because he made a musical classification of lyric texts for the Alexandrian Library. On the other hand, most of the extant musical papyri probably had no intention of handing down ancient music to posterity. They would only have helped to support public anthology-performances, which might even have included new musical settings of originally spoken verses. Thus, the likelihood that the musical setting of Euripidean papyri (*DAGM* nos 3 and 4) goes back to Euripides himself cannot be taken for granted, as the authors do: they could easily be an entirely new third-century setting, or represent the partial oral transmission of ancient hummable tunes.

The practical purpose of these documents can be confirmed on the basis of their dissimilar employment of notational signs, especially the rhythmical ones, like diseme and triseme marks, arsis-points, and pause symbols. Their interpretation varies in each individual case, probably according to the requirements of the performance for which (or the performer for whom) it was intended. Perhaps the converse usage of the arsis-points (*stigmai*) to mark out the thesis of the trochaic metron in Oxyrhynchus papyrus 3162 (*DAGM* no. 55) finds its own logic if we assume, as Winnington-Ingram has long since pointed out for other fragments, that in the third century A.D. the meaning of the terms ἄρσις and θέσις had already been reversed as a consequence of their application to the tonic accent (instead of to the raising or lowering of the foot in beating time) and was becoming familiar to musicians too. But see the most recent comprehensive study of this argument (J. Luque Moreno, *Arsis, thesis, ictus: las marcas del ritmo en la música y en la métrica antiguas* [Granada, 1994]), which regards this semantic inversion as a 'philological ghost', trying to show that Latin sources do not really relate to any vocal ictus.

In revising the 1970s edition, many improved readings have been obtained and small mistakes corrected. An oversight occurs in Athenaios' Paean (*DAGM* no. 20): at l. 23, the note O is supposed to be *b*, not *e*♭, as the comment at p. 73 also indicates. It would perhaps be worth studying more carefully the diagonal stroke used as a divider in musical notation (as in *DAGM* no. 44, fr. 1↓): it resembles the form of musical *diastolē* we find in some medieval manuscipts (Anon. Bell. 11, see apparatus), and even its usage seems consistent with the theoretical formulation of it.

It is clear that the outstanding value of this collection lies not only in the richness of its documents and in the clarity of their exposition, but also in the results of the two editors' scholarly collaboration (even when their personal points of view on some questions are conflicting, as in the Vienna papyrus G 2315). While this work is without doubt the fruition of years of study and discovery, its main worth is that of furnishing scholars of the new millennium with the necessary tools to investigate many still unsolved problems concerning the music, the rhythm, and, on a larger scale, the history of ancient Greek culture.

University of Pavia ELEONORA ROCCONI

MEDICAL PAPYRI

I. ANDORLINI (ed.): *Greek Medical Papyri I* (Progetto Corpus dei Papiri Greci di Medicina). Pp. 182, pls. Florence: Istituto Papirologico G. Vitelli, 2001. Paper, €41.32. ISBN: 88-87829-23-3.

After earlier glimpses of the material in A'.s contribution to *ANRW* II 37.1 (1993)

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and her monograph *Trattato di medicina su papiro* (1995), this multi-contributor volume offers a preview of the ongoing project of producing a corpus of Greek medical papyri. Most of the papyri here are previously unpublished and cover the period from the second century B.C. to the sixth century A.D. The fifteen texts (found on altogether nineteen papyri) are presented in separate chapters by nine contributors—four (or six papyri) by A., the others by R. Flemming, J.-L. Fournet, A. E. Hanson, J. Jouanna, R. Luiselli, C. Magdelaine, D. Manetti, and S. P. Mattern. With the exceptions of 14 and 15 (which are in French), all chapters are in English.

The papyri are subdivided into four sections: known authors (only three: a Hippocratic author, Dioscorides, and Galen), *adespota*, medical prescriptions, and one 'related text', a list of flavoured wines, possibly for medicinal use. The book contains indices of selected passages and Greek terms, as well as a general index, and the plates have good photographs of all the papyri (four of them in colour). There is no overall bibliography, as all bibliographical information is contained in the footnotes. This is still manageable with a book this size, but it is to be hoped that the finalized *Corpus* will have a joint bibliography.

It is not possible to discuss all contributions in detail within the limits of a review, so brief outlines, concentrating on A.'s contributions (texts 1, 10, 11, and 12, or fragments of six papyri), will have to suffice. The first text contains a citation from the Hippocratic *De fracturis* 37, dealing with dislocation of the knee, the oldest textual evidence for that passage. It was probably circulated in Egypt in the late 170s A.D., at the the time at which Galen was writing his commentaries.

For both 10 and 11, A. herself discovered the connection between fragments kept in different collections, in the case of 10 (second century B.C.) Paris and Berlin. The text deals with analgesics and women's diseases, but does not appear to quote any known text. The author speaks of 'hysterical suffocation' and mentions rue, honey, resin, wine, henbane, and sweet and bitter almonds, together with modes of preparation.

