pp. 188; 193; 229 and is referred to on pp. 230; 432; 435. Bion Epit. Adon. 87–92 is cited on p. 427, then again on p. 437 for the same purpose. The procedures of the rites described in fr. 4 are repeated several times (e.g. on fr. 4.5 and on p. 333). P. 327 n. 378 on the orthography of ἥπειρα is redundant in view of the fine explanation produced on p. 335. On p. 41 the possibility of Herinna hailing from Laconian Tenos «resta ... aperta» (cf. Neri 1996, 127), but Laconian origin seems to be presupposed on pp. 49 and 52. – Misprints do not disturb reading, even if on p. 347 four occur in a single quotation of Od. 12.86–92, and on p. 384 another two in the quotation of a single Euripidean verse (IA 187). Other minor typos would include p. 70 «corresponded», 199 «Lys. 2.179» for '2.79' (print dots between ὄνειρος and μνήμην), 258 «simmetrical», 373 2nd par. «ὅ» for 'ὅν' (correct on p. 374), 402 3rd line «v. 35» for 'v. 36', 421 «ὁν» for 'ὠν'.

But it is only fair to say that such cases are not representative of the quality of the production.

All loss of classical literature is regrettable, but the loss of Herinna’s ‘poème noire’ is to be particularly regretted. At least we now have an edition of her surviving work daring enough to tell us, often credibly, what the missing parts could contain. The book is the outcome of long, profound reflection on Herinna’s personality and her celebrated poem. It will no doubt become the standard reference work on its subject.

Rethymno

Konstantinos Spanoudakis


With the exception of the ‘Oath’, the work entitled ‘On the Sacred Disease’ is probably the best known among the so-called ‘Hippocratic’ writings. Its (anonymous) author, writing presumably around 450 BCE, criticises ‘magical’ concepts and treatments of epilepsy and advances his own medical account of the nature, cause and development of the disease, its curability and its ‘divine’ aspect. The work is of great interest both for the information it provides about magical and religious beliefs and healing practices in the Greek world, and for the author’s own ideas about (hereditary) disease, the workings and failings of the body, the influence at environmental factors, and especially the role of the brain in providing intelligence and consciousness to the rest of the body. In these respects, it shows similarities with the views of other Greek medical and philosophical writers such as Alcmaeon of Croton and Diogenes of Apollonia. It is written in an attractive and rhetorically elaborate style, and thus provides a powerful testimony to the argumentative and competitive nature of classical Greek medicine.

It is therefore warmly to be welcomed that this work has now been treated for inclusion in the Collection des Universités de France by one of the world’s most distinguished Hippocratic exegetes. Jacques Jouanna’s editions of Hippocratic texts in the Budé-series have been widely acclaimed for their very high standards of textual scholarship, and the present work lives up to the expectations raised by these earlier publications. It provides a meticulous account and a judicious
evaluation of the manuscript tradition, which is reflected in a very careful and generously detailed presentation of the Greek text with (positive) critical apparatus; a French translation which follows the Greek text admirably closely; copiose helpful notes on significant textual variants, the semantics of key terms, questions of interpretation or parallels with other works (including non-medical literary sources like historiography and tragedy, as well as papyri); an extensive introduction discussing the nature, structure and contents of the work and its affinities with its intellectual context; and an index verborum to the Greek text.

There has, of course, been no shortage of scholarly treatments of this fascinating work, and J. acknowledges earlier scholarship on the whole generously and in considerable detail. In particular, there have been several critical editions of the Greek text (most recently by Grensemann in 1968 and Roselli in 1996, both with introduction, translation and notes), and the manuscript tradition has been the subject of various dedicated studies, i.a. by A. Rivier (1962). In addition, there have been several modern translations and numerous interpretive studies (most of which are listed in the bibliography). Thus the degree of novelty of the present publication is not as high as that of some of Jouanna’s other editions – and this is reinforced by the edition-with-commentary format, which inevitably forces him to deal with a number of issues that have been well covered in earlier scholarship. In terms of priority, therefore, one would perhaps have preferred him to devote his energy to some of the less well-studied Hippocratic writings. Still, there is much to be learned from this edition, especially from the notes, which have adopted the proportions of a full-size commentary; and even J.’s accounts of earlier scholarship are illuminating for the balanced and judicious overviews they provide, even if he does not always provide fresh arguments in favour of a particular position taken.

