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Introduction

Les travaux lexicographiques n’ont point de fin.
ÉMILE LITTRÉ, Dict. de la langue française, Suppl. p. 1

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very much coming to hear about our Hippocratic work in Hamburg. I feel deeply obliged also to Señor LÓPEZ FÉREZ for his kindly invitation to me and my colleague, A. ANASTASSIOU. It took about fifty-five years until the *Index Hippocraticus* and the Supplement were printed and during thirty-six years I was a member of the group that in former times was called *équipe hippocratique*. Of course the above printed sentence of ÉMILE LITTRÉ (we choose it as motto of our Supplement) does not allude to the fifty-five years of work but to the fact that we have become resigned to finding things that need to be corrected. Before speaking about the projects themselves, how they started, why the Index took an incredibly long time, I would like to talk about our two authors, Hippocrates and Galen. At the end I shall show, how to use the testimonies, and I shall tell about the future—or non-future—of the Hamburg Thesaurus.

**Corpus Hippocraticum — Corpus Galenicum**

**Rank and Size**

Both authors are not very well known. Having worked in this area nearly all my life, I sometimes ask myself whether I could explain my interest in them. Even many philologists do not know the topics and the size of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* and *Corpus Galenicum*. As for Hippocrates many scholars know the name and that there is a Doctor’s oath, which is discussed intensely but very often in an incompetent way. Galen on the other hand has had a bad image for centuries. The philologists dislike his writings because he was a verbose Asianic author. Like Aristotle he was highly estimated by the Arabs and so he dominated European medicine. Therefore, the physicians had to argue against his theories nearly until modern times.—When I was looking for a way to show the importance of the ancient Greek authors Hippocrates and Galen, first I examined the data base files of the CD-ROM of the Irvine TLG: *Galen’s* Greek text contains about 2.5 million words,¹ and so he is the largest profane author. Then I looked for old authors larger than the Hippocratic corpus and I found *Aristotle* with a

¹Not included the tractates which survived only in translations: In the testimonies we cite four lost partly and eleven lost totally in Greek. And this does not include the Pseudo-Galenica.
third of Galen’s text (851.322 words), followed by Plato with a quarter of Galen’s text (591.211 words). Then comes Hippocrates with a seventh of Galen’s text (369.293 words).

My Corpus Hippocraticum

At http://www.med.virginia.edu/hs-library/historical/antiqua/textn.htm I found an exhibition Antiqua Medicina: From Homer to Vesalius. There are two pages about the Corpus Hippocraticum containing some wrong facts and showing little interest in historical development of science.\(^1\) Well, I think the way the Corpus Hip-

---

\(^1\)The framed boxes are my addition.

THE HUMORAL THEORY

The elaborate general doctrine of the Four Humors endured through many centuries and is central to the tenets of the Hippocratic Corpus. It was grounded on the Empedoclean principle of the four supposed elements: earth, air, fire and water. The four constituent elements, or humors, in man were identified analogously as phlegm, blood, yellow bile and black bile, all of which had to be in correct proportion to one another. The fourfold pattern was infinitely adaptable: to the seasons, the winds, the elements, and even, in due course, to the Evangelists. It offered a kind of universal holdall, in which tastes, temperaments, and a surprising number of diseases could find loose accommodation. Though virtually worthless as a theory, it remained the fundamental prop of European medicine for over two millennia.

There is something subtly seductive about the four humors: their widespread and lasting impact on European medical thought has been out of proportion to their medical value. The success of the humoral theory put a heavy brake on physiological research since there were few phenomena for which the humors could not be made to yield some sort of easy explanation.

GREEK ORTHOPÆDICS

Orthopaedics originally was the branch of ancient Greek surgery that concerned itself with reducing or realigning bodily distortions. It is thought that it was strongly influenced by the techniques of treating athletes in the gymasia. So far as written sources are concerned, the basic information comes indirectly from three Hippocratic treatises: Joints, Fractures and Surgery. These works are not extant but their contents were transmitted to the Western world by way of Greek manuscripts compiled by Apollonius in the first century BCE and by Soranus in the second century CE. Of all the subjects covered in the Hippocratic corpus, those volumes treating dislocations and fractures demonstrate the most affinity to modern technique and practice.

THE HIPPOCRATIC CORPUS

The Hippocratic Corpus is a library, or rather, the remains of a library. Although the thirty-four books which are included in the Collection were attributed to Hippocrates himself in antiquity, scholars now know that they were in all likelihood composed between the sixth and fourth centuries BCE. Between the career of Hippocrates and the pre-Socratic philosophers a special kind of prose for medical writings was developed in Greece. Although the island home of Hippocrates is located within what was a Doric speaking region, the medical writers of Cos who developed the Hippocratic treatises appropriated the dialect of philosophy, that is Ionic. The
pocraticum is described there is not my point of view. — No Classical philologist or philosopher would dare to doubt that the works of Plato or Aristotle were important not only during antiquity but also nowadays, that is in respect to history and the development of European culture. What about Hippocrates? Two hundred and fifty years ago in an old German Encyclopedia with a remarkably long title

The use of Ionic instead of the native Doric dialect is analogous to the practice of Renaissance scientists, such as Andreas Vesalius, using Latin instead of the vernacular for their treatises.

