

We may end this review with a famous quotation from Phaedrus: “Es sei so viel Stoff da, dass eher der Schmied der Arbeit als die Arbeit dem Schmied fehle” (p. 250).

GERT-JAN VAN DIJK  
Independent Scholar  
gertjanvandijk@hotmail.com

DANIELA MANETTI, *Anonymus Londiniensis. De medicina. Editio altera*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana 2044, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, xxviii+127 pp., 59.95€, ISBN 978-3-11-078540-1.

Reviewing the most recent critical edition of the renowned *Anonymus Londiniensis* is an apparently straightforward undertaking, as the text of the work is so well-known that it requires very few introductory words. It is, in fact, the papyrus housed at the British Library, inventory number 137 (P.Lond.Lit. 165), containing 39 columns – not always consecutive – of an anonymous medical treatise, dating back to the 1st century AD.<sup>1</sup> This manuscript is remarkable both for its content and for its material characteristics, which have led to its recognition as a work in progress, complete with authorial annotations, corrections, and variants.<sup>2</sup> This task seems also straightforward because the volume in question, edited by Daniela Manetti as the *editio altera* of her previous one, published for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana in 2011,<sup>3</sup> fits into an ecdotic journey that began in 1893 with Hermann Diels<sup>4</sup> and that encompasses, within the chronological gap between the two Teubner volumes, the two editions by Antonio Ricciardetto (2014 and 2016),<sup>5</sup> which have naturally been taken into due account in this latest effort by the Italian scholar, alongside numerous other specific interventions carried out by various scholars over time.

Manetti’s edition is articulated in a preface (pp. vii-xvi) overviewing the main features of the papyrus and its medical content; a note about some editorial choices (“De huius editionis ratione”, p. xvii); bibliographical lists of editions and scholarly literature (pp. xviii-xxvii); the *conspectus siglorum* (p. xxviii); the main text with a double apparatus, also indicating parallel or comparable

<sup>1</sup> See the general overview by A. Ricciardetto, *L’Anonyme de Londres. P.Lit.Lond. 165, Brit.Lib. inv. 137. Un papyrus médical grec du Ier siècle après J.-C.*, Paris 2016, x-clii.

<sup>2</sup> D. Manetti, “Autografi e incompiuti: il caso dell’Anonimo Londinese P. Lit. Lond. 165”, *ZPE* 100, 1994, 47-58; R. Criore, “Genetic Criticism and the Papyri: Some Suggestions”, in N. Reggiani, ed., *Greek Medical Papyri: Text, Context, Hypertext*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 173-92: 185-6.

<sup>3</sup> D. Manetti, ed., *Anonymus Londiniensis. De medicina*, Berlin-Boston 2011.

<sup>4</sup> In *Supplementum Aristotelicum* III 1.

<sup>5</sup> A. Ricciardetto, *L’Anonyme de Londres (P.Lit.Lond. 165, Brit.Lib. inv. 137)*, Liège 2014, and Ricciardetto, *Anonyme* 2016.

passages in the extant medical literature<sup>6</sup> (pp. 1-92); textual fragments, divided into “Fragmena maiora” (pp. 93-4), which actually are two additions to the main text written on the verso of the roll and a medical recipe annotated on the same side,<sup>7</sup> and “Fragmenta incertae sedis” (pp. 95-8); a general word index (pp. 99-127). Unlike Ricciardetto’s edition, Manetti’s one does not take into consideration the historical text transcribed on the verso of the roll, the copy of an official epistle addressed by Marcus Antonius to the *koinon* of the Greeks of Asia. This is an agreeable choice, since the relationship of the letter with the medical text is still far from clear.

It would seem, then, that there is not much to comment on, except to highlight the meticulousness of Daniela Manetti in revisiting the lengthy and intricate papyrus text, comparing it firsthand with her own previous edition and with Diels’ and Ricciardetto’s readings, indicating divergences in the apparatus where necessary. Therefore, I have limited myself to reviewing these latest findings against the papyrus (in the digital reproductions made available by the British Library<sup>8</sup>), almost all of which are agreeable and serve to definitively enhance the comprehension of various challenging points in the papyrus.

