The Lexicographer Erotian as a Guide to the Hippocratic Corpus

Elizabeth Craik

The heterogeneity of the works that collectively comprise the Hippocratic Corpus is manifest.[1] How can these multifarious treatises and compilations be classified? To what extent is it possible to determine their original purpose or meaningful to assign them to different genres? Editors and commentators have always categorised and made judgments, although their criteria have tended to be neither well formulated nor fully articulated. It is here suggested that the classification of the Hippocratic works sketched by Erotian in the first century AD in his Hippocratic lexicon (dated to the age of Nero through its dedication to the imperial physician Andromachos) is original and insightful; it is further argued that it approaches and prefigures both the modern physician's classification of subjects in medical textbooks and the modern philologist's classification of works on a generic basis.

Erotian's lexicon is a valuable resource, not least because it contains the earliest surviving account of works attributed to Hippocrates. The ordering of words with regard to the treatises in which they occur is remarkable in that it is surely based on unordered materials: even in the medieval manuscripts there is a lack of consistent internal arrangement in the Hippocratic works as listed and as copied. Erotian's preface is illuminating, and displays a remarkable degree of self-awareness, in its account of his predecessors and of his own approach to his task. The structure of Erotian's lists, the arrangement of his exegetical choices and the sources of his citations have been, and continue to be, much discussed topics. Some attention has been paid also to the text and interpretation of his preface. But the more evaluative and comprehensive approach to Erotian's classification pursued in this paper is new.[2]

Writing about a century after Erotian, Galen viewed, and by implication categorised, Hippocratic works as γνήσια 'authentic' or νόθα 'spurious'. While he

[1] See Craik (2015).

[2] Nachmanson's seminal works of analysis and edition (1917 and 1918) make an immense contribution to our understanding of Erotian's sources and methods and remain indispensable in modern scholarship. Arrangement and attribution are discussed by Grensemann (1964 and 1968); see also Irmer (2007). On the preface, see Danielsson (1919); Kind (1937); Manetti (1997). On Erotian's place in the lexicographical tradition, see von Staden (1989 and 1992).

revered a substantial original core of works as truly Hippocratic, there was a large penumbra of works dismissed by him as unworthy and inferior. Galen's judgments were conditioned by a degree of prejudice and wishful thinking, as he moulded the figure of Hippocrates to fit his own preconceived image.[3] Thus, Galen's high opinion of the treatise *On the Nature of Man* was due primarily to its presentation of a version of humoral theory which was in accord with his own views. Galen chose those Hippocratic works which he regarded as most genuine and also as most useful as prime subjects for commentaries. Accordingly, his commentaries on the twin related surgical treatises *On Fractures* and *On Articulations* were first to be written. In the light of Galen's reiterated view of relative worth in the works traditionally attributed to Hippocrates, it is surprising that, as declared in the preface to his Hippocratic lexicon (*Galeni linguarum seu dictionum exoletarum Hippocratis explicatio*, 19. 62-157 K.), he chose to explain words from all, and not just from those which he regarded as 'authentic'. Erotian, by contrast, did not challenge the Hippocratic attributions of his day. There is a single exception: he states that *Prorrhetic* – it is not clear whether he means both *Prorrhetic* I and *Prorrhetic* II or just *Prorrhetic* II – is not Hippocratic; he promises to give the reasons for this judgement elsewhere, but we do not have this.

The approach of the great nineteenth century editor, Emile Littré, was not so different from that of Galen, although his conclusions differed markedly: his views on authenticity were at times similarly subjective. Littré accorded a pre-eminent place to *On Ancient Medicine*, the only work printed, following a long and judicious general introduction, in the first of his nine volumes; he did however place *On Articulations*, *On Fractures* and *Mochlicon* in his first class, devoted to supposed 'écrits d' Hippocrate'. Littré's second class included *On the Nature of Man* and his third *Prorrhetic* I, both of which had been more prized by Galen. The authenticity question preoccupied other nineteenth century scholars also. Thus Adams chose a revealing title, making reference to the 'genuine' works and Greenhill presented an ingenious 'tabular or genealogical view of the different divisions and subdivisions of the collection'.[4]

Subsequently, the quest for the true Hippocrates and his works became focused on putative provenance. Once again, Galen's standpoint may serve as a point of departure. Galen remarked, 'In the old days, there was great rivalry between the doctors of Kos and of Knidos … They were joined by the doctors from Italy ....