One of its earliest specimens is the Hippocratic tract *Ancient Medicine* by an anonymous 5th century physician devoted to traditional lore and technique, though familiar with contemporary theory. Ancient Medicine is one of two polemical works in the Hippocratic corpus. Both *Ancient Medicine* and *On Epilepsy* attack the divine origin of disease and the intrusion of hypothetical philosophers into medicine.

1 I would like to mention two treatises I like for personal reasons: The author of *De morbo sacro* saw that the brains of sheep suffering from a kind of falling sickness had altered their shape and so he guessed that the falling sickness of human beings might be caused by sickness of their brains too. Thirty years ago this way of solving a problem seemed very odd to me. — The author of *De genitura pueri* tried to argue against a stupid idea, we can still find nowadays: If a wife remains childless it may be a reason for divorce because it is her fault. On the other hand a little son is the living proof of his father’s strength. Why do babies resemble both their parents? Why do childless widows have babies with a new husband? — He took twenty eggs and had a hen sit on them and opened one egg a day. He presumably saw chickens getting out of eggs—and this is indeed interesting to look at and very impressive. Unfortunately he thought that a baby is born because it does not have enough food in its mother’s womb and that the baby must try to free itself.

the author calls him “sovereign of the physicians”. What about his writings? I even met people who thought that the Hippocratic writings might be a collection of cryptic fragments. If this were true, one might imagine that scholars would be more interested than they are now. There are two book-titles describing important aspects of the Hippocratic corpus: JAMES LONGRIGG called his book Greek rational medicine. Philosophy and medicine from Alcmaeon to the Alexandrians and JACQUES JOUANNA Hippocrate. Pour une archéologie de l’école de Cnide. This means that many of the nearly seventy treatises of the collection were written in the 5th or 4th century B.C. They are the oldest medical writings of the west and written in Ionic dialect, the dialect of scientific prose. They show Ionic rationalism, the authors argue in a way common to us. Some of these writings are mere manuals but in some of them the authors argue against wrong ideas. So these tractates are ascribed to different schools. One can perceive older sources—partly they have remained in the corpus as parallel texts—that means textual archaeology. These sources in the gynaecological writings go partly back to Egypt. We can guess this from the exotic drugs the authors knew—among other things. Of course there are from time to time attempts to discover the genuine Hippocratic works of the corpus. To prove that, I may quote a sentence from an announcement of the first volume of our testimonies: Others can note the rarity of quotations from Sacred disease and Ancient medicine, treatises highly prized to day for their allegedly Hippocratic origin but not regarded by Galen as coming from the pen or from close associates of Hippocrates himself.

Corpus Galenicum—Galen commenting on Hippocrates

The most voluminous antique secular texts in the Greek language were written by an author who considered himself both philosopher and physician. In the already mentioned ZEDLER Universallexikon 500 books concerning medicine and 250 books on other subjects are ascribed to him. The G. FICHTNER


\[1\text{JAMES LONGRIGG, Greek rational medicine. Philosophy and medicine from Alcmaeon to the Alexandrians, London 1993.}\]

\[2\text{JACQUES JOUANNA, Hippocrate. Pour une archéologie de l’école de Cnide, Paris 1974.}\]

\[3\text{Medical History, July 1999, 43, p. 419}\]

\[4\text{The Father Iohannes Chrysostomos even wrote about a third more.}\]
pus Galenicum, compiling information about books mentioned with the name of Galen, summons up to 440 titles. Nevertheless, he was neglected by philology just like rhetoricians and the Early Fathers. To the Corpus Hippocraticum he is important because of his commentaries and commenting books on about twenty books of Hippocrates. Comparing the Littré Hippocrates edition we learn that Galen commented on more than half the Corpus Hippocraticum. His interest being selective, he neglected for instance the Coan Prognoses and the nosological books. This is also evidenced by our collection of testimonies.

Questions of method—scientific and technical

To start a lexicon, a concordance or an word-index needs planning and preparations. When it is finished, one then knows the way one should have done it. Nobody can divine the amount of labor and time needed to create a single page of any lexicon unless he himself has done Lexicon work. Besides we should never forget how much the technique of working has been facilitated during the last century: Typewriter, copying-machine, the computer with its special hardware and software.

