

couples and orgies, homo- and heterosexual, misleadingly fills most of the section entitled 'Symposium and Komos' and concludes with a disclaimer that such images reflect 'humour and the types of things that happen in ancient Greek comedy, but they should not be classified as pornographic'. Such a generalization, let alone the inference that sex was not a daily occurrence in ancient Athens, cannot stand and should not minimize the importance of such images to the study of sex and gender in antiquity.

The volume is excellently illustrated, with ample colour and grey-scale images, and even some line drawings. Spelling errors are restricted to Greek terms, yet disappointingly so because they spread to the glossary ('astragoloi' for *astragaloi*, 'chyrta' for *chytra*, 'krotola' for *krotala*, 'lagabolon' for *lagobolon*, 'thyrosos' for *thyroros*). Here as elsewhere it is not made clear which special terms are transliterated from the Greek and which peculiarly crept into academic verbiage over the last several centuries. How many readers would know, for example, that 'booners' was an Oxford shortening of 'boon companions' put into print by Donna Kurtz and John Boardman in 1986 to refer to symposiasts ('Booners', *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 3.35–70)? A final archaism is the absence of references to the Beazley Archive Pottery Database numbers, which have become essential for scholarship in our digitally assisted era.

There is a relative absence also of historical context, which is, however, understandable in a volume that presents and interprets such a large body of evidence, up to 200,000 Athenian pots spanning 300 years (750–350 BCE), in so few pages (230). Yet readers should be made aware that much of Oakley's knowledge comes from contextualizing historical sources, textual and otherwise: references to a selection of them are presented at the end of each chapter. In sum, Oakley has successfully synthesized the vast scholarship on Athenian painted vases, our most complex treasure trove of images from antiquity, into an easily readable and accessible sourcebook.

AMY C. SMITH

University of Reading

Email: a.c.smith@reading.ac.uk

OCCHIPINTI (E.) (ed.) **Elleniche di Ossirinco** (I frammenti degli storici greci 14). Tivoli: Tored, 2022. Pp. 409. €130. 9788899846695.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426924000442](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000442)

The critical edition with translation and commentary of the *Hellenica of Oxyrhynchus* by Egidia Occhipinti, who in 2016 published a book devoted to the historian of Oxyrhynchus (*The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and Historiography: New Research Perspectives* (Leiden)), is the first in Italy: the annotated translation by Giorgio Bonamente (*Studio sulle Elleniche di Ossirinco: saggio sulla storiografia della prima metà del IV sec. a. C.* (Perugia 1973)) did not, in fact, present a critical text. I do not have sufficient philological and papyrological expertise to comment on the quality of the proposed critical text, which is not devoid of personal proposals. However, Occhipinti insistently repeats that a safe reconstruction of the text is a central step in her volume, and this seems to me a commendable and courageous approach.

The introduction is documented, concise but comprehensive. Perhaps it would have been useful to address the much-discussed problem of the work's authorship a little more thoroughly: working on the *Hellenica* without considering this issue does not seem appropriate. In the introduction there are concise briefings on the current *status quaestionis*; but perhaps in the commentary, when encountering significant clues, on several occasions it would have been appropriate to deal with the issue. For instance, the remarks on p. 35

about the cultural milieu of the Anonymous point towards Cratippus. In general, the attribution to Cratippus does not receive particular attention from Occhipinti (Plutarch's summary of his work, *On the Fame of the Athenians* 345c–e, is mentioned only once, on p. 65, without discussion). However, Occhipinti points out (and I agree with her) that the attribution to Theopompus is not convincing; on the one hand, she notes the total absence of the moralism which was typical of the historian of Chios; on the other, the style does not seem compatible with that of Theopompus, to which Occhipinti reserves special attention (29ff.). The part of the introduction where Occhipinti compares the Anonymous with his predecessors, especially Thucydides, is particularly interesting; she focuses also on the innovations of the historian, such as his interest in constitutional structures and federalism.

The commentary is comprehensive, despite being to some extent selective both in the choice of topics that deserve examination and in the bibliographical references.

Much attention is paid, I would say appropriately, to stylistic aspects, though their usefulness on the issue of authorship, in my opinion very important, is perhaps not adequately emphasized in the commentary. Occhipinti proposes that the papyrus of Theramenes (*P.Mich.* 5982) and *P.Oxy.* II 302 and XI 1365 belong to the *Hellenica*, without, however, arguing it in depth. As for the former, I fully agree: after all, the hypothesis had already been put forward, though without particular insistence, by the papyrus' editors, H.C. Youtie and R. Merkelbach ('Ein Michigan-Papyrus über Theramenes', *ZPE* 2 (1968), 61–69). Style, bias, tendency and topics covered (not only Theramenes' speech in the assembly during the negotiations with Sparta after the capitulation of Athens, of which *P.Mich.* 5982 is the only witness, but also military matters emerging from fragments of the same papyrus) seem to correspond to the characteristics of the text of the Anonymous.