[3] This is well demonstrated by Smith (1979); see especially 175-6. See also Nutton (2004) at 221 and, for still useful lists and detailed references, Mewaldt (1909).
[4] Littré (1839); Adams (1849); Greenhill (1862).

There were these three 'bands' (χόροι) of doctors competing with one another. The Koan group had most and best, but the Knidian came close and the Italian too was of considerable account' (*de methodo medendi*, 10. 5-6 K.). Much twentieth century scholarship was devoted to attempts to isolate differences between the medicine of Kos and that of Knidos. However, although there seem to be traces in the Hippocratic Corpus of works emanating from these two regions (the extant *Koan Prognoses* and the lost, but allusively cited, *Knidian Opinions*), the differences once postulated – such as that Kos was concerned primarily with prognosis or treatment of the sick, while Knidos was concerned with diagnosis or tabulation and description of disease – have proved hard to substantiate.[5] There is ample evidence in the corpus of influence from the west Greek world, as adumbrated by Galen; but also of influence from the north and the east.[6] The question of provenance is subtly allied with questions of vocabulary peculiar to different dialects. Although the Hippocratic works are all written in the Ionic dialect, other elements, notably of Doric, are sporadically present. As will be seen, dialect was a concern of Erotian, as well as of other lexicographers.

Another line of approach to categorisation of the treatises in the Hippocratic corpus is through the modern debate on orality and literacy. Verse preceded prose as a medium of expression and oral compositions existed before written texts. There is some evidence of metrical forms in the Hippocratic works and some of these may be explained as survivals of early traditional wisdom or as fragments of oracular material with its origins in healing shrines.[7] And there is much evidence of expression in speech as well as in writing; most obviously, verbs of 'saying' as well as of 'writing' are used in many works.[8] This is a distinction alien to Erotian but implicit in Galen's differentiation between συγγράμματα 'treatises' and ὑπομνήματα 'collections of notes'. However, although Galen perceived this fundamental generic difference, he nevertheless viewed *Aphorisms*, unmistakably a collection of disparate notes, as a quintessentially Hippocratic composition. To Erotian, the Hippocratic oeuvre is collectively πραγματεία, a term more usually applied to a single scientific work than to a corpus; it is used in the first sentence of his preface and later repeated.[9]

[5] Jouanna (1974) and Grensemann (1975) are pioneering works; Thivel (1981) and many others express scepticism.
[6] See, for example, Craik (1998 and 2006a).
[7] See Craik (2006b).
[8] See Dean-Jones (2003).
[9] Nachmanson (1918), 3 (*bis*) and 5.

The infiltration into scientific prose of rhetorical techniques and modes of expression, present in many Hippocratic works to a greater or lesser extent, may be used as a further basis for classification and chronology. However, 'rhetoric' takes different forms: such works as *On Fractures* may be considered didactic and such works as *The Law* epideictic. It is evident too that techniques of intertextuality may be applied to the tradition, as many passages are repeated, sometimes with minor variations, in different works: the gynaecological texts are a complex tissue of such repetition. Modern tools of lexicon and concordance have facilitated identification of repeated passages. Such aspects relating primarily to style rather than to substance do not concern Erotian who, though alert to expression as well as content, bases his classification primarily on the latter.

Erotian's view of Hippocrates can be encapsulated in one of his judgments: γένονεν ἀνὴρ Ὁμηρικὸς τὴν φράσιν 'The man (sc. Hippocrates) is Homeric in expression'. Erotian's postulated resemblance between Hippocrates and Homer goes far beyond the diction he here singles out: his Hippocrates is a unique author, magisterial, a monumental cultural icon – a figurehead in medicine and medical education parallel in stature to Homer in literature and cultural education. Thus, in his preface, Erotian gives a telling statement of his motivation for writing, in terms of his professed view of the importance of Hippocrates: Hippocrates is useful (to all) for the literary instruction he vouchsafes and (to doctors) for the medical knowledge he imparts. In this, Erotian follows the judgment of his day. Many parallels can be drawn between ancient perceptions of the importance of Homer and the importance of Hippocrates, paradigmatic of perfection in verse and in prose. Indeed modern scholarship on these authors mirrors these ancient perceptions. The Homeric question and the Hippocratic question have been addressed in similar ways: through study of authenticity and provenance and through isolation of repetitions or of interpolation or of 'late' material. Also, the debate on orality has been highly relevant to both.