Preparing our small documentation for the fifty years’ anniversary of the Hamburg Thesaurus, I read letters of the founding period. Doing this, I noticed how much information on the technique of preparation they contained. At first I smiled just, since I was well-acquainted with the author. Later, planning our testimonies and composing a kind of logbook to remember details (about titles, tricks of word processing, and so on) I realized the importance of those technical problems. A

---

1 G. Fichtner, Corpus Galenicum. Verzeichnis der galenischen und pseudogalenischen Schriften, Tübingen: Institut für Geschichte der Medizin (published by the author).
2 An important set of commentaries from the second century CE does survive (J. Mansfeld, Prolegomena. Questions to be settled before the study of an author, or a text, Leiden 1994 [Philosophia Antiqua 61], p. 3).
4 Nine of which are totally lost, two survived in translated form.
scientific problem for all lexicographic projects is the selection of the best editions (and the question of how to cite them). At the very beginning one must think of the time of publication: will the readers then be given access to the texts used?\(^1\) And an important part of the preface of any lexicon will be the explanation of references. For Hippocrates and Galen this is a really annoying problem that never will be solved due to the fantasy of philologists creating new abbreviations.

There are presumably fundamental differences between the planning of general and special lexica and dictionaries: Writing this text I learned that I may be able to imagine the requirements for planning special lexica by making card-indexes, lemmatizing and so on but that I do not know anything about preparing a general dictionary—I think of basic questions. I suppose that there are many ἀγραπτοὶ νόμοι (unwritten laws).\(^2\) When we use a general dictionary we presuppose that it is good and without mistakes: Preparing an article of our index I first would look into the LSJ (Liddle-Scott-Jones) to get a general impression of a word and its problems; then I looked into the Diccionario Griego-Español (DGE) in respect of actuality. If there were difficulties we looked into the Dindorf-Thesaurus of 1848–1854 because there is still a lot of information dropped by the LSJ-editors.

Why and when ought we to use special indices and lexica? For reading a certain author’s text, they are normally difficult to use for different reasons: on the one hand they contain too much information; on the other they give very little information if we think about concordances or pure indices with masses of numbers. But together they all provide us with division of labor. If we use them in the right way we can find very useful hints. But only if they are known and used! In the case of the Index Hippocraticus there are instances, where using it would have avoided errors: Unfortunately the editors of the newest Supplement of LSJ did not know it. Nor was it known to the editor of a Lexicon to Hippocrates in modern Greek.\(^3\) JAQUES JOUANNA says of the Loeb edition of Epidemics V and VII that the editor might have avoided some mistakes, had he used our index.

---

\(^1\)In this regard I can relate a truly Danaic gift: The DGE cites the Hippocratic treatise De hebdomadibus using a new edition by CHARES Toul. The text is really better than that of the ROSCHER edition. It is printed by the Academy of Athens—but first of all it is impossible to find it by common bibliographical methods. The next surprise was that the apparatus criticus was not understandable when we looked for variants. The printed manuscript had not been finished by the author.

\(^2\)E. T. WITHINGTON, known as an interpreter of surgical treatises, was responsible for integration of the Hippocratic vocabulary into LSJ: according to the preface he read the Hippocratic writings and made excerpts—how did he know the words to integrate? As far as we know he did his job very well.— And I want to add an anecdote we cannot verify: PAUL MAAS worked 1940 at the LSJ. He is said to have informed the founder of the Thesaurus BRUNO SNELL, that the LSJ staff had their material in college maps.

\(^3\)A. APOSTOLIDIS, Ἐφημερευτικό Λεξικό ποιητών λέξων τοῦ Ἰπποκράτους, Athens 1997.
Why did we not write a Lexicon Hippocraticum?

Why did we not write a *Lexicon Hippocraticum*? Why did the directors of the Hamburg Thesaurus not prefer a modern lexicon to a word index? Indeed this index took a long time to publish. It contains masses of numbers, only few Latin translations and a lot of manuscript variants. The Latin translations were chosen of course after the model of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. The integration of nearly all important variants grants that the index retains its value despite modern editions.

To answer the question “Why not a lexicon”, I have to go back to the first days of the Hamburg Thesaurus. In autumn of 1944 BRUNO SNELL started in Hamburg an *Archiv für griechische Lexikographie*. It was intended as a collection of all Greek words to provide a base for special lexica. At this archive on the 4th of April, 1945 HANS DILLER started a lexicon to the *Corpus Hippocraticum*.1

When I became a member of the Hippocratic staff in 1963 the situation was as follows: At the very beginning the Hippocratic texts had been written to a card-index. Because in those times there was lack of paper, the cards were very small but began with small text excerpts of five lines.2 The best editions were chosen. To get better texts than those in the LITTRÉ edition, medieval manuscripts were collated, editors for provisional editions were sought, and editions were proposed as doctoral theses. Because in scientific texts, text variants very often are of equal worth, excerpts were also made from the apparatuses of the modern editions. This preliminary work was finished about 1957 and resulted in more than sixty indices. By 1959 they were combined in a so-called general index.