In his introductory ‘Notice’, J. first deals with the nature, structure and unity of the work (pp. x–xxii). He suggests that the work may have been presented orally, although he distinguishes it from ‘epideictic’ works like ‘On Breaths’ and ‘On the Art’ and concludes that the work is a ‘cours’ rather than a ‘discours’, addressed at apprentices rather than a lay audience, thus (implicitly) disagreeing with J. Laskaris’ reading (2002) of the text as a rhetorical speech for a wider, non-medical audience; but J.’s distinction between ‘cours’ and ‘discours’ is without problems, (it does not correspond to an ancient division, and it is difficult to apply) and his arguments for reading ‘On the Sacred Disease’ as an example of the former are based on rather speculative assumptions about lay audiences’ expectations and interests. One wonders whether the long first chapter on religious issues would really be intended only for a medical audience. Moreover, the degree of technical detail is not that much higher than that of ‘On Breaths’, and it

1 Though it is somewhat odd that the bibliography does not list V. Langholf’s ‘Medical Theories in Hippocrates’ (1990), which has a useful discussion (pp. 239–241) of the relationship between medicine and religion, in particular the similarities between the purity rituals which the author of ‘On the Sacred Disease’ himself advocates towards the end of chapter 1 and the ‘holy laws’ attested in Coan inscriptions. Nor does J.’s bibliography list Nestle’s important article ‘Hippocratica’ (Hermes 1938), Kudlien’s ‘Das Göttliche und die Natur’ (Hermes 1977) or Thivel’s paper on ‘Le divin dans la Collection Hippocratique’ (in: La Collection Hippocratique et son rôle dans l’Histoire de la médecine, 1975).

is difficult to imagine that a medical audience would be impressed by the author’s extremely vague therapeutic recommendations in the final chapter.\(^1\)

J. follows recent scholarship in defending the unity of the treatise and the authenticity of chapters 14–17. He then discusses the author’s relationship to magic, religious healing and the divine (pp. xxii–xxxix), drawing numerous illuminating parallels with other literary sources of the time (also in his notes to chapter I). Here, it would have merited some discussion whether the author is attacking one specific group of magical healers (as J. seems to assume) or rather a cluster of ideas not necessarily held by the same group of people (the latter is suggested, e.g., by the change of perspective in ch. I, 10). More in general, J.’s use of stereotypes like ‘magical medicine’ or ‘rational medicine’ does not do sufficient justice to the plurality of magical and religious beliefs and healing practices in the author’s time. J. interestingly associates (p. xxxiii) the classification of symptoms and their attribution to different named gods as practised by «la médecine magico-religieuse» with the classifications of ‘Cnidian medicine’ on the ground that «la médecine magico-religieuse, telle qu’elle apparaît à travers le mirroir, même déformant, de l’auteur hippocratique, n’a pas le caractère miraculeux et incroyable des récits de guérison conservés sur les stèles d’Épidaure». But this generalisation takes no account of the more ‘rational’ elements of temple medicine, and it sits somewhat uneasily with J.’s (correct) observation (p. xxxviii) that the author is not in conflict with «la religion des sanctuaires des grands dieux guérisseurs, Apollon ou Asclépios» (a point reiterated on p. 63 [note 3 to p. 9]).

J. then discusses the ‘medical’ aspects of the work, especially the author’s account of the nature and causes of the disease (pp. xxxix–lxx) with its underlying anatomical and physiological presuppositions, and the relationship to ideas of the time, such as those held by Alcmaeon and Diogenes (lxi–lxx). This is useful, though covering largely familiar territory, as is that old question about the relationship between ‘On the Sacred Disease’ and ‘Airs Waters Places’, where J. sides with the view that the works are by the same author and that the former is the earlier one, though J.’s arguments are not very compelling and somewhat circular (the fact that the author does not ‘yet’ use the term ἐκληρικικός and is not ‘yet’ familiar with the notion of black bile as a cause of epilepsy (lxxi–lxxiv)).

The rest of the introduction (pp. lxxiv–cxxxii) is devoted to an extensive discussion of the textual tradition, the relationship between the various manuscripts, and the indirect authenticity of chapters 1–3. Here, on p. cxxv (cf. p. ix), J. notes the surprising fact that Galen makes hardly any use of this text, even though, of all the ‘Hippocratic’ treatises, it is the one that most explicitly promotes the view that the brain is the seat of reason. J. offers no new positive explanation for this, although he does point out that Galen’s use (in his ‘Commentary on Joints’) of ‘On the Sacred Disease’ to prove a point of Hippocratic lexicography makes it very unlikely that Galen regarded the work as spurious, even though that is suggested by an anonymous scholion on his ‘Commentary on Prognostic’. Two observations may be made

\(^1\) J. reads this differently: «Ainsi s’expliquerait également que l’auteur oriente la fin de sa conclusion vers des conseils au médecin sur ce qu’il doit savoir pour traiter correctement le malade» (pp. xii–xiii). But these ‘conseils’ are extremely general and unspecific, and the author does not address doctors there but explains what ‘the doctor’ (p. 32,8) must do. It is not at all inconceivable that these words are spoken by a doctor defending the medical art to a non-medical audience.

