

more might have been said about their role in Babylonian medicine.

What followed later is, with one significant exception, not described in this book. There is a nod to Rufus of Ephesus, but the selections on the environment in Oribasius (some coming from Galen's teachers) and in Vitruvius are not discussed. The exception is Galen, for, thanks to the generosity of Dr. Gotthard Strohmayer, the author has been able to use sections from his long-awaited edition and translation of the Galenic Commentary on this text. What is cited here whets the appetite for what is to come, although the absence of any index of names or non-Hippocratic texts means that those wishing to find out what Galen said will have first to plough through all the footnotes.

Galen shows himself to be an intelligent commentator, interested both in the details of the areas named and in the overall medical benefits to be gained from taking account of environmental factors. He makes plausible guesses as to the precise location of cities merely alluded to, and shows a broad knowledge of geography and meteorology. The text in front of him already had the major lacuna in the middle of the book, although it is far from clear when that damage occurred, and one cannot hold out great hopes for the recovery of the missing section. The longest citation concerns the title of the book, which appears in various forms in the manuscripts and in editions known to Galen. He concluded that they were the result of earlier attempts either to impose a title on a work that circulated originally without one, or, less plausibly, to explicate a title such as *On local diseases*. It is unclear whether a possible original title *On local and universal diseases* derives from a suggestion by Galen or by the author herself, but this too would appear to be much later than the text. Elsewhere, Galen demonstrates a wide knowledge of Hippocratic writings, and his judgments, as cited here, are generally sound. Given his enthusiasm for this book, it is odd that he should say much less in his writings about *Sacred disease*, which is closely connected in language and theme with it.

This is a useful piece of work, although save for the Galen passages, one that brings relatively little that is new, although one can respect the author's sound judgment. But it is not an easy book to dip into. Although the sections are clearly signposted in the list of chapters, it is almost impossible to locate specific passages in the text (and in non-Hippocratic authors) without an index. One can accept the author's overall message, that one must be careful about using blanket terms such as 'meteorological medicine', while regretting that an opportunity was lost to consider the influence of this text on later Greek medicine. But for that, we shall have to wait for the publication of Galen's commentary.

Mai 2016

Vivian Nutton

I. M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University

CHRISTIAN ORTH

Aristomenes – Metagenes. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar

Heidelberg, Verlag Antike. 2014. 538 S. 8°
(*Fragmenta Comica*, 9,2.)

The monumental project "Kommentierung der Fragmente der griechischen Komödie" (*KomFrag*) which began in January 2011 under the leadership of Prof. Dr. Zimmermann at the University of Freiburg is now nearing the quarter-way mark. Of the 70 projected volumes (28 official "Bände" with numerous sub-divisions: Kratinos for example receives 6 "Teilbände" all published separately), thirteen volumes have already been published or are due to be published in 2016. Many of these 100+ comedians between the sixth century B. C. E. and the first century C. E. are receiving commentaries for the first time.

Christian Orth is a central figure in the project. He has already published four commentaries – Strattis (not officially part of the project but also written at Freiburg and published by Verlag Antike in 2009), Alkaios-Apollophanes (9.1), Aristomenes-Metagenes (9.2), Nikokhares-Xenophon (9.3), and is due to produce more: Aristophanes: *Aiolosikon-Babylonioi* (10.3) and Aristophon-Dromon (16.2). His commentaries are generally of very high quality and display not only the diligence of a scholar who leaves no stone left unturned, but also the creativity of one who brings fragments to life with a range of imaginative (and often very funny) possibilities for their comic context.

The present volume under review *Aristomenes-Metagenes* (9.2) is the middle of his three volumes devoted alphabetically to the minor comedians of the 5–4th century. These fragments of 11 comedians (Aristomenes, Aristonymos, Autokrates, Demetrios I, Diokles, Epilykos, Eunikos, Kephisodoros, Krates II, Lysias, Metagenes) range from Metagenes to whom more than 100 pages are devoted and who has received a commentary elsewhere (Pellegrino, M. 1998. 'Metagenes' in A. M. Belardinelli, ed., *Tessere: Frammenti della commedia greca. Studi e commenti*. Bari: 291–39), to Lysias, a poet for whom no fragment remains, nor is even to be found in Kassel and Austin's *Poetae Comici Graeci*, since this comedian's existence was only recently recognized (Millis, B. W. and Olson, S. D. 2012. *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens. IG II² 2318–2352 and Related Texts*. Leiden: 159–62).

Each comedian receives the following introductory treatment: 1) name and identity, 2) chronology und career, 3) transmission and reception, 4) themes and motifs, 5) *kômōdoumenoi*, 6) diction, 7) metrics und form, 8) the author's relationship to other comedians, 9) bibliography.

Each fragment's discussion is similarly divided into 1) presenting the text and translation of the fragment,

2) presenting the text and translation of the text where the fragment is cited, 3) analysis of the meter, 4) list of works where the fragment has been discussed, 5) analysis of the context the fragment is cited in, 6) textual analysis of the fragment, 7) interpretation of the fragment.