Now the time had come to write some specimens of the still intended Hippocratic lexicon. Prepositions were chosen—I suppose to avoid problems with questions concerning the History of medicine. That went wrong. A new redactor tested the substantive ηιοκα. HANS DILLER, then in Kiel, but still esteemed as an authority, did not like it either. At that time the director of the Thesaurus had decided that he wanted a mere word index of the old LITTRÉ edition without any information or variants. It was to be finished within three years. The only reminiscence of the formerly planned lexicon was the incorporation of the old Hippocratic lexica

---

1The new name *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* was chosen in 1950. Of course the fifty years old warning of HERMANN DIELS translated in the LSJ preface was mentioned in the correspondence. The new name was chosen because the *Fédération des Associations d’Etudes Classiques* wanted it. Already at that time most of the Thesaurus budget was spent for the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*.

2Later on it became too expensive; so one word (and its lemma) was written on the cards.
of Erotian and Galen.¹ This revised plan was accepted by the administration of the “Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft” (DFG) who gave money for some staff. But alas, that project would have meant checking the lemmatization with LSJ, and altering the references from newer editions to the Littré edition. If this plan had been realized, the index would be waste paper to day because in the meantime about sixty-seven new editions have been published.² So a revolution was started. First prepositions were sorted according to cases and homonyms were separated. If a word of the Littré edition was not in any of the manuscripts, the notation of variants seemed necessary. And in time the manuscript took on the hybrid nature of lexicon and word index we see to day (translations if necessary, and a formal, grammatical subdivision). In reality any collation of a new manuscript was a risk, because the time plan had to be altered.³ The consequence was that this work was stopped in 1976. In 1978 the DFG resumed subsidizing for eighteen months, with the index to be completed by 1980.⁴ Then we decided to publish the index in four parts and not as a single volume. Because it took until 1985 until the first part was published Mr. Anastassiou and I had the opportunity to make further collations. The new material could be integrated without too much trouble because instead of writing a “manuscript” we sorted the cards in their boxes. When the last part of the index had been published, nobody—but us—would have been irritated if our Hippocratic studies had been terminated. On the other hand nobody made us prescriptions as to what to do or not to do.

The actual state of Hippocratic lexicography

Since 1945 there have been developments in Hippocratic lexicography, but still we lack a good modern lexicon.⁵ In addition to A. Foesius’ Oeconomia Hippocratis alphabeti serie distincta, Frankfurt 1588 and Geneve 1662 there exist since 1984 and 1986 the five volumes of G. Maloney/W. Frohn, Concordance des œuvres hippocratiques.⁶ This concordance shows the problem of how to cite

---

¹The lexicon of Erotian (1st century A.D.) is the oldest surviving lexicon with alphabetical order of the first letters of the words. The Glossary of Galen is the oldest lexicon complete in alphabetical order.
²We still lack complete editions of some longer gynecological treatises.
³The “Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft” decided in 1970 to stop financing long-term projects.
⁴In 1978 Mr. Anastassiou and I became members of the Hamburg university. For further information see the “Zeitafel” p. 8–9 in “Fünfzig Jahre Thesaurus”.
⁵A. Apostolides gives the translations in modern Greek and is a physician not interested in philological problems.
an author without standardized titles and lacking a basic edition. And it shows the
problems of computer aided lexicography.\textsuperscript{1} Of course we used the concordance
and we learned that our index is sometimes very uncomfortable for users but that
it kept its actuality because of its notation of manuscript variants.

Last but not least we have to be mindful of the new possibilities for text research
on the TLG CD-ROM, where we also see inconveniences citing Hippocratic and
Galenic texts.

\textbf{Index — and then …}

\textbf{Index Hippocraticus • Supplement}

We started (better: continued) collecting \textit{Corrigenda & Addenda} after having fin-
ished the manuscript of the fourth fascicle of the index. The material increased
because we used the index daily while we collected the testimonia. When we saw
that there would be no “heirs” of our Hippocratic plans we decided to write a
kind of \textit{Addenda addendorum}. When it became to voluminous for a small publi-
cation in a periodical, we scanned the Addenda of the index, edited them by an
Optical Character Recognition program and integrated the new addenda. A part
of the preliminaries, concerning tradition and editions of the treatises, had to be
rewritten because so many new editions had been published. There was also the
possibility of reanimating an old plan, to integrate the Latin tradition of \textit{De heb-
donadibus}. The late VOLKMAR SCHMIDT started an edition of the Latin text as a
doctoral thesis we had the opportunity to use.\textsuperscript{2} So we got even some new words:
e. g. αιθεριος, Βοσπορος, Εοζεινος, Ισθμος, Κιμεριος, πόνος, τροπαιος.

\textbf{Galen—Special indices?}

Already in 1973 we had hoped to finish the index within a few years and so we
discussed plans for the publication of special indices to the \textit{Corpus Galenicum us-
hippocratiques}. Tome VI. Index inverse du vocabulaire hippocratique, Hildesheim/Zürich/New

\textsuperscript{1}The editors of the concordance could not get rid of all mistakes caused by automatic lemmatiza-
tion.