The early emergence of Hippocratic lexicography is an aspect of the weight attached to the Hippocratic writings already in an era soon after the life of Hippocrates. At the same time, it is merely one strand in a long and distinguished tradition of philological research in which miscellaneous lexical compilations – notably on Homeric language – played a part. Already in the fifth century, many of the sophists (including Gorgias, Hippias and Prodikos) pursued interests in linguistic accuracy and niceties of terminology. Demokritos is said to have written specifically on Homeric diction and vocabulary (DK 68 A 33 = Athen. *Epit*. 2. 46e). Collections

of words regarded as specimens of peculiarities presented by regional dialects, or archaic vocabulary, or recondite form coexisted with collections of a wider sweep, evincing thematic as well as linguistic content; in the latter, an interest in medical terms is apparent. Strictly speaking, collections of *glossai* were confined to obsolete and obscure terms; collections of *lexeis* embraced all that seemed to need explanation, whether in form or significance.[10] The celebrated compilation of *lexeis* edited by the grammarian Aristophanes was all embracing and many principles of Aristophanes can be seen in his contemporaries and successors: through intermediaries, he surely influenced Erotian.

Erotian is the first Hippocratic lexicographer whose work, though extant in excerpts only, is substantially known to us. But he tells us in his preface of his many predecessors, both physicians and grammarians, laying stress on their deficiencies.[11] The first of whom we can form some impression is Bakcheios, a younger contemporary of Aristophanes. Bakcheios wrote commentaries on several Hippocratic treatises as well as compiling a Hippocratic lexicon. The reception of Bakcheios' work was largely combative and critical. (Xenokritos, whose activity preceded that of Bakcheios, seems to have occasioned less hostility and disagreement from his successors.) Philinos, a near contemporary of Bakcheios in the mid third century BC, wrote a polemical treatise in six books against Bakcheios' work and later writers too – Herakleides of Tarentum and Apollodoros of Citium, as well as subsequently Erotian and Galen – cited him primarily to express disagreement. In lexicographical compilation, which tends to involve a degree of derivative repetition of the work of predecessors, such polemic against older versions – even where variations may seem relatively trivial to the modern reader – is ubiquitous and perhaps inevitable.

Bakcheios, originally from Tanagra in Boiotia, lived and worked in Alexandria. According to the traditional ancient formulation of master-pupil relationships, he was 'taught' by Herophilos; from this it is reasonable to suppose that he was a younger contemporary of Herophilos or a junior member of Herophilos' circle. The same amalgam of philological expertise and medical interest is evinced in the previous generation: a contemporary of Praxagoras, allegedly 'teacher' of Herophilos, was the poet and polymath Philitas of Kos, whose collection of *glossai*, sometimes known as the *ataktoi glossai* or *atakta*, a revealing indication that they

[10] See Pfeiffer (1968), 197-202.
[11] Nachmanson (1918), 4-5.

were not strictly ordered, contained material clearly indicative of medical interests.[12] The strong political and cultural connections between Kos and Alexandria doubtless contributed to the formation of overlapping circles, with overlapping interests, of physicians and philologists.

The range and arrangement of Bakcheios' lexicon is uncertain, as is the precise nature and extent of Erotian's debt to his predecessor. Erotian refers explicitly to Bakcheios sixty-eight times, and cites sixty of his glosses. It may be that he draws even more than he declares from Bakcheios. Thus, he may depend on Bakcheios for corroborative literary quotations, not only where they are specifically attributed but also where they are not.[13] But such dependence is a regular part of lexicographical practice: Bakcheios himself, according to Galen, followed Aristophanes in poetic citation. It is possible also that Erotian's statement of purpose is based on the declared purpose of Bakcheios.[14] If this is correct, some of the credit for originality of thought and purpose here attributed to Erotian must belong rather to his predecessor. However, there is no real evidence to support this ultimately unverifiable hypothesis. According to Erotian, Epikles of Crete abridged and revised the entire work of Bakcheios.[15] Bakcheios' arrangement, which was at least partially alphabetised by Epikles, seems to have been in part thematic and so to anticipate Erotian's; but his notional three sections (approximately semiotic, physiological and therapeutic) were rough as well as inconsistent and not fully differentiated. Thus, *On Articulations* is present in all three of these sections and *Prognostic* in two of them.