\(^2\) Here, on p. cxxiv (cf. p. ix), J. notes the surprising fact that Galen makes hardly any use of this text, even though, of all the ‘Hippocratic’ treatises, it is the one that most explicitly promotes the view that the brain is the seat of reason. J. offers no new positive explanation for this, although he does point out that Galen’s use (in his ‘Commentary on Joints’) of ‘On the Sacred Disease’ to prove a point of Hippocratic lexicography makes it very unlikely that Galen regarded the work as spurious, even though that is suggested by an anonymous scholion on his ‘Commentary on Prognostic’. Two observations may be made
earlier work), e.g. the account of one of the recentiores, the Corsinianus 1410, a manuscript that has clearly been a source of fascination for J. (and others) but which, for all its coddological interest, ultimately has no independent value for the constitution of the text. J. himself concedes this and accepts (p. xcv) that, strictly speaking, it should not therefore figure in the apparatus criticus. J. nevertheless records all the readings of Co. «afin que le lecteur ait la possibilité de se faire son opinion personnelle à partir des faits». Yet this does raise the question of the status of those cases where J. prefers the reading of Co. over the main witnesses Θ and M, especially when this concerns issues of more than mere coddological or dialectal interest (e.g. in p. 29,11 τέος Co.: τε ὑδας Θ M). ¹

Text and facing translation cover 33 (double) pages; notes are printed at the bottom of the page or as ‘notes complémentaires’ at the back. J.’s handling of the Greek text is on the whole more conservative than Grensemann’s and more appreciative of stylistic patterns such as repetition and ring-composition. The apparatus is positive and extremely informative, listing virtually all variations between Θ and M (as of p. 17,2 Co.), even many dialectal ones (although one sometimes wonders what the point is, from a textual perspective, of presenting variations such as καθαρία and καθάθα in p. 19,3 as textual variants). The translation is on the whole accurate, and the notes accompanying the translation are very full and helpful.

Some queries: on p. 4, there is some unclarity about the status of the explanations offered for the magicians’ dietary prescriptions, printed in brackets. J. takes these as expressing the author’s own rationalisations, except the final one on p. 4,5, where the infinitive ίδιου indicates that this is reported speech (cf. p. 47); but what about the penultimate parenthesis θευντῶν γὰρ τὸ μὲλέν (5,2)? There is no syntactical indication that this is the author’s view rather than that of his opponents. J. refers (p. 46) to Pythagorean doctrine and to a passage in ‘On Regimen’, but leaves it open whether an explanation like this is in accordance with the author’s «perspective d’une médecine rationnelle» (p. 41). – Considering J.’s stress (p. viii) on the significance of the Greek religious mentality, it is disappointing that when it comes to the culmination of the author’s own religious argument in section I,13 (pp. 9,1–10,3), J. has not more to say than just «C’est l’un des passages les plus remarquables de la littérature païenne sur le divin». Related to this, in p. 10,1, one regrets the absence of a note on the intriguing textual omission (in Θ) of the words ἀλλ’ ἕτε γαϊτο πρότερον ἐγνμεν μῦνος, τοῦτο ἐξαιρετικάμενον (mentioned on p. lxxv but not discussed): is this just a matter of haplography of -μενος or is there more to it?² – On p. 10,7 one wonders why πρώτος has not been translated as ‘cause déclenchante’ as on p. 2,4 (to preserve the repetition of the Greek text). – On p. 29,11 in the famous chapter XVI on intelligence (or, perhaps better, ‘consciousness’, φύνης), I think that, from a textual perspective, there is little point in obelicising φύνης or proposing the emendation πνεύμης (there is no reference to locomotion in this chapter); presumably the author wrote φύνης, and got subsequently involved in a slight contradiction on p. 11,7, but the contradiction is softened by the fact that the point there is that the heart and the diaphragm are not the sources or organs by which we think (cf. p. 30,17–18).

here: (i) the author’s statement that the brain is the seat of all mental affections, including emotions and desire, sits uneasily with Galen’s (and Plato’s) view that spirit resides in the chest and the emotions in the liver; (ii) Galen may therefore have been uncertain about the work’s authenticity, and hence have been reluctant to use it more frequently.

¹ It should be noted that in all the four instances where Co. has a more significant diversion from the other MSS, as discussed by Grensemann (1968, p. 41), J. prefers the reading of Θ and M over that of Co.

² Cf. my own discussion of this passage in ‘Apeiron’ 1990, 110–111, esp. n. 52.
A final word regarding presentation and accessibility. The edition is not particularly user-friendly. Specialists will regret the absence of an *index locorum* (listing all passages mentioned in the introduction and the notes would have been extremely helpful), while non-specialists will be disappointed by the absence of a French index of names and subjects mentioned in the text as well as the ‘notice’ and ‘Notes’. This may be a matter of general Budé-policy; but it is worth asking whether the time is right for this to change, for the purpose of the Budé-series has always been to make texts accessible to the non-specialist as well. In the case of ancient medical texts, this means: to medical historians, who today often lack the necessary linguistic skills to read the texts in the original, but who would be greatly helped by a good General Index in a modern language. Secondly, although J. refers to the Littré pagination and chapter division, as well as that of W. H. S. Jones’ (in vol. 2 of the Loeb edition), it is confusing that his numeration of sections within a chapter differs significantly from Grensemann’s. Whatever the reasons for this, it will give rise to much confusion when using this edition in combination with older literature that still refers to Grensemann’s section division. Ancient medicine is notorious (even among classicists) for its intimidating reference systems, and adding further scope for confusion does not help.

To sum up, J. deserves to be congratulated for this excellent contribution to our understanding of this important text within its intellectual context. One can only hope that he will continue to do so for other, less well-known Greek medical texts as well.

Newcastle upon Tyne  

Philip van der Eijk

---
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