A deliberate editorial choice is certainly the indication of lacunae in certain sequences of letters, of which very few, faint traces of ink actually survive on the writing surface, and which are noted by Ricciardetto with underdots (lines iii 28; iv 9; xii 20). At line iv 41 Kν[ιδ]ι[oc] Diels : Kνιδις Ricciardetto : Kν[ι]δι[oc] Manetti, one can discern at least the traces of ο on the papyrus. At line v 16, where the papyrus contains an inaccurate reading of ἀπογεννᾶσθαι (apparatus: “ἀπογεννῶσθαι *vel* ἀπογεννεσθαι D[iels]”), the erroneous letter is undoubtedly *sigma*, as already noted by Ricciardetto; the reading *epsilon*, due to Diels, is definitely to be discarded. At line x 45, Manetti prints ]ψυχ( ) in the text and “ψυχ P, fort. ψυχ(ρόν?) : ψυχ[. . .] D[iels]” in the apparatus: the abbreviation is certain, but on the papyrus, *chi* is visibly raised, whereas this characteristic is not apparent from the apparatus (it could be a mere printing error). At line xvi 2 [ἐστιν], on the papyrus there are traces that do not seem compatible with the proposed supplement ([. . .] Ricciardetto).<sup>9</sup> At line xx 24, †αυτηγει† is a desperate point since Diels’ edition; *gamma* seems very uncertain to me, while *omikron* might be a better choice, which was already read by Diels (αυτονει *vel* αηγνει), Manetti<sup>10</sup> (αυτογει), and Ricciardetto (αυτον(ο)ει); the letters νει are certain. At line xxxix

<sup>6</sup> This apparatus of parallels is an added value with respect to Ricciardetto’s edition.

<sup>7</sup> Ricciardetto indeed distinguishes them in an appropriate section devoted to the verso.

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=papyrus\\_137\\_f001r](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=papyrus_137_f001r).

<sup>9</sup> The final letter of the preceding word, ἐμψυχότερα, extends downward, almost forming a ligature similar to α; before the subsequent word, ἀμέλει, there appears to be room for at least five letters, with the certainty that the last of these is not *ny*.

<sup>10</sup> D. Manetti, “Doxographical Deformations of Medical Tradition in the Report of the Anonymus Ladinensis on Philolaus”, *ZPE* 83, 1990, 219-33.

25, after  $\rho\upsilon$  at the end of the line, there may be traces of ink, noted by Ricciardetto as a supralinear addition but not printed by Manetti.

In the hastily annotated recipe on the verso of the roll, at line 3, it is definitely  $\beta\delta\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\upsilon$  (for  $\beta\delta\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\upsilon$ ) as read by Isabella Andorlini,<sup>11</sup> not  $\beta\delta\epsilon\lambda\lambda\upsilon$ , reading shared by Manetti and Ricciardetto. At line 4, separated from the name of the last ingredient, there is a trace that has always challenged the editors. The shape, recognizable as a hooked vertical, is compatible with both a weight unit symbol ( $f$  or  $\mathcal{f}$  Ricciardetto, i.e., the *triobolon* or *tetrobolon*) and with a  $\rho$  ( $\rho\upsilon$  Manetti,  $\rho$  perhaps for  $\chi\rho\omega$  Andorlini). Considering the position in the context of the prescriptive text, it seems to me that the hypothesis of a measurement indication is the most probable, and it could even be a simple  $f$  (*diobolon*).

