The most charitable interpretation for this oversight may be a desire to avoid the pitfalls of source-criticism. But some attempt to sort out the chronology of this material would have made much clearer the disparate nature of the evidence, and clarified the process by which often quite light-hearted remarks eventually took on a biographical life of their own. For example, in the life of Empedocles, the earliest strands seem to go back to two sources, Aristotle and, more influentially in biographical terms, a dialogue by Aristotle's older contemporary in the Academy, Heraclides Ponticus, *On the Woman who Stopped Breathing*. (See H. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus* [Oxford, 1980]; this may or may not have been the source for the leap into Aetna.) As that case shows (and others could be adduced, e.g. from comedies, when the ultimate nature of these remarks is brought to light), it is no longer evident that they deserve the epithet biographical, even in the loose sense outlined above.

Finally, given the lengths to which C. goes in relating the biography to the works, it is odd that she is so resolute in denying a shorter possible inference further upstream: that from work back to author. Despite C.'s general claim that the biographical reading of 'abstract philosophy' is suspect, or tells us nothing of the personality of the author, rather than his or her first-person persona, if I were compelled to choose between Heraclitus and Democritus for a room-mate, I would still opt for Democritus. For a more balanced view, including some incisive criticisms of C.'s earlier work, not apparently considered by C., see R. Goulet, s.v. 'Empédocle', in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, ed. R. Goulet, vol. 3 (Paris, 2000), pp. 76–9.

A few final complaints. The book is handsomely produced, but marred by relatively frequent typographical errors, as well as a number of grosser mistakes, especially in the Greek. C., rather bizarrely, uses as her main text Hicks' Loeb (1925), rather than H.S. Long's OCT (1949) or Marcovich's Teubner (1999).

University of Edinburgh SIMON TREPANIER
strepani@staffmail.ed.ac.uk

THE DERVENI PAPYRUS

JOURDAN (F.) *Le Papyrus de Derveni. Texte présenté, traduit et annoté*. Pp. xxxiii + 166. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003. Paper, €22. ISBN: 2-251-32434-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06001526

Prose writers have no problem in understanding poets. Thus Anaxagoras saw that Homer's poems were all about justice and virtue (Diog. Laert. 2.11) and Aristotle could see through Empedocles' inarticulate mutterings (ἃ ψελλίζεται λέγων) to get at his meaning (*Meta.* 985a4–7). Nor is there a problem if the poet appears to write intentionally puzzling verse, as is shown in the Derveni Papyrus, whose author felt up to the challenge of interpreting this 'enigmatic' text, as he proudly boasts more than once. In this case the poetry is that of 'Orpheus', which does indeed present problems of interpretation and would do so even if we had a complete text. As it is, though, the fragmentary nature of the papyrus adds additional layers of problems, making it difficult for scholars to reach a consensus even on the author's interpretive stance.

The text of the Derveni Papyrus, notoriously still awaiting official publication over 40 years after its existence was announced, has seen print in various unofficial forms, most famously in the twelve pages (unacknowledged in the table of contents) at the

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved

end of *ZPE* 47 (1982). At the moment, the most complete versions are those of Gábor Betegh and of Richard Janko, the former after having viewed the papyrus fragments while they were on public display in Thessalonike (admittedly not the most favourable conditions), the latter working from all the available photographs and, like Betegh, from the various statements made by K. Tsantsanoglou incorporated into the proceedings of the Princeton conference on the Papyrus.[1]

Betegh's text and commentary is a solid work of scholarship that will remain the primary source of reference for many years. There remains a place, though, for a briefer yet still scholarly introduction to the Derveni Papyrus, a position filled by J.'s book; and it is as an introduction and not as a rival to Betegh, who is everywhere more thorough, that I assess it here. The format is exactly that of recent Budé volumes with brief footnotes attached to the translation, some of which refer to quite extensive Notes Complémentaires which follow. Even the pagination follows the practice of the Budés, so that 27 of its pages are in fact duplicated in number for the text and facing translation. J. merely reprints Janko's *ZPE* text, although without his extensive critical apparatus.

J.'s introduction surveys the background to the text's discovery and the nature of its contents. Since Anaxagoras is often mentioned in discussions of the author's influences, J. deserves credit for pointing out what is often ignored, namely that a bronze crater found in one of the Derveni tombs contains the inscription *Ἀστιούνειος Ἀναξαγόραιοι ἐς Λαρίσας*, which, if not altogether transparent, has reasonably been taken to mean 'belonging to Astioun the son of Anaxagoras' (*SEG* 30.567). Although the name Anaxagoras is found throughout Greece, it is tempting to think that one of the Presocratic's sons made his way from Lampsacus to Larisa, bringing the text of the Derveni Papyrus with him. Although she makes nothing of this inscription, such a hypothesis fits with her cautious dating of the original composition to the early third century, although I am still open to a date somewhat earlier. On the question of genre, J. prefers not to speculate, and while it is true that 'la question reste ouverte' (p. xiv n. 3), a more thorough review of the scholarship on this question would be welcomed by the target audience of this book.

