

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](#)



Wellmann's *Fragments of the Greek Physicians Die Fragmentesammltmg der Griechischen Aertze*. Band I. Die Fragmente der Sikelischen Aerzte Akron, Philistion, und des Diokles von Karystos. Herausgegeben M. von Wellmann. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1901. Pp. 254. (Preis. M. 10).

T. Clifford Allbutt

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 04 / May 1902, pp 220 - 222
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206008, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206008

How to cite this article:

T. Clifford Allbutt (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 220-222 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206008

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BLAYDES ON EURIPIDES.

Adversaria Critica in Euripidem. Scripsit ac Collegit F. H. M. BLAYDES, M.A., LL.D. Halis Saxonum. 1901. 10 M.

It is some sixty years ago since the Rev. Dr. Blaydes published his first edition of a classical writer, namely an edition of a portion of Aristophanes. In 1859 he issued an edition of the trilogy of Sophocles in the *Bibliotheca Classica*; the rest of the plays were issued separately (and by another publisher) somewhere between 1870 and 1880. The Sophocles completed, Dr. Blaydes returned to his first love, and began a complete edition of Aristophanes on a large scale. It was completed in thirteen octavo volumes.

One would have imagined that such an output would have sufficed any ordinary editor; but Dr. Blaydes is not an ordinary editor, by any manner of means. Within the last decade we have had about ten volumes of '*Adversaria Critica*,' on the fragments of the Greek comic Poets, the Tragic fragments, on 'various Greek and Latin poets,' complete editions of the Aeschylean trilogy; '*adversaria in Aristophanem, Sophoclem, Aeschylum*'; and last of all, a portly tome of nearly 600 pages of *adversaria* upon Euripides. No! not 'last of all'; for during the last few weeks another volume has appeared—'*Adversaria in Hero-*

dotum;' and a further volume '*Spicilegium Aeschyleum*' is announced as '*sub prelo.*' Shades of Porson and Dobree!

The present collection of notes and *adversaria* does not differ materially, in method—or the lack of it—from Dr. Blaydes' other volumes. There is a vast number of parallel passages—not all of them relevant—a great many wanton alterations of the text, introduced by 'qu.,' 'leg.,' 'malim,' and so forth, and a certain amount of exegetical material. All this material is thrown together without much regard to the first duty of an editor—careful revision; hence the book is somewhat of a '*rudis indigestaque moles.*' Dr. Blaydes sows with the sack; this besetting fault has never left him during his whole editorial career.

Still, when all is said and done, there is a mass of useful grain among the chaff; but it requires winnowing out. The book is curiously annoying in one particular; it scarcely ever notices recent editions, or the work of scholars in such publications as the *Journal of Philology* or the *Classical Review*. Even such well-known works as Dr. Sandys' edition of the *Bacchae*, or Dr. Verrall's *Medea*, appear unknown to Dr. Blaydes.

The present volume is dedicated to Prof. Robinson Ellis.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

WELLMANN'S FRAGMENTS OF THE GREEK PHYSICIANS.

Die Fragmentesammlung der Griechischen Aerzte. Band I. Die Fragmente der Sikelischen Aerzte Akron, Philistion, und des Diokles von Karystos. Herausgegeben von M. WELLMANN. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1901. Pp. 254. (Preis. M. 10).

THE comparative appreciation of the various writings of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* does not even yet make rapid or continuous progress, in spite of the admirable labours of Littré, Daremberg, Greenhill, Ilberg, Kühlewein, and others. The testimony even of Galen himself on this subject is hesitating and contradictory; it has been necessary therefore to rely on the somewhat

slippery ground of critical methods without definite testimony.

No little interest then was aroused in the subject by the discovery of the medical papyrus, now in the British Museum, described in this *Journal* by Mr. Kenyon in June 1892. This papyrus, dating not later than the Second Century A.D., is based in part upon Menon's compilation of Aristotelian notes: this part contains a large number of references to Greek medical writers; and if by means of these, or of any of them, certain extant treatises could be authentically attributed to particular authors a standard of comparison, now sadly wanting, would be supplied. Without repeating what I stated on this subject in

the Classical Review in 1898, I may say that to attribute, for example, even any one treatise of the Corpus definitely to Hippocrates himself would give us a 'point de prise' which now is wanting. Such and no less an attribution was boldly proclaimed by a recent critic,¹ and very startling would have been the results of the application of it to the Canon, had the apparent authorship stood the test of criticism. If this attribution were accepted it is not too much to say that on the one hand our conception of the genius of Hippocrates would, to say the least, be profoundly altered; and on the other hand that the current conceptions of the Greek Schools and their doctrines would be turned topsy-turvy.

