πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά. The *Periegesis* expresses, surely, the many-sidedness of Greece, of which 'pilgrimage' is but a single aspect.

The dominant tendency of Pausanian scholarship has been, of course, to use the text as a guide to the material realities of the ancient world. Two fine essays by two archaeologists, Anthony Snodgrass and Sue Alcock, demonstrate the prior need for a sophisticated understanding of the text. Snodgrass treats the lengthy discussion of the chest of Cypselus (5.17.5–19.10), offering a sympathetic assessment of the author's apparent attempts to understand the artwork and its inscription, composed in archaic Corinthian lettering in the boustrophedon format. Pausanias' methodology, according to Snodgrass, is much closer to that of modern art-historians than has been allowed: he attempted to read the entirety and comprehend it synoptically, even if in the process he misguidedly imposed a Homeric schema upon it (an error also, according to Snodgrass, endemic among modern scholars). Alcock's powerful chapter addresses the apparent structural unevenness in Book 4, where a disproportionate amount is given over to history, and little to the sights. Like Snodgrass, Alcock explains Pausanias' strategy by reference to his methodology, in this case his sustained exploration of the theme of freedom and slavery. If the text as a whole is (as we have learned to read it) saturated with the cultural politics of the here-and-now, these issues are, according to Alcock, metaphorically retrojected into the distant history of Sparto-Messenian relations.

Snodgrass's and Alcock's chapters also raise, incidentally, the question of scholarship's traditional agonizing over the status of Pausanias as pellucid recorder. The section on *Nachleben* is full of rich and subtle insights into early nineteenth-century topography (Wagstaff on Colonel Leake, Bann on Chateaubriand's *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*) and late-Victorian academic politics (Henderson on Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States*, Beard on Harrison and Verrall's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*). All of these contributions underline the singular rôle of the *Periegesis* in the intellectual warfare of (particularly) the nineteenth century, and his gradual transition (via Harrison, Frazer, and Farnell) from 'ancient Baedeker' to guide to 'a quite different, imaginary, journey' (Beard, p. 236) into ancient religious sensibilities. And although this new *Periegesis* emergent at the turn of the twentieth century was no more 'literary' than before, this phase arguably marks the beginning of the processes leading to the current recuperation of Pausanias as a 'wonderful' text, saturated with mysteries, pleasures, and coruscant idealism.

University of Exeter TIM WHITMARSH

GALEN'S *PROTREPTICUS* AND *ARS MEDICA*

V. BOUDON (ed.): *Galien II:* Exhortation à l'Étude de la Médecine; Art Médical (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. 454. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000. Cased, frs. 400. ISBN: 2-251-00483-1.

Although the preface by J. Jouanna curiously refers to it as the first to be published, the present volume is the second in what at some point is to become Budé's complete collection of Galen's works with French translation and commentary. The two treatises chosen by B. are Galen's exhortation to the study of the arts, the *Adhortatio ad artes addiscendas*, or *Protreptikos*, and the more widely known *Ars medica*. (The

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Budé edition does not appear to progress by either chronological order—as far as that is known—or the order of works in Kühn, so the choice is presumably up to the individual editors.) There are separate introductions for the two works, followed in either case by a stemma, a list of abbreviations, the Greek text with an accurate yet fluent facing translation, a critical apparatus, and then the longer notes (the shorter ones appearing as footnotes under the translation), and finally two separate *indices nominum*.

Only the first part of the *Protreptikos* (about arts in general) survives, while it seems that Part II (concerning the study of medicine), which was still known to Hunain, was already lost in the twelfth century. Part I, exhorting the young to study the arts, opens with praise to man as superior to all other beings, the only one to have free choice rather than just following his nature. Some arts are divine, e.g. medicine, prophecy, geometry, or astronomy, the greatest being philosophy, and so the need to practise an art arises from the fact that they are what man has in common with the gods. In Chapters 2–5, Galen depicts Hermes and his followers as personifying the straight road of reason, effort, and endeavour, and on the other hand, the sad fate awaiting those who chose Tyche instead.

Chapters 6–8 discuss the temptations that young people will encounter, in particular reliance on wealth, noble birth, and beauty. This leads on to criticism of the profession of the athlete, a career which Galen appears to consider particularly attractive to young men. In the final sentences of Chapter 14, at the end of the extant text, Galen returns to the initial theme, distinguishing between liberal and vulgar arts. This passage would have acted as a transition to Part II, in which Galen encouraged the young to study medicine in particular.