Erotian's exegetical policy in general is directed to words which he finds 'unusual', that is unusual to him or his contemporaries, and especially to words perceived as obsolete and archaic, used by the 'men of old', οἱ ἀρχαῖοι (as Σ 5) or οἱ παλαοί (as Π 67, Τ 29 etc.). In using the term παλαοί, the Alexandrians seem to have intended simply pre-Alexandrian writers.[16] It may be that this same convention remained current centuries later, without adaptation to a new era, and without regard to the thought that antiquity is relative. Erotian comments on the studied obscurity and recondite diction of Hippocratic material, distinct from 'common exchange'.[17] Here the adjective 'common' (κοινή) is suggestive of the term used of the newly prevalent universal Greek, distinct from the earlier differing dialect forms.

[12] On Bakcheios, see von Staden (1989), 484-500 and *id*. (1992); on Philitas, see Spanoudakis (2002), 236, 347-400.
[13] So von Staden (1989), 493.
[14] So Smith (1979), 203 n. 31.
[15] Nachmanson (1918), 5.
[16] See Pfeiffer (1968), 199 n. 2.
[17] Nachmanson (1918), 3-4.

But many of the words that Erotian chooses to explain do not seem obscure to the modern reader and there is a corollary silence in countless cases where we need help; in this Bakcheios had evidently preceded him.[18] Some seem bafflingly obvious in sense; others can be viewed as simply poetic or Ionic (and so very familiar to modern scholars, extensively trained in Greek drama). Erotian uses many literary parallels to illustrate and authenticate his glosses, and makes especial use of the poets. Homer is most commonly cited (almost fifty instances); the tragedians Aeschylus (four instances), Sophocles (fourteen instances) and Euripides (seventeen instances) as well as the comic poets Aristophanes (twenty-five instances) and Menander (nine instances) are all well represented. We find too the historians Herodotos and Thucydides as well as Demokritos, Plato, Diokles and others writing on themes more obviously akin to those present in the Hippocratic works. This range of authors is in itself revealing. Generic convention in Greek writing was a strong determinant of form and expression, especially in choice of dialect, and the Ionic of verse naturally resembles that of Hippocratic prose.

Although Erotian does not focus on this, he is well aware of dialectal variation. He remarks frequently that particular words glossed are 'Attic' (Α 25, 62, 63, 135, 142; Δ 2, 25; Ε 22, 35, 54, 76; Η 4, 14; Ι 20; Κ 2, 3, 8, 65, 68; Μ 4; Ο 2, 41; Σ 54, 62; Τ 14; Φ 5, 20; Χ 4). In some cases, however, this judgment is made on criteria which are demonstrably false, for example on the basis of poetic usage (Aeschylean, Ι 21; Sophoclean, Κ 8); or on criteria which are inherently unreliable, for example on the basis of features frequently distorted through vagaries in scribal transmission (double tau, rather than double sigma, Ε 35). But he perceptively notes the occasional obtrusion of Doric (Κ 27) and, more specifically, of Sicilian Doric forms (Κ 61). Erotian gives no indication that he finds the occurrence of vocabulary from other dialects in the Hippocratic works, written in Ionic, to be strange, or to require explanation beyond simple identification. Despite singling out such instances for comment, he adheres unswervingly to his view of a single monumental creator for all the works in the Corpus. Hippocrates – sometimes indicated simply by the emphatic pronoun 'he' or 'he himself' – 'says' is a much repeated comment (Α 8, Ε 30, Η 5, Κ 44, Μ 22, Ο 1 etc.), usually with context but in one case less precisely, 'he himself says somewhere' (καὐτος δέ πού φησιν Ρ 5). Erotian comments approvingly on Hippocratic style both in general terms, drawing attention to onomatopoeia and choice of the mot juste (preface) and more specifically isolating devices such as metaphor (Ν 2, Π 1). The presence of Doric might have excited