The treatises of the Hippocratic scriptures are by no means congruous in doctrine; on the contrary they are very inconsistent, some of them even in polemical opposition. A few of these treatises we now regard as scientific in method, founded, that is, upon reason tempered by experience; and such we have been wont to attribute to the School of Cos, some of them indeed more or less directly to the Master himself. So firmly indeed was this opinion held that with modern physicians the phrase 'Hippocratic Method' became current to signify cautious induction from clinical observation, after the manner of our own Sydenham; as opposed not only to dogmatic or fantastic philosophizings and dialectics, but even to more sober use of logical and speculative thought. The School of Cos leaned to the former habit, that of Cnidos to the latter. To Hippocrates himself it is usual to attribute certain treatises which, combining breadth of view with close observation of Nature, seem to justify his claim to a place beside the greatest of the ancients.

If then it should suddenly appear that to Hippocrates must be assigned not merely a work of Cnidian cast, but one indeed of the most fantastic of a sophistical kind, it is evident that the bearer of this name must descend from his pedestal; that the works hitherto attributed to him must have been written by some other person, even more mythical than Homer. Furthermore it would soon appear that by such a criterion the whole Canon would have to be re-shuffled and re-distributed. Now from the more metaphysical, the more formalizing side of the Hippocratic Collection, such a particular work, the *Περὶ φύσων*, a treatise fanciful and

metaphysical beyond almost any of them, seemed in the Menonian Aristotle to be attributed to the great Hippocrates himself. Thus a confusion was set agoing; and voices were heard to declare that, contrary to all tradition of him, Hippocrates was a speculative, and even fantastic thinker: that he was indeed a forerunner of that Pneumatic School on the history of which, as set forth by Max Wellmann, I wrote a short notice in the 9th volume of this Journal (*C.R.* Vol. ix. p. 162, *et seq.*)

In the volume now before me, which forms the first of a new edition of the Fragments of the Greek Physicians, Max Wellmann presents us with the Fragments of Diocles of Carystos (fl. c. 400—350), and of the Sicilian physicians Akron, and Philistion. The volume contains also a chapter on the *Περὶ καρδίας* of the Hippocratic Collection, and one on a Tractate of Vindicianus, whose historical relation to Diocles, by way of Soranus, is made manifest by a careful comparison. I sincerely hope that the indisposition, to which the learned Editor attributes some delay in this work, is past; and that it may not interfere again with his admirable labours.

In this volume Wellmann relieves us, at any rate for the present, of turning the Hippocratic Canon inside out. He agrees with Diels (*Hermes* xxviii) and with Ilberg (*Phil. Woch.* 1897, f. 1153) that the Menonian Papyrus is in error; and that the *Περὶ φύσων*, although a part of the original Corpus, probably belongs as little to Hippocrates as any treatise in it can be said to do. Both by its style and its tendency indeed it is marked off from all the other treatises of the Collection, being a compromise between the teaching of the Sicilian physicians and that of Diogenes of Apollonia. Diels has supported the prevalent opinion that a collection, or Corpus, of the Hippocratic writings was in existence before the Menon-Aristotle; and that the *Περὶ φύσων* was contained in it—that is in the Fourth Century, not long after the time of Hippocrates. In support of this opinion the testimony of Diocles of Carystos is very important. Diocles, an eminent Athenian physician with some connection with the Sicilian School, who flourished between the time of Hippocrates and the rise of the school of Alexandria, was after Hippocrates the greatest physician of the period, and was known as *ἄλλος Ἱπποκράτης*; Pliny speaks of Diocles as standing next in renown to the great Hippocrates. Few of the writings of this century remained even

