The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Ilberg on the Texts of Hippocrates *Das Hippocrates-Glossar des Erotianos und seine ursprüngliche Gestalt*: von Johannes Ilberg (Abhandl. d. phil.-hist. Classe königl. Sachs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften, band xiv. 1893). 2 Mk. *Prolegomena Critica in Hippocratis operum quae feruntur recensionem novam*; scripsit Johannes Ilberg (Teubner, Leipzig, 1894).

F. G. Knyon

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 57 - 58

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187360, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187360

How to cite this article:

F. G. Knyon (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 57-58 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187360

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

year, each list marked by the name of the Archon of the year in which they were enrolled and with the name of an ἐπώνυμος τῆς ἡλικίας. 2. The forty take, as the list of the διατηραί of the year, τὸν τελευταῖον τῶν ἐπώνυμων, the last of the forty lists; in other words those who are now in the last year of the cycle of ages, that is (if at the beginning of the year) are between fifty-nine and sixty years old. To make the words mean the list of those who were in the last year of the cycle *the year before*, as Thumser and Gilbert do, is to do violence to Aristotle's language. 3. The list of ἐφηβοί enrolled in the year assumed is marked by the ἀρχων of the year and by the ἐπώνυμος ὁ τῷ πρότερον ἔ[τε]ι δεδαιτηκώς. The only meaning that can be given to those words is, the ἐπώνυμος that marked also the list of those who the year before had served as διατηραί.¹ Those, therefore, who had served as Arbitrators the previous year were during that year in the last of their forty-two years of liability to military service; for they were still in a list marked by an ἐπώνυμος, and there were but forty-two ἐπώνυμοι; and a youth was enrolled as ἐφηβος in his nineteenth year, ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονότες ('Αθ. πολ. 42, 1). The arithmetic-

¹ Gilbert (*Handbuch* i.² p. 353) strangely interprets the phrase as meaning the Archon of the previous year. His words are: 'Die einzelnen dieser 42 Jahrgänge der Hopliten waren in den Katalogen durch den vorgesetzten Namen des Archon, unter welchem sie eingezeichnet waren, und seines Amtsvorgängers rubriciert. Diese 42 Archonten wurden als die ἐπώνυμοι der 42 Jahrgänge bezeichnet.'

tical problem involved in the passage may be a little confusing at first sight, but the above solution is surely the only possible one, and the phrase ἐξηκοστὸν ἔτος is to be understood in its most obvious modern sense.

As regards errors of the press, it should be said that for a work of this character the book contains remarkably few. It would be too much to expect to find all of the hundreds of references quite correct; but in looking up a considerable number no mistake was found. On p. 346, note 2, however, in the quotation from 'Αθ. πολ. for νόμους read θεσμούς.

But enough of criticism upon details. Until some scholar endowed with equal learning and calmness of judgment and possessing also a high degree, but not too high a degree, of the reconstructive imagination, shall write a genuine constitutional history of Athens, instead of a handbook of Athenian political antiquities from the historical standpoint, we can scarcely expect a better work of its class than this of Thumser's. It will probably be long before that still more difficult task will be performed; meantime we wish for the present volume the widest possible circulation and use. With the additions to our sources of information which may be expected, it will naturally require supplementing and correcting here and there, but will not soon be superseded.

THOMAS DWIGHT GOODELL.

Yale University.

ILBERG ON THE TEXTS OF HIPPOCRATES.

Das Hippocrates-Glossar des Erotianos und seine ursprüngliche Gestalt: von JOHANNES ILBERG (Abhandl. d. phil.-hist. Classe d. königl. Sachs. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften, band xiv. 1893). 2 Mk.

Prolegomena Critica in Hippocratis operum quae feruntur recensione novam; scripsit JOHANNES ILBERG (Teubner, Leipzig, 1894).