The translation is not always flawless and sometimes suffers from a lack of adherence to the text. I limit myself to two particularly significant examples. At XIX, 3, κ[αὶ τὰ μὲν] ἴδια διετέλουν [οἱ] τῷ διοικούμενοι, τὸ δὲ τῷ [ν Βοι-] ωτῶν τοῦ[τ]ον ἦν τὸν τρόπον συντεταγμένον is translated 'amministravano in questo modo anche gli affari interni [di ciascuna città], mentre la modalità stabilita per la conduzione della politica beotica era la seguente', that is, 'they also administered the internal affairs [of each city] in this way, while the established mode of conducting Boeotian politics was as follows'. But the passage clearly contrasts, in a federal structure that the Anonymous is accurately describing, the level of the individual communities affiliated with the federation with the federal level of the *ethnos* of the Boeotians; thus, a translation of τὰ μὲν ἴδια as 'the local affairs' and of τὸ δὲ τῷ [ν Βοι-] ωτῶν as 'the federation, league of the Boeotians' would perhaps have better rendered what the Anonymous means. At XXI, 1, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀνδροκλείδαν καὶ τὸν Ἰσμηνίαν ἐ]σπούδαζον ἐκπολεμῶσαι τὸ ἔθνος [πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους is translated 'Gli uomini di Androclide e Ismenia si adoperavano per spingere in guerra la popolazione [beotica] contro gli Spartani', that is, 'Androclides' and Ismenias' men worked to push the [Boeotian] people into war against the Spartans'. But *ethnos* here is not generically 'people'; it means the Boeotian federal state, namely, 'the *ethnos* of the Boeotians'; thus a better translation is again 'the federation, the league'. In an author particularly sensitive to the topic of federalism, attention to traces of federal terminology is especially important. Again, at IX, 1, οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ καὶ δημοτικοὶ is translated 'the majority of the population and the democrats', but in fact this rather seems to me an hendiadys and thus to be translated as 'the democratic majority': in any case, the presentation of Athenian factions in the early fourth century poses particularly complex problems, even from a definitional point of view.

A small final observation of a linguistic and methodological nature: Occhipinti misuses the concepts of 'verosimiglianza' and 'plausibilità', which have no historical value, since the historian does not go in search of *possible* reconstructions, but of *provable* reconstructions. This is a purely semantic issue, but the argumentation is in my opinion weakened by

it. In conclusion, one can disagree with some choices, but the volume is a valuable working tool, especially in the area of Italian studies as it fills the gaps mentioned in the opening.

CINZIA BEARZOT

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Email: cinzia.bearzot@unicatt.it

PETIT (C.), SWAIN (S.) and FISCHER (K.-D.) (eds) **Pseudo-Galenica: The Formation of the Galenic Corpus from Antiquity to the Renaissance**. London: Warburg Institute, 2021. Pp. xv + 207. £46.80. 9781908590572. doi:[10.1017/S0075426924000090](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426924000090)

Near the start of this excellent volume of essays, Caroline Petit and Simon Swain share a characteristic anecdote from Galen. Walking through the Sandalarium in Rome one day, the physician overheard two men arguing about the authorship of a work apparently by himself. Galen commended the booklover who spotted the forgery and felt inspired to pen *On My Own Books* in the hopes of deterring future pretenders, a futile objective as the substantial Pseudo-Galenica would prove. But while Galen's concerns foreshadowed centuries of scholarly interest in Galenic authenticity, the editors of this volume make a compelling case for a different approach. There is much to be learned, they show, from the textual tradition that sprung up in Galen's shadow. As several contributors demonstrate, the meaning of 'authorship' shifted over time, and various medical thinkers valued Pseudo-Galenic texts as much for their content as for the name on the cover. The Pseudo-Galenica, then, are shown to be valuable beyond their authorship, and offer unique insights into what mattered to those who transcribed, translated and compiled medical texts.

The essays presented in this volume are the revised proceedings of a conference hosted by the Warburg Institute in London. Its contributions range in time frame from Galen's own day through the late antique, medieval and early modern periods, and consider not only a European context, but the crucial periods of Arabic, Hebraic and Syriac transmission. The chapters take two broad approaches. Several chart the formation of the Galenic Corpus across time and place, while others move beyond the question of authorship to explore the Pseudo-Galenica on their own terms (many do both).

Vivian Nutton begins with a consideration of three pseudonymous works of pharmacology, showing their potential as evidence for the medical milieu of imperial Rome. Véronique Boudon-Millot charts the incorporation of *Theriac to Piso* into the authentic Galenic Corpus, while Laurence Totelin explores the often-neglected *Euporista*, setting them in their broader historical context. Marie Cronier examines the manuscript tradition of the *Medical Definitions*, revealing a complex thread of origins possibly linked to late antique teaching contexts. These compelling hints of a teaching environment continue in Caroline Petit's chapter on the origins of four pseudonymous works on Prognostic. Next, Siam Bhayro explores the shifting meanings of authorship in the Arabic and Syriac traditions, while Petros Bouras-Vallianatos offers a close analysis of the Pseudo-Galenic works in *Wellcomensis* MS.MSL.60, providing the Greek text in a helpful appendix. Mauro Zonta's posthumous chapter makes a case for the medieval Hebrew tradition in reconstructing Galen's authentic *Avoiding Distress*. In the remaining chapters, Stefania Fortuna shows how Galenic and Pseudo-Galenic texts were transmitted together in the 15th to 17th centuries, while R. Allen Shotwell demonstrates how the physician Alessandro Achillini drew upon the Pseudo-Galenica to suit the needs of his practice in 16th-century Bologna. Finally, Christina Savino pieces together the puzzle of