At this juncture, it is worthwhile to dwell on some broader considerations regarding the publication of a critical edition of a literary text with a single papyrus witness. First and foremost, the endeavor of editing such a text is an intricate scholarly pursuit, one that demands the utmost care and attention to detail. A single papyrus witness means that there are no alternative manuscripts to consult, compare, or corroborate readings. In a canonical papyrological edition, textual variants consist of the mechanical errors made by the scribe and linguistic phenomena tied to the evolution of the Greek language during the Graeco-Roman era, to the influence of the Egyptian language, as well as to local or personal substandards. These variants are typically recognized as culturally relevant and significant aspects of the material context of papyrus writing – akin to palaeography and graphic, paratextual, and layout devices. Therefore, they are printed in the main transcription of the text, while the ‘standard’ reading, conforming to orthographically correct classical Greek, is provided in the apparatus.<sup>12</sup> In a sense, it is somewhat the opposite of the critical edition of a literary text with a manuscript tradition, where the reading considered correct is established as the main text, and divergent variants from individual witnesses are noted in the apparatus.

The most recent editors of the *Anonymus*, Manetti and Ricciardetto, have approached the edition as the one of a literary work. They have printed the ‘standard’ form in the main text and included the reading from the papyrus in the apparatus, without accents and spirits.<sup>13</sup> This applies to cases of phonetic

<sup>11</sup> I. Andorlini, “La ricetta medica dell’*Anonimo Londinese*”, *Galenos* 4, 2010, 39-45.

<sup>12</sup> See in general J. Stolk, “Encoding Linguistic Variation in Greek Documentary Papyri. The Past, Present and Future of Editorial Regularization”, in N. Reggiani, ed., *Digital Papyrology II. Case Studies on the Digital Edition of Ancient Greek Papyri*, Berlin-Boston 2018, 119-38 and N. Reggiani, “Linguistic and Philological Variants in the Papyri: A Reconsideration in the Light of the Digitization of the Greek Medical Papyri”, in N. Reggiani, ed., *Greek Medical Papyri: Text, Context, Hypertext*, Berlin-Boston 2019, 237-56.

<sup>13</sup> The sole exception to this setting is the medical prescription written on the verso of the roll, where the original papyrus reading, without accents and spirits, is transcribed by Manetti in the main text, with the ‘standard’ readings provided in the apparatus. Ricciardetto, on the other hand, publishes it according to the same criteria as the main text.

variants (e.g., i 10 κίνητιν in the main text, with κεινητιν in the apparatus; viii 44 κατάρρους, app. καθαρρους; xiv 17 κύγχυτιν, app. “συνχυτιν P”), as well as in cases of mere orthographic errors, as in the example of ἀπογεννᾶσθαι mentioned earlier. This choice, which is perfectly justifiable also considering the publishing context of the editions, contrasts, however, with other editorial decisions shared by Manetti and Ricciardetto, which demonstrate attention to aspects of the materiality of writing. These include indicating uncertain letters with underdots in the main text, marking expanded abbreviations in round brackets, and highlighting paratextual devices of text articulation, such as *paragraphoi*, *diplai* *obelismenai*, *ektheseis*, and, in the case of Ricciardetto, inline *vacat*, which Manetti indicates in the apparatus. Both editors also note supralinear insertions in the apparatus. The discussed editorial choices also produce anomalous cases, such as l. viii 23 ἐμμειῖναν, where the underdot in the word printed in the main text may mistakenly lead one to believe that there is an uncertain or partial *my* on the papyrus before discovering from the apparatus that it is, in fact, *ny*. In cases like this, placing an underdot in an editorial correction can potentially lead to interpretive confusion. In a standard papyrological edition, we would find ἐγμειῖναν in the main text, with “l. ἐμμειῖναν” in the apparatus.