THESE two works by Dr. Ilberg deserve notice as a most praiseworthy attempt to reduce to order the critical material available for the text of Hippocrates. The *Prolegomena* falls into two divisions, the first containing a description of the MSS. and

an attempt to constitute their *stemma*, the second an examination of the secondary evidence contained in the glosses and in the commentaries of Galen. The second chapter is of especial interest, and not to students of Hippocrates only, from its bearing on the general question of the transmission of ancient texts. We are in the unusual position of being able to tap the stream of the Hippocrates-tradition at two points before reaching the extant MSS., by means of the glosses of Erotianus (*circ.* A.D. 60) and the commentaries of Galen (*circ.* A.D. 175); and the conclusions of Dr. Ilberg are briefly as follows. The text of Hippocrates used by Erotianus differed to a considerable extent

from that which is represented by our MSS., sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. On the other hand the tradition which Galen selected as best among the numerous authorities known to him (which must be sought in the commentaries themselves, not in the lemmata prefixed to them, which have been gradually corrupted) is substantially the same as that of the best MSS. of Hippocrates now extant. The bearing of this evidence on the general history of textual tradition cannot be examined in detail here, but it deserves notice; and much gratitude is due to Dr. Ilberg for his illuminating labours in the tangled wilderness of the criticism of Hippocrates, and incidentally of Galen.

The examination of the glossary of Erotianus is subsidiary to the *Prolegomena*; and it has the valuable result of recovering the original order of the glossary (which has come down to us mainly in an alphabetically-arranged epitome), while at the same time Dr. Ilberg has been able to make the study of the text used by the glossographer, the result of which has been mentioned above.

It should be added that the *Prolegomena* contains a photographic facsimile of a page from one of the principal manuscripts of Hippocrates, the Cod. Parisinus gr. 2253 (A), of the eleventh century.

F. G. KENYON.

REICHARDT ON THE SATURNIAN.

Der Saturnische Vers in der römischen Kunstdichtung, von ALEXANDER REICHARDT. Nineteenth *Supplementband* of the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, pp. 207—253.

THIS methodical and lucidly written essay is in two parts,—first a collection and review of material, and secondly a systematic discussion of metrical phenomena on the basis of this material. The first part anticipates the second a good deal, as the question of the integrity of the examples necessarily turns in large part on their conformity to standards, and Reichardt finds it necessary to postulate at the outset the rules which he expects to demonstrate afterwards more fully. ‘Kunstdichtung’ with him includes not merely the Saturnians of Andronicus and Naevius, but those of the Scipio epitaphs and some other inscriptions, which he considers to have been composed under the influence of the literary Saturnian. So his treatise covers pretty much the old ground, and deals with the old problems. Nor does it contain much that is new in opinions or results. What novelty of method there is, lies in the rigid exclusion of alien or doubtful material. Popular verses—the ‘rude Saturnians’ or ‘quasi-Saturnians’—are of course barred out altogether; even the Arval song and Mummius’s dedication (*ductu auspicioque*, etc.) do not figure in these pages. This is justifiable: the literary Saturnian was a thing by itself. He also excludes from con-

sideration, as a disturbing element, all verses which bear signs of serious corruption or incompleteness, and in this he is extremely conscientious, throwing out, for instance, the last two verses of the oldest Scipio inscription—*hec cepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe* and *dedet Tempestatebus aide mere-to*—on the ground that they are incomplete at the end.

Reichardt arrays himself with decision on the side of a quantizing Saturnian, and dismisses the word-accent theory of Keller, Thurneysen and Westphal with brief comments that will seem wholly inadequate to the adherents of that doctrine. Proceeding on the assumption that the Saturnian is a quantity-verse, he finds that of his stock of verses and parts of verses, ninety-one conform to a certain scheme, defined by eleven rules, and that fifteen more are brought into conformity by easy and certain emendations, not made wholly for metrical reasons. To these he adds later on two more, making seventeen. This total of 106 (or 108) verses represent, in his view, the usual or normal form of Saturnian. In substance, it is the Saturnian of many previous theorists, as Spengel, L. Müller, Havet. Nineteen remaining verses, which differ from this norm, yet appear to be sound, Reichardt believes to exemplify rarer but admissible forms of the Saturnian. Here, of course, he is on slippery ground, and will not expect to convince everybody. These rarer forms arise:

1. By catalexis of the first half, *without*