

# 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](#)



---

## In Galeni de Placitis Hippocratis *In Galeni de Placitis Hippocratis Et Platonis Libros Observationes Criticae.* *Scriptis* Caeolus Kalbfleisch, Dr. Phil. Berolini 1892. Richard Heinrich. 2 Mk.

Paul Shoeev

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 06 / June 1893, pp 267 - 267

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019794X, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X0019794X](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019794X)

### How to cite this article:

Paul Shoeev (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 267-267 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019794X

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## IN GALENI DE PLACITIS HIPPOCRATIS.

*In Galeni De Placitis Hippocratis Et Platonis Libros Observationes Criticae. Scripsit CAROLUS KALBFLEISCH, Dr. Phil. Berolini 1892. Richard Heinrich. 2 Mk.*

THE writer gives us first a new collation of the Codex Hamiltonianus with Müller's text, undertaken 'exercitationis causa magis quam nova explorandi spe,' and then a critical discussion of some forty loci. He proposes a few plausible emendations and rightly explains a number of passages unnecessarily emended by Müller, justifying his views by diligent citation of Galen's usage. Among the best emendations are: τὸ γοῦν ὀφθαλμῷ εἶναι τί ποτ' ἔστιν for τῷ γοῦν ὀφθαλμῷ ἵνα ᾗ (159, 9 sqq. Müller, 1874) suggested by Diels; ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὴν τῆς μὲν ἡγεμονικῆς ψυχῆς ἀρχὴν ἐν ἐγκεφάλῳ περιέχεσθαι for Müller's ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὴν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ. (184, 9); προσλαμβάνων αὐτῷ for αὐτό (314, 4 sqq.); ἴσθαι for ᾗδεσθαι (441, 2); πέμψεως ('Johannes Schraderus amicus docuit') for πέψεως (714, 13); τῆς δὲ τῶν τεχνῶν κρίσεως ἢν ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι φύσει ποιοῦνται for φύσεως (803, 4 sqq.).

In 384, 2 sqq. the writer shows that μαρτυρεῖ τοῦ yields the reverse of the sense required and proposes καταμαρτυρεῖ τοῦ. Perhaps ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ τῷ is better, if we are

to guess. In 439, 5 sqq. ἀπορεῖν ἐρεῖ τῆς κατὰ τὴν κακίαν γενέσεως οὐτ' αἰτίαν ἔχων εἰπεῖν αὐτῆς may have seemed no looser to Galen than the Platonic τί δὲ δὴ τοῦ ἀδικεῖν (*Gorg.* 509 D) but it does no harm to insert περὶ. In 179, 8 it is not necessary to change πείραν μὴ ὥς εως λαβεῖν to μαθήσεως if we suppose Galen to have had in mind the idea of *Euthydemus* 277 D, E: cf. *Herodian* i. 13. 8. In 349, 13 οὐ μόνον κρίσειν ἔπεσθαι φάσκων ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο κρίσεις εἶναι the author is right in rejecting Müller's αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα, but his own Latin paraphrase 'id ipsum dicere ausum esse perturbationes judicia esse' seems to misrepresent the Greek idiom. αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο (εἰ μοι πρέπει τὰ τοιαῦτα κομψεύεσθαι) is not 'in apposition' with τὰ πάθη... κρίσεις εἶναι as a whole, but with the predicate κρίσεις only. It seems a waste of energy for one scholar to show that συνεχῆς is construed with the dative in Galen, for another to emend ἐπὶ τὰ συνεχῆ τοῦ λόγου τρέφομαι on the strength of this principle, a third to point out the futility of the emendation, and a fourth to review the whole operation, when Macaulay's schoolboy could have done it all. But philologists are like Cicero's Stoics:—'opus enim quaerunt.'

PAUL SHOREY.

University of Chicago.

## ST. BASIL ON THE HOLY SPIRIT, BY C. F. H. JOHNSTON.

*The Book of St. Basil the Great on the Holy Spirit: a revised Text with Notes and Introduction, by C. F. H. JOHNSTON. (Oxford. 1892. Crown 8vo. Pp. lxiiv, 180. 7s. 6d.)*

MR. JOHNSTON and the Clarendon Press deserve the cordial thanks of theological students for this excellent and beautifully printed edition. The 'thirty chapters' of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit are a most important landmark in the development of post-Nicene theology; and their intrinsic excellence recommends their intelligent study as the best possible introduction to what may be called the period of doctrinal settlement which followed the storm and stress of the age of Athanasius.

An edition of this kind may be estimated by two standards; either according as it

advances the existing knowledge of the subject, or in respect of its practical utility to the lecturer and student. The present notice will take account mainly of the latter purpose, for it is here that the merit of the edition is wholly or mainly to be found. The introductory matter in fact, where fresh light on the historical and dogmatic significance of the tract might have been looked for, furnishes so little of the kind that, for all practical purposes, it might advantageously have been cut very much shorter. Without assuming the right to dogmatize in a sphere where opinion is apt to colour the interpretation of fact, I must yet venture to note an inadequate grasp of the history of dogmatic development as the general characteristic of this part of the work. The theological position of the 'Semiarians' (a name that it