[18] See von Staden (1978), 564-6 on Bakcheios' glosses on words 'neither obsolete nor rare'.

comment on regions of Doric speech – including Kos, Knidos and many regions in Italy and Sicily – or prompted questions on the character of and reasons for such vocabulary. (As Doric features in anatomical terminology, it may be that early anatomical writing had some kind of Doric input.[19])

A prime concern here is with Erotian's own professed organisation of topics in relation to the Hippocratic works. He knows some forty to fifty works (about twice as many as Bakcheios), sets out five categories in his preface, and allocates certain treatises to each. His arrangement of words in the ensuing lexicon is then partially alphabetic, following the sequence of occurrence in the different works addressed within his categories. Many questions of detail in Erotian's references to Hippocratic works are here disregarded, and complexities are simplified. The question of variation in titles is not addressed, but Erotian's title *On Barley Gruel* (περὶ πτισάνης) is tacitly changed to *On Regimen in Acute Diseases* (*Acut*.), to which it evidently corresponds. No attempt is made to enumerate works, such as *On Affections* and *Koan Prognoses*, transmitted in medieval manuscripts but not mentioned by Erotian.[20] No account is taken of works omitted from Erotian's prefatory list but apparently, or possibly, included in the lexicon. For instance, it may be that the long and important work *On Regimen* (*Vict*.) was actually glossed, following *On Humours* (*Hum*.) in sequence.[21] No mention is made of the work *On Missiles*, known to Erotian and to Galen but lost to us.[22]

Erotian's categories are as follows:

1 σημειωτικά (matters relating to signs): *Prognostic*; *Prorrhetic* I and II; *On Humours* (*Prog*.; *Prorrh*. I and II; *Hum*.)

2 αἰτιολογικὰ καὶ φυσικά (matters relating to aetiology and physiology): *On Winds*; *On the Nature of Man*; *On the Sacred Disease*; *On the Nature of the Child*; *On Airs, Waters and Places* (*Flat*.; *Nat. Hom*.; *Morb. Sacr*.; *Nat. Puer*.; *Aer*.)

3a θεραπευτικά – χειρουργία (matters relating to treatment – surgery): *On Fractures*; *On Articulations*; *On Sores*; *On Head Wounds*; *In the Surgery*; *Mochlicon*; *On Haemorrhoids*; *On Fistulas* (*Fract*.; *Artic*.; *Ulc*.; *VC*; *Off*.; *Mochl*.; *Haem*.; *Fist*.)

3b θεραπευτικά – δίαιτα (matters relating to treatment – regimen): *Diseases* I, II; *On Regimen in Acute Diseases*; *On Places in Man*; *On Diseases of Women* I, II; *On*

[19] See Craik (1998).
[20] These are listed by Jouanna (1999), 436 n. 29.
[21] Nachmanson (1917), 281-3.
[22] On entries in Galen's glossary relevant to this work, see Salazar (1997).

Nutriment; *On Infertile Women; On Use of Liquids* (*Morb*. I, II; *Acut*.; *Loc. Hom*.; *Mul*. I, II; *Alim*.; *Mul*. III; *Liqu*.)
4 ἐπίμικτα (mixed matters): *Aphorisms*; *Epidemics* (*Aph*.; *Epid*.)
5 τέχνη (on the art of medicine): *The Oath*; *The Law*; *On the Art*; *On Ancient Medicine* (*Jusj*.; *Lex*; *Art.*; *VM*).

Erotian begins with works on signs, that is prognostic signs, a subject of fundamental importance in ancient theories of pathology, relating to an understanding of the course of illness and predicting its outcome; then continues with works on aetiology and nature, equally fundamental to ancient views of physiology and anatomy, relating to an understanding of the nature of the body and the causes and character of illness. These first two categories comprise an overarching approach to the major theoretical underpinning of medical practice, and correspond broadly to the modern doctor's divisions of essential medical knowledge under the heads of anatomy, physiology and pathology. At the same time, the content of these first categories corresponds broadly to the content of 'handbooks' in modern generic terms. Of course these groupings have their limitations. There was no concept of essential medical knowledge, there being no formal teaching and no approximation to a core curriculum. There are in truth no handbooks; only works which fulfil a purpose similar to that of the handbook. Anatomy, for example, is nowhere clearly set out; physiology is set out only incidentally; pathology is present everywhere, but in slanted forms.