\textsuperscript{2}Unfortunately K. AGGE’S text has not been published.
ing the computer. Each index would have to be independent of the others, because with respect to the new policy of the DFG projects were limited to five years. On the other hand with respect to the texts of the *Corpus Galenicum*—it contains seven times the text of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*,1—a complete index would presumably fill about seven volumes. This was rejected by the DFG in 1977. Looking back with the experience we made with the testimonia and regarding the present state of Galenic lexicography I dare to say that it was a good project.2

Testimonien zum CH

Teil II: Galen   1. Band: Hippokrateszitate in den Kommentaren und im Glossar
(Hippocrates citations in Galen’s commentaries and Glossary)

**First plans**   Having finished a project of some fifty years and being aware of the difficulties Mr. Anastassiou asked me to collaborate on a new project of some extent that might be published in independent parts. Already in 1949 ULRICH FLEISCHER, at that time still general redactor of the *Archiv für griechische Lexikographie*, wrote in a report that he had started the collection of Hippocratic citations in the *Corpus Galenicum*,3 because they are more useful in regard to the Hippocratic text than the collection of explanations of Hippocratic words he had already started. This was presumably also the intention of HANS DILLER, at that time still directing the *Lexicon Hippocraticum*. I like to tell this because it is the answer to the question, whether a collection of Hippocratic citations is Hippocratic lexicography: The citations are part of the textual tradition and explanation of words is

1And there are some works not preserved in Greek.
2There is a Latin index by ANTONIUS MUSA BRASSAVOLUS, *Index referissimus in omnes Galeni libros, qui ex nona Iunctarum editione extant*, Venice 1625 (Reprint Hildesheim 1975). Without this translation one cannot use the Brassavolus. There is the 20th volume of the KÜHN edition containing a Latin Index by FR. W. ASSMANN. There are the indices of the CMG-Editions. And really new is an unlemmatized index by JOST GIPPERT, *Index Galenicus*. Wortformenindex zu den Schriften Galens, Dettelbach 1997. To print only two big volumes, the references are abridged on the basis of the TLG-numbers in a very cryptic way (for instance 17a 3: 737,13 is *De usu partium* vol. 3, page 737, line 13 Kühn). In many cases only the number of items is printed. There is a dangerous distinction made between important and unimportant words; so a sickness ιπιος does not exist. It is indeed easier to use the CD-ROM.
3The collection of citations mentioned by FLEISCHER was increased in 1952 by about 3500 cards, a copy of an older collection of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*. I used it to prove our testimonia.
lexicography $\text{xατ}^\prime$ $\text{ξεχην}$. In some respect we can compare the usefulness of our collection to the importance of Homeric scholia.

In the *Corpus Galenicum* we were already well-acquainted with the Hippocratic commentaries and the Glossary. Preparing the index we often found citations and explanations in these running commentaries. Often they were repeated by Galen for different reasons and separated from the so called *lemmata', that is the citation of text to be explained actually. So we decided to center our collection on testimonies of this kind because they are often neglected.\(^1\) In sum: Our personal interest in collection of citations and the way we arranged them\(^2\) results from our (bad) experiences working out the index. With other words: We wrote a book we needed ourselves.

**Collecting citations—preparing the manuscript** We collected citations reading the texts themselves.\(^3\) Then we copied the pages containing testimonies from the editions, added a short *apparatus criticus* to the cited Hippocratic sentences and made a markup for publishing. Thus within a short time we had a kind of “manuscript”. We wasted much time setting and checking the line numbers of the texts and the *apparatus critici*. The most important tool we used was of course our *Index Hippocraticus*; we could not have identified some testimonies without using our critical adnotations. But very often the Concordance with single lines of text instead of numbers was more useful.

The textual tradition of the commentaries and the glossary is known, there are many new editions, so we dared to collate also the main manuscripts of the texts printed in the Kühn edition only and wrote a kind of abridged *apparatus criticus*.\(^4\)

But there was also a development of technique: We started collecting testimonies about ten years ago: ten years ago personal computers began to become cheaper—since that time most of us are forced to be typesetters. The advantages on the other hand since that time have been: we can use the TLG CD-ROM downloading Greek texts. Writing a file ready to print is not much more complicated than writing a manuscript with the type-writer.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Otherwise we would copy all of the lemmata and a great part of the commentaries.

\(^2\) They are in the order of the LITTRÉ edition and containing very short hints to the *lemmata* of accessible running commentaries.

\(^3\) Indeed there are *indices locorum* in the CMG-editions but they are not at all easy to use.—Of course we used the indices in order to check and correct our collections.

\(^4\) We obtained unpublished texts by courtesy of F. KULDVIEN and G. STROHMAIER. Other colleagues sent us proofs.