Who, though, is this target audience? Although clearly not those who have been studying the papyrus and who now have Betegh to hand, anybody who can read Greek (and French) would benefit from this book. Many of the notes, however, seem to assume that the reader needs the most basic information; e.g. 'Le terme *ψυχή* désigne tout d'abord le "soufflé", et plus précisément le "souffle vital" '. Other notes more helpfully substitute for the missing apparatus by suggesting possible restorations or interpretations, although here too some simple facts of vocabulary and morphology are spelled out. The serious amateur, who may have forgotten much of his Greek, can thus learn much from J.; more experienced Classicists can simply skate over these passages.

The translation reads quite well (better than the Greek, in fact). Her rendering of the Author's etymology of *Δηιώ* from *ἐδηιώθη* as '*Dè*io / *dé*-chirée' is attractive. On the whole it is accurate, but note that *κατὰ γλῶσσαν ἑκάστοις*, 'according to each group's dialect' (col. 22.9), is rendered as 'selon la langue de chaque peuple'. The most attractive feature of the book is J.'s 64-page *index uerborum*, which goes well beyond the mere listing of places where each word is cited (such as are found in Janko's and

[1]R. Janko, 'The Derveni Papyrus: an interim text', *ZPE* 141 (2002), 1–62; G. Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge, 2004); A. Laks and G.W. Most (edd.), *Studies on the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford, 1997).

Betegh's editions). For each passage, J. not only translates the word but also repeats the word in its original context along with a translation which frequently is not quite the same as the official facing translation, but which may nicely complement it. Here too one can easily point to unnecessary explanations (γάρ does not need eight and a half column inches), but even experienced readers of this difficult text may appreciate her summaries here of some of its more significant vocabulary. In other words, there is something for everyone in this attractively produced and inexpensive volume. An English equivalent would be welcome.

New York University DAVID SIDER
ds128@nyu.edu

ON ANCIENT MEDICINE

SCHIEFSKY (M.J.) *Hippocrates*: On Ancient Medicine. *Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. (Studies in Ancient Medicine 28.) Pp. xiv + 415. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005. Cased, €129, US$169. ISBN: 90-04-13758-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06001538

Ever since Émile Littré placed *On Ancient Medicine* (abbr. *VM*) at the beginning of his monumental edition of Hippocrates' works (*Œuvres Complètes d'Hippocrate*, 10 volumes [Paris, 1839–61]), it has taken centre stage in Hippocratic studies and attracted the attention of philologists, physicians and philosophers. This glorious fate marks a stark contrast with its reputation in Late Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, when it suffered badly from the fact that Galen regarded it as spurious. The work was originally a speech (which would have taken just under an hour to deliver) in which the author attacked physicians eager to reduce medical theory to a number of simple principles such as hot, cold, dry and wet, and defended ancient medicine as a more complex art (τέχνη).

Littré saw in *VM* the work of the historical Hippocrates, who, as an empirical physician, would not let himself be bound by the shackles of futile theoretical speculation. Following this assessment, subsequent scholarship has traditionally revolved around a number of problems. The first and foremost is the so-called Hippocratic question: which texts in the Hippocratic Corpus were written by the historical Hippocrates? Or, more specifically, was *VM* actually written by this historical Hippocrates? The second problem, closely linked to the first, is the medical doctrine to which the author of *VM* adhered and its relationship with medical and philosophical ideas of the time. Thirdly, scholars have asked who is actually attacked in this treatise.

The work under review, based on the author's 1999 doctoral thesis, questions the validity of these traditional concerns and offers a fresh perspective through a close and careful reading of *VM*. It is divided into three main parts: an Introduction discussing the general background, argument and context of the treatise (pp. 1–71); the Greek text with a facing English translation (pp. 74–109); and the commentary (pp. 111–343). The commentary is arranged both around chapters and in a lemmatic way. For each individual chapter, S. provides a short interpretative paraphrase, and discusses points of greater significance occurring at this point of the text. He then moves his attention to individual passages or expressions in need of interpretation or elucidation. The commentary is followed by two appendices (on the relationship of

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved