The Classical Review
VOLUME 52 NO. 1
2002

PHILOCTETES

C. W. MÜLLER: *Euripides: Philoktet. Testimonien und Fragmente*. Pp. 468. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2000. Cased, DM 268. ISBN: 3-11-016348-9.

This edition of the testimonia and fragments of Euripides' *Philoktetes* is an important contribution to scholarship not only on Euripidean tragedy but also more generally on the myth of Philoktetes and its reworkings, both in Attic drama and in subsequent literary and artistic productions. Indeed, the standard description, that the fragmentary remains of the play have been 'edited, translated and commented upon', scarcely does it justice. Müller's long-standing engagement with the play (starting, as he notes, with a seminar he offered in 1977–8) makes him the ideal scholar to undertake this complicated task. His numerous articles on the play have recently been re-edited, expanded, and republished, along with several new chapters, in the book which serves as a companion to this edition, *Philoktet: Beiträge zur Wiedergewinnung einer Tragödie des Euripides* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997). M. remarks in his foreword to this edition of *Philoktetes* that the reader should use both works together—and, as the ample references to the *Beiträge* in the edition of *Philoktetes* show, the reader would do well to follow his advice.

In his extensive introduction, M. reviews the myth of Philoktetes in Greek literature before Euripides and provides a substantial discussion of the fragments of Aiskhylos' *Philoktetes*. He then gives a general interpretation of Euripides' *Philoktetes* itself, which in turn leads to a brief history of the reception of the play (largely excluding its impact on Sophokles' *Philoktetes*, on which he has published separately in the *Beiträge*). Efforts at reconstruction are helped, he maintains, by the tendency of later authors and artists to rely on Euripides' version of the myth more than any other. M. concludes his introduction with an extremely helpful and thorough history of such efforts; beginning with the attempts in the seventeenth century to assemble and arrange the fragments of the play, he proceeds with a careful account of the different reconstructions of scholars up to Olson in 1991, finishing with a review of his own earlier attempt published in 1992 and now Chapter I of the *Beiträge*.

Reconstruction efforts for *Philoktetes* have been especially aided by the discussions of the play in the fifty-second and fifty-ninth essays of Dio Chrysostom. Because Dio 52, which compares the *Philoktetes* plays of the three great tragedians, is so crucial for an evaluation of Euripides' work, M. has re-edited it completely and has conveniently included this new version in its entirety in the book. Moreover, he includes a fairly extensive commentary on the text, which he introduces with a discussion of its purposes, its place in the author's works, and its possible date, and which he then

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subjects to detailed commentary. He has also re-edited Dio 59, but has chosen to print this text in different segments integrated into the reconstruction of the play.

Facing the Greek 'text' of interspersed testimonial fragments and paraphrases, M. supplies translations (or, in the case of visual evidence, descriptions) of all the ancient material. He also provides a running prose narrative of the play in which he not only includes descriptions of stage action but also supplements the translations of fragments and paraphrases with his own understanding of what the surrounding text might have said. The commentary pays attention both to philological concerns and to issues of interpretation. Here I can mention only a few of the many difficulties that M. has attempted to resolve. First, he maintains that the entrance of Philoktetes is deferred until after the arrival of the chorus and the first episode. Drawing on parallels with that of the Servant in the first episode of *Alkestis* and the Nurses in *Medea* and *Hippolytos*, he argues that in the first episode, Aktor appears and tells the chorus about Philoktetes' way of life on Lemnos. Although M. successfully argues against those who would assign Aktor a larger rôle in the play than that of helpful friend or servant, and against the notion that Aktor somehow knows about the embassy of the Trojans to Philoktetes, the parallels to other plays are not as exact as M. contends. The content of the first episode is related to another problem, that of the first stasimon and the placement of F791 Nauck–Snell. Correctly rejecting on grounds of both content and style the attribution of the fragment to a monody by Philoktetes, he argues against most other scholars that this fragment forms part of the first stasimon rather than part of the parodos: such an expression of sadness over Philoktetes' life makes sense only after the chorus, who have neglected to visit Philoktetes all these years, have heard an account of his wretched way of life. While he admits that those who argue for the placement of the fragment later in the play may be correct, he nonetheless asserts that the most sensible placement is in the first stasimon. His interpretation makes good sense, especially if he is right about the content of the first episode.