Erotian goes on from the theory which underpins medical practice to practice itself, that is to the therapy which is based on the theory and he subdivides this as 'surgical' and 'dietary'. Once again, his classification corresponds to modern divisions of medical knowledge and training, in this case to surgical procedures and to *materia medica*. It corresponds also to modern generic designation: these works are, in modern terms, 'instruction manuals' of a type which would be ancillary to an accompanying demonstration. In many passages of the surgical works, and in many recipe cures, a set of instructions is clearly given, steps in a procedure being prefaced by words signifying 'then', 'next'. Finally, Erotian's category of works on the *techne* of medicine can be viewed not only in relation to an important aspect of modern teaching, that of medical ethics and etiquette, but also in modern generic terms as 'manifestos'.

It must be conceded that Erotian's classification is subject to the same constraints as all later attempts at classification: many of the works are very mixed in character – as is recognised in Erotian's own formulation – and so resist neat

pigeonholing on any criteria. Despite such inevitable limitations, his classification is clear-sighted and meaningful viewed on its own terms and penetrating and intelligent viewed from a modern standpoint. There are, however, areas where Erotian's arrangement is less successful. Some possible reasons for this are now outlined and a further generic or cross-generic grouping is adumbrated. The work, for it is a single work, *On Generation-On the Nature of the Child* (*Genit-Nat. Puer*.) is placed by Erotian in his category 2. It seems probable that this is simply because of the dominating concept *physis* 'nature'. Then a large group of gynaecological works is placed in his category 3b. The reason for this is, in all likelihood, the preponderance in these treatises of recipe cures, which can be subsumed under *diaita* 'regimen'. However, from a significant degree of cross-reference, accompanied by linguistic and doctrinal affinities, it is now possible to group together, and impute common authorship to, a large body of material in the gynaecological texts, including parts of *On Diseases of Women* (*Mul*. I and II) and the short piece *On Diseases of Girls* (*Virg*.), which was unknown to Erotian, along with *On Generation-On the Nature of the Child* (*Genit-Nat. Puer*.) and *On Glands* (*Gland*.).[23]

Is it possible to assign this writer to a particular genre, or to accord his oeuvre a single purpose? Do these works, as suggested above for others, fit into the modern physician's classification of subjects in medical textbooks and the modern philologist's classification of works on a generic basis? The overall style is that of the 'research paper' or scientific monograph, marked by verbs of demonstration and proof (such as ἀποφαίνειν), nouns of evidential weight (such as σημεῖον, μαρτύριον) and a tightly structured sequence of thought. The use of the term ἴστόριον 'corroboration', much repeated in *On Generation- On the Nature of the Child* (*Genit-Nat.Puer*.) and in the related *On Diseases* IV (*Morb*. IV) is revealing. Whereas works such as *On Ancient Medicine* (*VM*) and *On the Art* (*Art*.) express their intent in general terms as ἵστορία 'enquiry', the concern in the works discussed is a search specifically for the related but more focused concept ἴστόριον 'proof'.

In content, the author's most recurrent concern is with the physiology of human reproduction and embryology. But this is viewed in a wide context of physiological function and pathological change. The human body is seen as a mechanism (through theories of pressure and attraction) yet teleology (theories of development to an end) is interwoven. Human and plant life are seen as subject to the same rules of organic growth. In this visionary approach, the ideas of Demokritos are apparent. But

[23] On common authorship, see Craik (2009), 22-34 and cf. already Littré 1 (1839), 375-9.