Although the commentary breaks down to roughly one page per surviving word of comedy, none of this feels excessive, since a great deal of valuable information is always presented in a focused and polished manner. To select a few interesting moments among many: from Aristomenes' *Goētes* is preserved the line παντευχίαν δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ταύτην λαβεῖν / καὶ περιθετον πρόσωπον, ὃ λαβὼν ἔσταθι (5 KA). Kaibel had already conjectured 'fraus paratur a praestigiatore superstitiosis similis Alexandri Abonoteichitae fraudibus' but Orth, who also connects the lines to the title for dramatic possibilities, offers a clever parallel in Peisistratos' "Athena" trick from Herodotus 1.60.4–5 (pgs. 60–1). Regarding Aristomenes' *Dionysos Askētēs*, which seems to involve Dionysos undergoing athletic training, Orth does not just cite the expected comic parallels for Dionysos 'in unpassenden Rollen' (e. g., Eupolis' *Taxiarchs* where Dionysos is trained to be a soldier) but also makes the interesting suggestion that Dionysos' penchant to appear in comically inappropriate roles may be influenced by the similar miscasting of satyrs in satyr drama (quoting Seidensticker at 73 n. 107: "Meistens befinden sie [die Satyrn] sich in einer ungewohnten oder gehaßten Umgebung und Situation. Dauernd versuchen sie oder sind gezwungen, etwas zu tun, was sie nicht wollen oder nicht verstehen."): a persuasive idea indeed. For Metagenes, one finds informative entries like those from *Thouriopersai* (fr. 7 KA) regarding dancing horses (pgs. 428–9), *Philothutēs* (fr. 15 KA) regarding the word *epeisodion* (pgs. 468–71) and *Aurai/Mammakuthos* (fr. 4 KA) regarding the presence of *aulētrides* and *orkhēstrides* not only at symposia but harbor establishments (pg. 402).

One of this commentary's virtues lies in its offering a range of possibilities regarding questions of interpretation, history, and text, without any explicit statement of preference. So, for example, from Kephisodoros' *Trophonios* comes a fragment (3 KA) where a slave abuses his master for asking him to buy perfume. It is unusual and effeminate for a man to request perfume and so it seems that the slave is upbraiding him for this reason. Yet a subtle alternative reading is offered: the slave's surprise at the request may not ride merely on the request being unusual for a *man*, but also unusual behavior for his *master* – certainly compelling considering the contexts of a play involving religious matters. Yet Orth carefully avoids pushing one interpretation over the other, preferring instead to think through various possibilities and then leave it to his reader to decide (pg. 326; cf.

the treatment of the IG II² 2325.56–66 inscription on pgs. 24–5).

This book is a worthwhile purchase for anyone interested in the fragmentary comedians of the classical period. Although I have nothing to criticize about the book, I could not help but remember Dover's warnings about reconstructing lost plays from comic fragments (K. J. Dover. 2000. "Fragments" in D. Harvey and J. Wilkins, eds., *The Rivals of Aristophanes*. London: xvii–xix). Dover focused primarily on plots, but a similar concern might be expressed regarding the treatment of comic language itself. Comic language can be remarkably unstable at times (with its puns, word games, and so forth), and this instability must pose a knotty problem for anyone setting out to write a commentary on lost comedies. What kind of commentary, for example, would a line like that of Aristophanes' *Wasps* 1343 "Be careful, since the rope is rotten" (φυλάττου δ' ὥς σαπρὸν τὸ σχοινίον) receive by a modern commentator if it survived only as a fragment? Likely the student would be treated to a wonderful entry on ancient ropes, their length of life, their uses, their rotting in various climates; a range of potential dramatic contexts from a boat scene (with a list of parallel boat scenes) to a scene of tying up a goat (with a list of parallel scenes); and some stimulating speculation as to how such scenes might relate to a play purportedly about jury duty. None of this entry, of course, would actually have anything to do with the *Wasps* scene – there is no rope, no boat, no goat – just a courtesan pulling on an old man's leather phallus. But unlike *Wasps*, in regard to comic fragments, there is often no sure way of knowing whether the actual context was similarly unrelated, and one can only assume for the sake of the commentary that the language is, at the moment, stable.

Such an assumption – that comic language is behaving itself in any particular fragment – is a practical one to make and Orth is right to treat comic language in the way he does. One reason is that the great deal of information that he gathers and analyzes so well is not only highly useful for those studying comedy but also anyone in pursuit of such information not just via alphabetical lexica, encyclopedias, and thematic articles but via commentaries—which have the added benefit of arranging such information alongside (and through) surviving texts. This is a vital purpose for these comic commentaries whatever those original lost comedies actually were. And so although I sometimes worried that the excellent discussions about *askos* and *thulakos* (202–3), bees (217–19), and dreams (233–5) might be lost for those who have never heard of the comedian Diocles, I also developed a sense that many people will end up reading Diocles in order to read Orth.

Juli 2016

Stephen E. Kidd
Brown University