\(^5\) And the publisher, Mr. Ruprecht, now prints without subsidies.
(Hippocrates citations in other works of Galen including old Pseudo-Galenica)

We also used the method of collecting testimonies I just described in preparing the second volume. There were two technical differences: We did not use copies of the text but downloads or scans to prepare our “manuscript” and we became versed in a computer program: Critical Edition Typesetting.¹ There as a new inconvenience the numbers of the footnotes are not counted automatically.²

Outside the Galen commentaries we had to deal with new problems: The KÜHN edition does not contain all of the Galenic texts, many texts are not edited in a modern way and there is no standardization in Galenic titles and way of citation.³ Using the Corpus Galenicum by G. FICHTNER⁴ we looked for the most familiar Latin titles. We cite the text of modern editions sometimes using older editions as reference.⁵

Working with the testimonies ...

Galen’s Corpus Hippocraticum  The Collection of Hippocratic writings called Corpus Hippocraticum was first printed in the Aldina. It corresponds to the Pinakes of the main manuscripts M and V.⁶ Galen says nothing about the origin of this collection nor about the texts included. But if we look at the Hippocratic treatises mentioned in any way by Galen, we may dare to say that at the time of Galen more than sixty of these works were known, known as Hippocratic. Furthermore—that is really important—most of these works looked like they do to day. If there exists a running commentary of a Hippocratic tractate, this is quite evident. For instance

¹The EDMAC format for Plain \TeX{} by JOHN LAVAGNINO and DOMINIK WUJASTYK.
²The reason is that a normal critical edition has some apparatuses and a commentary referring to the lines of the text but not ordinary footnotes. So counting this kind of footnote is not done by the machine.
³The founders of the Lexicon Hippocraticum used the titles of LSJ.
⁴It continues the listings in the 20th volume of the KÜHN edition by K. SCHUBRING, that has been updated by V. NUTTON. FICHTNER not being a philologist listed the different Greek and Latin titles, editions, translations, commentaries, important literature, Incipitia and very helpful indices.
⁵J. GIPPERT writing the already mentioned Index Galenicus had a familiar problem: as far as possible he used the KÜHN edition as reference.
⁶Cf. Index Hippocraticus p. IX–X.
Galen commented on two important surgical tractates,¹ saying that he supposed them to be two parts of an older work.

Galen says, that *Epidemics V* had descriptions of fifty ill people, half of those in the text of our manuscripts. These descriptions were counted by him like the first fifty in the manuscripts we know. Therefore he surely knew the beginning of *Epidemics V.*²

In *De aere aquis locis* 2,56,1–3 Li. modern philologists suppose a loss of text in a paragraph cited by Galen in spite of its bad syntax.³ When citing this text Galen seems unaware of problems. But in the unpublished commentary he says “So it is clear from this text, that his information about the inhabitants of Lybia vanished and has been dropped”. Other commentaries had tried to explain this jump.⁴

**Galen’s Hippocratism** Dealing with the second volume we had to read many more texts than for the first one. Consequently we expected many more testimonies for the second volume.⁵ But we found less testimonies. The reason may be that Galen in the commentaries explained Hippocrates citing Hippocrates using his phenomenal memory. Teaching medicine in many of his other texts Galen had to be up to date: in anatomy there was new knowledge, also in pharmacology. But still he admires the prognostics, Hippocrates’ description of symptoms.

**Did the Hippocratism of Galen set a canon?** Starting with the 6th century A.D. we know Hippocratic commentaries of the early Byzantine period that show a re-

---

1*De fracturis* and *De articulis.*

2The “missing” descriptions are present also in *Epidemics VII.*


4There is also a Hippocratic lemma unknown to the *codex unicus* V “The same reasoning applies to their children” (Aer. 2,84,8). The translator of the Arabic text, G. STROHMAIER, thinks that it is real text while J. JOUANNA claims that “The same reasoning applies to their children” and the words “The same reasoning applies to inhabitants of islands” are variants of περὶ τῶν ἡβατῶν εἴτε μόνον ἐν ὠφῖ ἡγούμενον ἀνθρώπων (The same reasoning applies also to character.) (Aer. 2,84,8f); cf. comm. ad loc. (p. 243 note 1 = p. 345).

5Requested by our publisher.
semblance to commentaries commenting on specialized literature. These commentaries start with important questions concerning the author (ξεφάλαξι), for instance the τάξις, i.e. which tractates of an author have to be read in a special order. The longest lists of Hippocratic works (15) contain a Prognostikon commentary by Stephanus and an Epidemics VI commentary by Palladius. The De fracturis commentary by Palladius proposes a shorter list. The Aphorisms cited most by Galen are not mentioned in all τάξις. The τάξις seem to be independent of Galen.

Contributions to text and interpretation

Filling textual gaps

From a lexicographical point of view we are most interested in the testimonies because they provide additional textual tradition. Therefore I would like to point out some instances of this kind. Sometimes texts are preserved in citations only.