Erotian was not concerned with Demokritos and, as has been noted, maintains a unitary view of the Hippocratic works. It is not surprising that Erotian did not fully engage with this unusual Hippocratic writer and his works. Such wide-ranging biological enquiry may be regarded as a further generic group – and it is one with as long a history as any of the medical genres. In the early modern period, Severinus (Marco Aurelio Severino, of Naples, 1580-1656) argued cogently for the structural and functional unity of all plant and animal life and gave detailed accounts of the different yet comparable internal organization of many different species of mammals. In recent times, D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson (1860-1948) argued similarly for a dynamical view of growth and structure common to all living things.[24] The discipline of present day scientists working in the field of developmental biology or in evolutionary developmental biology, known colloquially as evo-devo, has Demokritean and Hippocratic roots. (Severinus consciously followed Demokritos; D'Arcy Thompson admired Demokritos and was a devotee of Aristotle but paid scant attention to the medical texts of antiquity.)

In conclusion, we look briefly at approaches to Hippocratic terminology in successors of Erotian. Galen's Hippocratic glossary presents many parallels to that of Erotian (*Galeni linguarum seu dictionum exoletarum Hippocratis explicatio*, 19. 62-157 K.). Like Erotian, Galen sets out his aims in a preface (62-68). Galen prides himself on his τάξις 'arrangement' and follows a consistent alphabetical order; this technique – obvious as it may seem to the modern reader – may have been innovatory. Like Erotian, Galen criticises his predecessors. Unlike them, he will not set out to be exhaustive; he will not comprehensively catalogue names of fish and animals. In the glossary itself, there are many points of correspondence with earlier writers, including both Bakcheios and Erotian, whose interpretations are sometimes explicitly acknowledged, more often not. Disagreement is usual, sometimes tacit, more often expressed. Galen does not categorise the Hippocratic works, or define areas of medicine. However, certain aspects emerge prominently. Unsurprisingly, in view of Galen's known interest in the subject, there is much on *materia medica*. More surprisingly, perhaps, there is much on gynaecology and especially on female anatomical terms; these are in some cases referred to specific Hippocratic gynaecological sources but in others unreferenced. (Galen does not cite other sources for earlier treatment of these terms; perhaps some material may come from Soranus.) Galen quotes extensively from *Koan Prognoses* (*Coac.*), a long aphoristic compilation which, as noted above, was unknown to Erotian.

[24] Severinus (1645); Thompson (1917).

The pseudo-Galenic work on medical definitions (*Galeni definitiones medicae*, 19. 346-462 K.) meshes in certain aspects with the lexicographical work of both Galen and others.[25] Here too the author makes claim to τάξις 'organisation' superior to that of his predecessors. In defining terms, certain lexicographical principles are applied. The definition of the two main μέρη 'parts' of medicine as *theoria* and *praxis* is reminiscent of Erotian's categorisation; these parts are further classified as φυσιολογικόν, παθογνωμονικόν, διαιτητικόν, ὑλικόν and θεραπευτικόν, that is concerned with physiology, pathology, regimen, *material medica* and therapy (*definitiones medicae*, 19. 351-2 K.). Definitions of prognostic signs and of *prognosis* or *prorrhesis* mirror the prominence accorded these features by Erotian (*definitiones medicae*, 19. 394 and 395 K.). We may add that the organisation of medical material, even in different cultures, is liable to run on somewhat similar lines. For example, the works in classical Sanskrit collectively known as Samhita, attributed to Caraka, is: anatomy, including embryology; physiology, including digestion, blood, respiration; pharmacology; aetiology of disease.[26]

In a lengthy *Onomasticon*, Pollux, a writer of the age of Commodus (180-192 AD) compiled exhaustive lists of Greek terminology, arranged thematically, and in this compilation medical and especially anatomical terms occupied much space (Pollux 2. 3, 4, 5). Later, Hesychios paid much attention to medical terms; in this, he drew on Erotian and other ancient traditions.[27] The *Oeconomia* of Foesius (1588), published some years before his vast Hippocratic edition (1595), is a remarkable compilation, demonstrating both an impressive familiarity with the detailed content of Hippocratic texts and a profound medical acumen. It remains a valuable adjunct to the indispensable modern tools of lexicon and concordance.

Erotian's achievement stands out in the long history of Hippocratic lexicography and indeed of Hippocratic scholarship. The aims expressed by Erotian in his preface, and applied in his lexicon, demonstrate a nuanced approach to the considerable body of disparate Hippocratic material known to him. It is evident that Erotian does not consciously think in terms of 'genre' (in any case an anachronistic concept) but primarily in terms of content (in which authorial intent and purpose play a part). However, the classification he presents is remarkably percipient not only through its understanding of the purpose of the works but also through its

[25] On date (between 70 and 150 AD) and source (pneumatist?) see Nutton (2004). 385 n. 31.
[26] See Valiathan (2003).
[27] See Perilli (2008).

identification of their wider affiliations in terms of literary typology. In this it is timeless.