A major difference between M.'s reconstruction and most other recent attempts is his interpretation of Dio 59: following a suggestion originally made by Ribbeck in 1875, he maintains that Dio 59 has fused parts of two scenes, the prologue and the second episode, into one. Thus M. argues that the meeting of Philoktetes and Odysseus does not take place in the prologue but in the second episode. For detailed and convincing argumentation on this point, M. directs the reader to the third chapter of the *Beiträge*.

M. argues that the famous *agon* between the Trojans and Odysseus takes places in the third episode, and he sets the entrance of Diomedes at the beginning of the fourth episode, whereas most other scholars have suggested an earlier entrance for this character. He suggests that Diomedes, in an unexpected entrance from the cave, narrates the attack of the disease which has taken place off-stage and the concomitant theft of the bow. Finally, he envisions a fifth episode in which Odysseus, now changed back into his original appearance, and Philoktetes appear on stage, and in which Odysseus compels Philoktetes to accompany him to Troy.

This edition is far richer than I have been able to do justice to here. Especially when combined with the *Beiträge*, it will enable the reader not only to gain a better understanding of Euripides' work, but also to read Sophokles' version of *Philoktetes* with greater insight. While the reconstruction of any lost play, even one so well-documented as Euripides' *Philoktetes*, will always remain open to debate and revision, M. has provided anyone who wishes to work on the play with the material necessary either to accept or reject his arguments, and, moreover, to engage with Euripides' play much

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more fully than has hitherto been possible. This is a work of scholarship that is at once rigorous and imaginative.

Bowdoin College, Brunswick JENNIFER CLARKE KOSAK

A HIPPOCRATIC TREATISE

E. M. CRAIK (ed.): *Hippocrates*: Places in Man. Pp. xxiii + 259. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-815227-2.

Although in late antiquity *De locis in homine* (*Loc.*) was considered one of the 'genuine' Hippocratic works, it has not been a focus of interest in more recent scholarship. There is an excellent edition by R. Joly (Paris, 1978, with French translation and commentary), but C.'s edition, appearing only three years after the Loeb volume containing *Loc.*, is effectively the only scholarly edition with an English translation and commentary to be published in the twentieth century. (Potter's Loeb volume, which provides a translation but no commentary and only a few pages of introduction, has different objectives.)

C.'s thirty-three-page introduction opens with a brief overview of early Greek medicine, in order to depict the environment in which the treatise was written. She makes discerning use of the terms 'Koan' and 'Knidian', neither discarding them altogether, as some recent scholars have suggested, nor using them as a clear-cut division, but keeping the distinction as an important way of designating salient features. C. dates *Loc.* as very early, possibly the earliest work in the Hippocratic Corpus, slightly earlier than Joly, who suggests some time between 420 and 390. She discusses the language and style of the treatise, but also points out the difficulties of doing so. The preference for using Ionic for medical writings—although Cos, Cnidus, and much of Sicily were Doric-speaking—together with a tendency to regionalization, led to a superficially standardized scientific idiom. Ancient medical writings also contain a high proportion of 'poetic' or 'Homeric' words, but on the other hand C. notes that the complexity of ideas is often accompanied by a lack of sophistication in expression. It has sometimes been suggested that *Loc.* lacks unity and coherence, but C. finds it consistent in content and expression. (Joly, too, points out that if some passages are additions, they are a very good imitation of the author's style.) C. sees it as something like the Hippocratic Corpus in miniature, given its combination of factual information, scientific reasoning, clinical practice, and ideological statements.

The structure of *Loc.* is as follows: Chapter I is an introduction; II–VIII discuss anatomy and physiology (with particular emphasis on the brain and organs of sensation); IX–XXIII, fluxes and their causes; XXIV–XXX, the origins and treatment of specific diseases (e.g. sciatica, jaundice, and angina); XXXI–XL, practical and surgical instructions; XLI–XLVI, medicine and medical education; and XLVII concludes with gynaecology.

From the point of view of doctrine, the author uses the term 'phlegm' in an idiosyncratic way for various types of moisture. It is usually connected with words for humidity, swelling, or growth, as opposed to dryness, shrinking, and attenuation. Moisture is vital for health, unless accumulated in the wrong places; it is also often associated with motion, while dryness stands for immobility, fixity, or blockage. The author's 'humoral theory' is presented in the language of contemporary physics, and the practical applications are consistent with the theoretical model. The concept of body flux also appears in many other Hippocratic treatises, and while the author's is

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press