‘You are with whom you eat’. There is a very useful, compact bibliographical essay and a good bibliography.

The first four chapters, resting firmly on Garnsey’s own previous work and continuing research, are perhaps the best, along with ‘Haves and havenots’. The chapters on food rules and taboos and on food and the family are notable for

their handy translated quotations from ancient sources, including long excerpts from Galen *On the Properties of Foods*, a major text not available in English. (But at 6.669, when Galen says ‘all Greeks eat *kokhliai* every day’, he is talking about snails, not tortoises: so translated already in my *Siren Feasts* (1996), p. 62. As to tortoises, some Greeks ate them, some didn’t, which is the point of the gnomic verse by Terpsion (Athenaeus 337b).) The chapter ‘You are with whom you eat’ is sketchy on Greek symposia, good on civic banquets, weak on Roman dining: the classification of ‘client dinner’, ‘protégé dinner’ and ‘peer-group dinner’ is, I suspect, unreal.

From a very marrowy book let me take one statement that still requires enrichment: ‘Anxiety over food is manifested ... in the ... centrality of the cycle of religious rituals ... in honour of food-associated deities such as Demeter ... [and] by the laws issued ... to safeguard the supply and distribution of food. An ... indication of the ... vulnerability of the mass of ordinary people to dearth and hunger is to be found in the very obsession of the sources with food and its lavish consumption by the rich. The conspicuous consumption of food was an important index of wealth, status and power. This was appropriate in a social context where food was a relatively scarce, highly valued and unequally distributed commodity’ (2-3, sharply abridged). ‘Anxiety over food’ is thus demonstrated; its relative scarcity is not. Comparison may show whether food-associated rituals, laws, literary obsessions, and conspicuous consumption exist less, or not at all, in well-nourished societies; only then could we use such evidence to show the relative scarcity of ancient food.

Garnsey is right to rubbish the easy assumption that the ancient ‘Mediterranean diet’ was, for most people, nutritionally healthy and sufficient. It might have been, if the poor (especially women and children) had been able to get it and if the rich had stuck to it. Wheat and barley with the traditional pulses of the Old World made a good staple (12-21); but if vegetables were fairly accessible, the other crucial components of such a diet – olive oil, fresh fruit, fish sauce and fish, wine, cheese, meat in small quantity – were not equally available to all. Still, the unguarded statement (123 with references) that meat, being ‘only available’ at religious ceremonies, ‘did not make a significant contribution to the regular diet’, misleads: (a) what price the sausage-seller? (b) do we know the frequency of private sacrifices?

Garnsey has for some years led a research team on ancient food and nutrition at Cambridge. In identifying his own special contribution to the field (if it is fair thus to pin him down) one cites his 1988 classic *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. A decade later, we are offered the result of new thinking on this crucial subject. Garnsey showed then that famine was of fairly regular occurrence in the ancient world. He is now ready to demonstrate that ‘endemic under-nourishment or chronic malnutrition underlay those periodic shortages’ (2), and does so effectively. As always, he draws skilfully and almost seamlessly on archaeology, ancient written sources, nutritional science and anthropology. Not only will this be an indispensable handbook for students; all ancient historians will learn from it.

ANDREW DALBY
Lezay, F-79120

SHIPLEY (G.) **The Greek World after Alexander, 323-30 BC** (Routledge History of the Ancient World). Routledge, 2000. Pp. xxxi + 568, illus. £65.00 hb, 0415046173; £19.99 pb, 0415046181.

This volume, once trailed under the name of Susan Sherwin-White, completes the Greek end of Fergus Millar’s famously becalmed Methuen Classical Civilizations/Routledge History of the Ancient World series that began all those years ago in 1983 with Hornblower’s *The Greek World 479-323 BC*. In scale, presentation and outlook Shipley’s volume more closely resembles Osborne’s 1996 contribution, *Greece in the Making 1200-479 BC*. The modern publishing phenomenon of smuggling out books on the Hellenistic period under the sheltering name of the bankable Alexander continues (cf. Green’s *Alexander to Actium* [1990] and Habicht’s *Athens from Alexander to Antony* [1997]).

This is an excellent book, the best introduction to the Hellenistic world available in English, and perhaps the best single-volume introduction available in any language. Unlike Walbank’s Fontana volume (*The Hellenistic World* [1981], cited as inspiration, xiii), among recent works, S.’s book is substantial and solidly referenced; unlike Green’s unwieldy volume, it is manageable.

The book opens with three ground-laying chapters on approaches and sources (the latter very effectively presented), the Diadochi, and the