Galen's text goes beyond the traditional contraposition between *tyche* and *techne*, its depiction responding to the contemporary taste for *ekphrasis*. The work invites comparison with a similar representation of Fortune in Cebes' *Tabula* (first century A.D.), where, however, the contrast is between Tyche and Paideia. B. suggests as Galen's source (or perhaps one of his sources) the *Protreptikos* by Posidonius, from where Galen adopts the figure of Aristippus as an example of the gifts of the soul bestowed upon the followers of Hermes.

When Galen disparages external goods such as wealth, nobility, and beauty, he—unlike the Cynics—does not condemn them altogether. However, they are only of value when combined with virtue. His main targets are the uneducated rich, those of noble birth but without learning, and the young whose beauty leads them to neglect learning an art.

Galen makes a distinction between true art and harmful art as the extreme ends of the spectrum, with the fraudulent arts occupying the middle ground. His main quarrel with the life of the professional athlete is that it neglects the divine part in favour of the body. He also states that athletes are useless for both agricultural labour and war, that even their greatest feats are insignificant when compared to those of animals, and even that they undermine their health. B. conjectures that these statements were based on Galen's experiences in treating gladiators in Pergamon, but these were presumably not what he meant by athletes—nor would anyone have suggested that being a gladiator was good for a man's health.

The title of the work appears also in Galen's list of his own books, where it is debatable whether the words 'On the [work] by Menodotus for Severus' belong to the *Protreptikos* or to the preceding title. B. suggests persuasively that they were part of the former and that Galen wrote the treatise as a response to a work written by the Empiricist physician Menodotus of Nicomedia.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The *Ars medica*, one of Galen's major works, was the most famous for centuries, engendering a rich tradition of scholarship. It is considered to have been written towards the end of Galen's life, probably after 193, a summing-up of the essentials of Galenic pathology. B. discusses the question of Galen's intended purpose for this treatise—a textbook for students or a reference work for doctors? B. opts for the latter, whilst acknowledging that the numerous references to other Galenic works make it useful for beginners, too. The *Ars medica* was in use for medical students from the fourth century, and in the twelfth century became part of the *Articella*. Astonishingly, given the popularity of the text, B.'s is the first French translation.

This volume is a valuable contribution towards an accessible (and, unlike the CMG, affordable) edition of Galen's works. It is to be hoped that the collection will progress fast to give us the complete works within a few years.

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

GALEN ON FOOD

M. GRANT: *Galen on Food and Diet*. Pp. ix + 214. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-415-23233-3.

This is the latest volume from Mark Grant on dietary works from writers at the imperial court. His *Anthimus: On the Observance of Foods* (Totnes) appeared in 1996, his selection of Oribasius (*Dieting for an Emperor* [Leiden]) in 1997. Galen was a major influence on the two later writers, and G. is to be congratulated for making available the dietetic works of a writer at the heart of Greek culture, much of whose work remains available only in the Latin version of Kühn. The treatises included here are *On the Humours*, *On Black Bile*, *On Uneven Temperament*, *On the Causes of Disease*, *On Barley Soup*, and *On the Powers of Foods*. The last, in three books and some 200 pages of text in Corpus Medicum Graecorum, is by far the most substantial; its importance was recognized long since by Peter Garnsey. G.'s selection of treatises was presumably influenced by P. N. Singer's *Galen: Selected Works* (Oxford 1997), in which *Mixtures* and *The Thinning Diet* had already been translated. Readers will find that Galen's focus is not on the imperial court, but rather on river estuaries and the fields of peasants; and that his interests extend beyond the heating powers of onions and the thickening powers of milk to the consumption of lions, snails, and vetches. The line is drawn at Egyptian bugs (p. 157). His scientific methodology is also of considerable interest in the field of nutrition, as discussed by several writers in A. Debru (ed.), *Galen on Pharmacology* (Leiden, 1998), among them Philip van der Eijk, whose edition of Diocles of Carystus (Leiden 2000) has just appeared: Diocles is one of the Hellenistic dieticians whose methodology is explored by Galen in his reinterpretation of the Hippocratic *Regimen II*. In trying to identify einkorn, emmer, and other wheats, for example, Galen adduces Diocles, Mnesitheus, Theophrastus, and Dioscorides. Van der Eijk's version and G.'s version (pp. 90–5) are as confusing as Diocles and Mnesitheus were for Galen: G. should at least have retained the Greek terms in brackets, since the ancient term *zeia* may refer to three different plants, while G.'s 'rice-wheat' refers to two. Similarly, with physiology, we need the terms *entera* and *koilia* respectively for 'bowels' in the gnomic sentence (p. 70), 'bile in some people flows down to the bowels from the liver and returns to the bowels'. On beans, I would prefer him not to use 'calavance' for *phasēloi* (p. 102) and *dolichoi* (pp. 103–4), since the term is not in common use.

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.273 Published online by Cambridge University Press