De hebdomadibus This tractate is lost in Greek. As already known 56 lines of text are cited in Ps.-Galen, De causa affectionum. Six other small fragments have been identified by the Latin tradition.

De ulceribus This tractate has survived in one manuscript. In some longer citations in De methodo medendi we find additional phrases. It is interesting that their integration into the Greek editions took about 100 years. In 1543 Vidus Vidius integrated the new text into the Latin translation of his Chirurgia. In 1595 A. Foesius mentioned the additions in the Annotationes of his Greek edition of Hippocrates. In 1665 Van der Linden took some of them in an abridged way; in the Chartier edition 1639–79 they are still missing.

---

2 They are listed in our supplement on p. X.
3 This has been demonstrated by Doris Raupach, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der hippokratischen Schrift De Ulceribus, Diss. Göttingen 1965 (dact.), p. 109–113.
Testimonies not locatable in the CH

Most uncertain testimonies have to be printed in editions as fragments.¹

Ancient variants

The aphorism Aph. 4,572,8–9 Li. ends ὄστω δὲ καὶ λύγματος. ([Convulsions come either from repletion or from depletion;] so too hiccough.) Only once did Galen mention that he did not find this sentence in all manuscripts (De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos 13,153,16–154,2 K); in his commentary and elsewhere these words are commented or cited.

The apparatus of citations in modern critical editions

In a new critical edition we expect listings of the secondary tradition. The editor of the last edition of a Hippocratic tract, Mayry Hansen,² is not aware of the Galen testimonies surviving in old translations only; and he gives two old variants from the incorrect Kühn text. I think nobody writing a doctoral thesis can be expected to read ancient authors for years to find six citations.—And to read and understand the “special” German language of translators of Arabic translations is very uncomfortable for foreigners.—But our service . . . has to be known and used.

Explanation of words—what did Galen write in his lost commentaries

Explanations of single words can be found outside the commentaries or the glossary: Here Galen’s wordiness and repetitiveness are very often useful to us: Acut. (Sp.)

¹One sentence in De causa affectionum 6,2–7,16 Helmreich is ascribed to De morbis IV, ³π. ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρν, ³ψρ

So we might guess that the words παροχέτευσις and ἀντίσπαση (Hum. 5,476,10–12 Li.) were explained in the lost commentary on De humoribus like in the commentary on Epidemics VI 64,15–21 CMG, De sanitate tuenda 192,23–29 CMG V 4,2 Koch, Ad Glauconem de methodo medendi 11,91,11–15 K and De methodo medendi 10,315,8–316,2 K.

1 GAL. Comm. in Hp. acut. 292,18 CMG V 9,1 Mewaldt/Helmreich/Westenberger.
2 GAL. Comm. in Hp. Epid. VI 64,15–21 CMG V 10,1 Wenkebach/Pfaff: θεραπευτῶν ἐπί γχουσις έναυάδα διδάσκοντες ἀφετέσθαι, γεγομενουσις τελευτασαν ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν γχουσις, εἰρήνονται δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀναμηνήσεως ἅνεκα. παροχέτευσιν μὲν ὄνομαξιν εἰλθεθον ὁ Ἰπποκράτης, ὅτινα γχουσις τῆς διαμεσον κενώσεως μὲ καθʼ ἐνεδρον ὄνομαξιν ἀφετέσθαι καὶ μὲν τοιούτου τοῦ προσφέρεσθαι μὲν ἔσε τὸν ἀνατίσσωσιν χώκον, ἀλλὰ στὰς σπέρμον ὄνομαξιν (εν) ἑκοικοησθαι, κεκοκαιομένης κώστας ἢ κεραυνῶν. (Here he starts to explain means of therapy according to humours described more perfectly in his tractate On humours and here repeating it for reminiscence. Hippocrates said παροχέτευσις, if a humour to be evacuated not went to the right place but is evacuated neither too far away from the right place nor in the opposite direction. But for instance if he is evacuated by urine if kidneys or bladder are ill.)

3 GAL. De sanitate tuenda 192,23–29 CMG V 4,2 Koch: ὁφθαλμῶν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὄστων ἢ χρεία μεγάλη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο προσφέρεται σῶν ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς περιτυπώματος εἰς κυών φαρμάκων τῆς ύπο. Ἰπποκράτους ὄνομαξμένη παροχέτευσιν ἐργαζόμεθα, μάλιστα μὲν ἐπὶ ἱλικεῖ μερισματικά τὸ φαρμάκον ἐπὶ αὐτά. τοιῇ δὲ ὁφθαλμοῦ, ἐς τὸ στήμα διὰ τῶν ἑπικηραμενῶν φαρμάκων, ὡσπερ γε κατὰ τὴν ῥίνα διὰ τῶν πτωμάτων κενώσεως, ὡστε τὰ πρὸς τὰς ἑμφασεῖς αὐτῶν θρησκεύς. (Eyes and ears are very useful. Therefore, if trash from the head flows into them, we must provoke what Hippocrates called παροχέτευσις. First of all we have to lead it to the nostrils. If the nose does not obey, into the mouth using drugs that remove plegm. As for the nostrils by sternatory drugs.)