This is accompanied by partial variations in other editorial notations. The restorations of letters or words omitted by the ancient scribe are generally marked in the main text with pointed brackets (e.g., i 28-9 συνί(τ)α|[ται κα]ι (τὰ) κτλ.), and the expunctions of redundant letters or words is indicated in braces (e.g., i 35 ἐπακολούθημα{ι}). This is the case even when dealing with clear phonetic phenomena typical of the Greek language of the papyri (e.g., i 39 οὔτω{ι}, where one might expect a treatment similar to that of iotacisms). However, consider line v 25 ταῦτὸ, apparatus τατο (so also Ricciardetto), where one might have expected τα(ὸ)τὸ. Ancient deletions are consistently recorded in the apparatus in a descriptive manner (e.g., l. i 9 ἐν τοῖς κόμασι, with the apparatus stating “εντοιῶω scripsit P, loco deletae vocis ζωτικης,” i.e., [[ζωτικῆς]] ἐν τοῖς κόμασι; elsewhere, however, with double square brackets, as in l. iii 2 φαντασίαν, app. [[παρου]]φαντα/σίαν; also, compare l. iv 26 παρὰ, app. “πα\ρα/ ex διὰ (π ex δι) correxit P”). There is an exception in the long passage spanning over lines 15-38 of the first column, which, perhaps due to its length, is enclosed in double square brackets in the main text.

The line division corresponds to the original layout of the papyrus, but there is a noticeable peculiarity in the lines following xxvi 48. In the original, they constitute an intercolumnar insertion consisting of eight short lines between column xxvi and xxvii, followed by three longer lines added in the lower margin below column xxvi. However, the graphical presentation in the edition does not replicate this layout. Instead, it presents all the additional lines consecutively, separated by vertical pipes, and divides them in a seeming arbitrary way into six lines of varying length, labeled as 48a-f. Notably, the first two words of the first intercolumnar line (τῶι [δὲ]) are placed at the end of xxvi 48 in the main text,

rather than at the beginning of xxvi 48a as one might expect, making it appear as if they are part of the main body of text.<sup>14</sup>

In summary, this is, of course, a consistent editorial system guided by choices partly dictated by the unique nature of the text in question. The preference is given to the literary content rather than its material nature as a papyrus artifact. In line with this general criterion, the decision is made to explicit the title Ἱατρικά at the beginning, within pointed brackets, as if it were the editorial integration of a scribal omission, “Diels secuta, exempli gratia tantum inserui, ut pateret quid papyrus continet.” This corresponds to the title *De medicina* given to the edition.<sup>15</sup> However, it should be noted that, for the reasons discussed above, this is not strictly a papyrological edition. Despite the abundance of critical editions of the papyrus, which have now established its text impeccably and exemplarily, a true papyrological edition would be desirable for a full appreciation of such a remarkable artifact, especially in anticipation of a subsequent, equally desirable digital edition.

NICOLA REGGIANI  
University of Parma  
nicola.reggiani@unipr.it

KEVIN BOVIER, *La Renaissance de Tacite. Commenter les Histoires et les Annales au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *Antiquity after Antiquity 2*, Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2022, 360 pp., 64.00 CHF, ISBN 978-3-7965-4606-8.

El libro de Kevin Bovier, fruto de una tesis doctoral en lengua y literatura latinas defendida en 2020 en la Universidad de Ginebra, propone el estudio de los primeros comentarios a los que dieron lugar en el Renacimiento dos textos historiográficos de Tácito considerados durante mucho tiempo como una sola obra, las *Historias* y los *Anales*. Se inscribe en un floreciente campo de investigación consagrado a los comentarios humanistas de textos antiguos, al tiempo que llena un vacío en la más que abundante bibliografía dedicada a la recepción de Tácito en la primera modernidad. De hecho, aunque la difusión y la utilización de las obras de Tácito desde su redescubrimiento a finales de la época medieval han llamado la atención de una importante comunidad científica, dando lugar a un número sustancial de monografías y volúmenes colectivos, las investigaciones

<sup>14</sup> Similarly, Ricciardetto reassembles the additional lines into six lines labeled 48a-f, with a partially different arrangement, omitting the pipes, and correctly placing the first two words, τῶι [δὲ], at the beginning of 48a.

<sup>15</sup> In contrast, Ricciardetto titles the Belles Lettres edition as *L'anonyme de Londres. P.Lit.Lond. 165, Brit.Lib. inv. 137. Un papyrus médical grec du I<sup>er</sup> siècle après J.-C.*, thus emphasizing the papyrological nature of the text.