Text 11 (first century B.C.) is based on the combination of a piece of papyrus from Copenhagen with a fragment from the Giessen collection. To the non-papyrologist the resemblance of the two fragments is not striking, but the contents are similar enough. Both deal with the preparation of remedies, in the case of fr. A clearly plasters or ointments, and mention ingredients well known from ancient authors, such as wax, frankincense, and *aristolochia*. In the notes to the text, A. makes connections to a considerable number of texts, principally by Dioscorides and Galen, and provides a wealth of information about the medical context of such texts. Some of the notes are in fact mini-articles on medicinal substances.

Text no. 12, a scrap of papyrus of merely 3.1 × 6 cm of the first century A.D. (kept at Duke University), appears to contain the recipe for a compress/poultice, and it is astonishing how much detail A. extracts from so few legible words. Again A. cites similar remedies from Galen, as well as Celsus, Dioscorides, and Oribasius, as well as other medical papyri.

In the preface, A. rightly thanks the typesetters; except for the aesthetic problem of the evanescent sigmas, the Greek has been reproduced with great accuracy. The copy-editor appears to have been less careful, as there is a lack of hyphens (e.g. 'time consuming'), and 'sticometric' (p. 110 n. 6) and 'hendyadis' (p. 90) have slipped through, but these are very minor quibbles.

Some of the chapters may be of interest mainly to other papyrologists and perhaps to linguists, the texts being too fragmentary to support any hypotheses or explanations, but the majority contain sufficient medical detail to make them interesting for historians of ancient medicine. However limited in size, these are new primary sources

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

being made available with great scholarly accuracy, and they make one wish for more soon.

Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Cambridge C. F. SALAZAR

PLUTARCH IN A NUTSHELL

R. LAMBERTON: *Plutarch*. Pp. xx + 218. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002. Paper, £10.95. ISBN: 0-300-08811-6 (0-300-08810-8 hbk).

Lamberton disposes his book in three chapters, followed by two appendices listing Plutarch's works, and citing some English translations and a rudimentary bibliography.

L. aptly characterizes Plutarch as a thinker and writer who constantly and untiringly interrogates the phenomena, asking what they *mean*. His inquiries yield a pluralism of explanations and interpretations displaying intellectual rigour and a deep sense of the abyss separating us from the truth. This characterization certainly gives his personality *in nuce*. However, in describing the discussions in the *Table Talk*, L. goes too far in emphasizing Plutarch's demand for a plurality of answers to the questions. Several discussions reach a conclusion, mostly delivered by Plutarch himself.

L. rightly concludes that Plutarch possessed a large private library at Chaeronea. For the *Lives* he read Thucydides and Herodotus and lots of other historians, and he was certainly widely read in philosophy, including commentaries. Evidence: the innumerable citations. L. (p. 16) assumes that Plutarch was not interested in logic and did not write about it. However, perhaps he did. The Lamprias Catalogue no. 56 cites a work entitled *Τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Τοπικῶν βιβλία η′*, and no. 45 another one called *Περὶ τῆς εἰς ἑκάτερον ἐπιχειρήσεως βιβλία ε′*.

Plutarch was obviously well acquainted with Latin literature. He had a need to know Latin historical texts, but L. underlines his extensive knowledge also of the works of Cicero. L. acknowledges (p. 17) that he had a command of philosophical literature 'not as a thinker with only secondhand knowledge of the texts'. He designates him (p. 33) as 'a lucidly original interpreter of Plato', and makes an illuminative comparison (pp. 35–36) with Dante, who had NT as his essential background, just as Plato formed the indispensible substrate for Plutarch's philosophical thinking.

L. (p. 45) would leave the question of the authorship of *De lib. educ.* open. His doubts about Wyttenbach's suggestion that this essay was written by a pupil of Plutarch on his advice leads him to doubt even that Plutarch had some kind of school in Chaeronea. This is excessive scepticism. Plutarch's hints at his educational activity with young students are few, but clear enough. Incidentally, L. himself observes (p. 12) that Plutarch is careful to avoid self-advertisement, and he notices (pp. 46–7) that he shows serious engagement in pedagogic matters, as seen, for example, in *De aud. poet*.

Treating of Plutarch as a priest at Delphi, L. could have spared himself of a striking understatement (p. 56): 'Plutarch thus believed in the existence of the gods he served'. Generally speaking, L. takes a critical, mostly apposite, position to Plutarch, but sometimes shows a propensity to excessive, idiosyncratic (a term he loves to use) judgement, e.g. when stating (pp. 64–5) that the *Parallel Lives* exhibit a 'radical ahistoricity' and that this collection 'provides the new context, the substitute for history, . . . elevating Greece from its marginality'.

Throughout his book L. excessively underlines the importance of rhetoric in

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press