4 GAL. Ad Glauconem de methodo medendi 11,91,11–15 K: ἢ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς θάνεως ἔνδειξες οὕτως, αὐτῆ παροπτοῦ: δὲ ἐν τῇ γὰρ χρείᾳ κενών καὶ ὅστως καὶ ὅθεν, αὐτὴ μᾶλλον διδάσκει. καὶ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ ἐπικηραμενής ἡ ἀντίσπαση, οὕτως ὡς ὁ Ἰπποκράτης ὄνομαξε, τὸν δὲ ἠφελείαν προνόμιος κενώσεως, ἡ παροχέτευσις τοιαύτη. (We have to look also at the recommendation given by the position. For it shows by what way, how, and wherefrom the evacuation ought to be done. If the humours are still flowing, the ἀντίσπασης, as Hippocrates calls it, if the humours are already in the part, παροχέτευσις is recommended.)

5 GAL. De methodo medendi 10,315,8σμ K: καὶ γὰρ καὶ ταύθ’ (sc. παροχέτευσις καὶ ἀντίσπασης) Ἰπποκράτους εὑρήκατα κοινά πάσης ἀμέτρου κενώσεως, παροχέτευσιν μὲν οὖν εἰς τοὺς πληθυντέρους τόπους, ἀντίσπασθαι δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀντικειμένους· οὖν τὸν ὁ πρὸς τὰς ἑπικηραμενῶς διὰ τῶν ῥίνων ἡ παροχέτευσις, κατὰ δὲ τῇ ἀντίσπασις, ὡσπερ γε τῷ δὲ ἔδρας διὰ μέγαρας δὲ παροχέτευσις, ἀνῶς δὲ ἡ ἀντίσπασις. (Hippocrates invented παροχέτευσις and ἀντίσπασης against any wrong evacuation. "It goes aside" into nearby regions or it is "drawn into the opposite direction". For instance παροχέτευσις means that humours to be evacuated from the palate are evacuated through the nostrils. If a humour is evacuated downwards, it is ἀντίσπασις; for instance if something to be evacuated through the anus, is evacuated through the uterus, it is παροχέτευσις, evacuated upwards it would be ἀντίσπασις.)
Thesaurus . . . Importance, development

Preparing our small book at the fifty years’ anniversary for the *Thesaurus* we sometimes spoke about the importance and the future of a “real” thesaurus and whether it is necessary at all. It was surely important that in the early years young philologists from different countries met and studied there. The main intention of the founder to make card-indexes of the Greek literature has now been achieved by the creation of the data-base of the Irvine TLG. But this data-base contains texts—their words unlemmatized.

Lemmatizing—I suppose—presupposes card-indexes. Nowadays this can easily be done by special programs. We only need to know all forms of a word. The Greek language from Homer to the middle ages is very rich in forms owing to time, dialect and general development of language. So much for the difficulties of lemmatizing. To write a dictionary would be a second step considering the heterogeneity of the documents and the difficulties in understanding them. It seems unlikely that anyone philologist meets the requirements for writing a lemmatized dictionary of all of Greek.

Hermann Diels in his report partly translated in LSJ seems to expect such knowledge implicitly because he was a very learned philologist and very skillful in organizing his studies. But contemplating a Greek Thesaurus he mentions more than a hundred scholars to achieve it. Two *centurias* of Diels!—From that point of view special lexica will still be the easier task. To-day’s comfortable possibilities for contact could lead to a virtual thesaurus with members all over the world and a coordinating central somewhere. At least the members of the central would need to be paid for their work.

Let me return to the *status quo* of the Hamburg Theaurus: The *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* is working in rooms of the Hamburg University and gets its budget from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Federal State of Hamburg; it is supervised and administered by the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Employment of young scholars is not planned; the youngest employee will be retired in 2013. His last duty will be “to switch off the lights”. If time allows, articles are to be written which were excluded in 1976 to hasten completion of the lexicon. The reason is that even the German academies dislike longlasting projects.

The Hippocratic department has melted down to two members; both of us are pensioners. We are “tolerated” in our former room, which is one of the two rooms of the Thesaurus library. Here, too, the end will come from lack of funds.
The Hamburg University has been reducing its staff for twenty-five years and no academy seems to be interested in Hippocratic studies. There was a small chance to continue the running project in a so called Sonderforschungsbereich. But this project failed because trying to conserve vanishing skills like editing Latin and Greek texts was not “innovative”. They only ray of hope in the last months was an inquiry by the vice-president of the university about the future of the non-epic Thesaurus. He wrote that he had been asked in foreign countries about the future of the Thesaurus.

Until now our Thesaurus has survived, and so there are still optimists among us, who do not believe in the end I just described.