¹ Cf. 'Die geschichtliche Entwicklung d. sog. Hippokratischen Medicin in Lichte d. neuesten Forschung; von Dr. Med. Spaet, Berlin, 1897.

in Galen's time; and little of their conditions of life; and among the few names of the disciples of Cos now known to us that of Diocles seems to be by far the most important. His *Περὶ παρασκευῆς ἀνατομικῆς* and *Περὶ ὑγιεινῶν*, and a work on the Diseases of women were most noted. Diocles seems to have been a learned and observant physician; but it appears to me, not in the case of Diocles only, that on the fall of Greek political freedom the value if not the activity of Greek thought altered greatly; it busied itself more and more with speculations on entities; and the sundry 'pneumatic' doctrines lurking in the Hippocratic writings sprang into dominance at the expense of the closer observation of nature.

Wellmann, by an ingenious and convincing comparison, finds a source for much of Diocles in the tract of Vindicianus, the importance of which he was fortunate enough to discover. Vindicianus was physician to the Emperor Valentinian, and in this essay he seems to have taken the work of Diocles, as handed down by Soranus of Ephesus, as his model. I see in Smith's *Dict. of Biog.* (Art. Vindicianus) the late Dr. Greenhill tells us that St. Augustine gives Vindicianus a high character for skill, wisdom, and learning. Putting together the known Fragments of Diocles and the Tract of Vindicianus, Wellmann concludes not only that the Hippocratic Collection existed in the time of Diocles, but also that Diocles may well have been himself the collector; and that in this sense he bore the name of ἄλλος Ἱπποκράτης after a more intimate fashion than we had supposed. Now internal evidence suggests that the 'sophistisches Machwerk' (the *Περὶ φύσιν*) was the work of Diocles, and if this be the case the error of Menon in attributing this treatise to Hippocrates II. (the Great) is very ingeniously explained. Wellmann ends his chapter ironically enough, however, with the opinion that the 'creator of the Hippocratic

Corpus,' if such he were, seems to have known about as much or as little of the 'echten grossen Hippocrates' as we do.

In his second chapter Wellmann compares the doctrines of Diocles, of Philistion of Locri and of Acron of Agrigentum; and traces their dependence upon Empedocles; and so I may add, upon Pythagoras who was a sort of father of Greek medicine: he points out that one of the great distinctions between the Coan and the Sicilian Schools is in the seat of the soul (Seele), which the Coan School place in the brain, the Sicilian in the heart. Akron wrote *Περὶ τροφῆς ὑγιεινῶν* of which crumbs rather than fragments remain. The most interesting story we know of him is that during the plague he burnt fragrant woods both to purify the general air and to disinfect the patient himself. Philistion wrote on Surgery (Oribasius) and also on Diet. It is interesting to observe how from the earliest (Homeric) times all these Greek Schools kept clear of religious cult and strongly enforced the wise management of life.

In the chapter on the Hippocratic treatise *Περὶ καρδίας* Wellmann finds a close connection between the author of this work, the Fragments of Diocles, and Plato. He regards the *Περὶ καρδίας* as written under the influence of the Sicilian school, and especially of Philistion; and notes that in its correctness of human anatomy it supports the belief that in its regard for anatomy the Sicilian School followed that of Alcmaeon of Crotona.

Of the technical scholarship of this instalment of the edition of the Greek medical Fragments I am no adequate judge; but speaking as a physician and, more or less, as a historian, I may be permitted to express the great interest I have found in reading it, and in the manner in which Max Wellmann has dealt with materials of much importance in these respects. I hope the future volumes of the series may be no less interesting and no less skilfully edited.

T. CLIFFORD ALBUTT.

KONSTANTINIDES' GREEK LEXICON.

Liddell and Scott in Modern Greek: Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης Ἀνέστη Κωνσταντινίδου. τόμος πρῶτος A, B, Γ, Δ, σελ. xxxii. + 669.

THE auspicious appearance of such monumental dictionaries as the *Historical English*

Dictionary and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* now in progress, have raised such reasonable claims to a worthy compeer for the Greek language, that no ordinary lexicon, however copious and elaborate, can any longer satisfy the legitimate longings of earnest Greek students. For whereas they