Bibliography

Adams, F. (1849), *The Genuine works of Hippocrates* (London).

Craik, E. M. (1998), *Hippocrates* Places in Man (Oxford).

----- (2006a), *Two Hippocratic Treatises*: On Sight *and* On Anatomy (Leiden).

----- (2006b), 'Horizontal Transmission in the Hippocratic Tradition', *Mnemosyne* 59: 334-47.

----- (2009), *The Hippocratic Treatise* On Glands (Leiden).

----- (2015), *The 'Hippocratic' Corpus* (London).

Danielsson, O. A. (1919), 'Erotiana', *Eranos* 19: 1-44.

Dean-Jones, L. (2003), 'Literacy and the Charlatan in Ancient Greek Medicine', in H. Yunis (ed.), *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

Foesius, A. (1588) *Oeconomia Hippocratis* (Frankfurt).

Greenhill, W. A. (1862), 'Hippocrates' in W. Smith (ed.) *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* (London).

Grensemann, H. (1964), 'Zu den Hippokratesglossaren des Erotian und Galenos', *Hermes* 92: 505-7.

----- (1968), 'Weitere Bemerkungen zu den Hippokratesglossaren des Erotian und Galenos', *Hermes* 96: 177-90.

----- (1975), *Knidsche Medizin,* Ars Medica Abt. 2, Gr.-Lat. Med. Bd 4 (Berlin and New York).

Irmer, D. (2007), 'Das Hippokratesglossar Erotians und die Identifizierung der erklärten Stellen im Corpus Hippocraticum', *Galenos* 1: 61-72.

Jouanna, J. (1974), *Hippocrate: pour une archéologie de l'école de Cnide* (Paris).

----- (1999) *Hippocrates,* English translation of *Hippocrate* (London).

Kind, F. E. (1937), 'Zu Erotian und Hippokrates', *Hermes* 72: 367-8.

Kühn, J. H. and Fleischer, U. (1986-99), *Index Hippocraticus* (Göttingen).

Littré, E. (1839-1861), *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate* (Paris).

Maloney, G. and Frohn, W. (1986-1989), *Concordantia in Corpus Hippocraticum* (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York).

Manetti, D. (1997), 'Il proemio di Erotiano e l'oscurità intenzionale di Ippocrate', *Testi Medici Greci*, 363-77 (Naples).

Mewaldt, J. (1909), 'Galenos über echte und unechte Hippokratika', *Hermes* 44: 111-34.

Nachmanson, E. (1917), *Erotianstudien* (Uppsala).

----- (1918), *Erotiani vocum hippocraticum collectio cum fragmentis* (Uppsala).

Nikitas, A. A. (1971), *ἔρευναι ἐπὶ τῶν πηγῶν τοῦ λεξικοῦ τοῦ Ἐρωτιανοῦ*. (Athens).

Nutton, V. (2004), *Ancient Medicine* (London and New York).

Perilli, L. (2008), 'Su Esichio e i cosidetti "frammenti" del Glossario ippocratico di Erotiano', *Galenos* 2: 35-55.

Pfeiffer, R. (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford).

Salazar, C. F. (1997), 'Fragments of lost Hippocratic writings in Galen's Glossary', *CQ* 47: 543-7.

Severinus, M. A. (1645), *Zootomia Democritaea* (Nuremberg).

Smith, W.D. (1979), *The Hippocratic Tradition* (Ithaca and London).

Spanoudakis, K. (2002), *Philitas of Cos* (Leiden).

von Staden, H. (1989), *Herophilus. The Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria* (Cambridge).

----- (1992), 'Lexicography in the Third Century B.C.: Bacchius of Tanagra, Erotian, and Hippocrates' in J. A. López Férez, (ed.), *Tratados Hipocraticos* (Madrid).

Thivel, A. (1981), *Cnide et Cos? Essai sur les doctrines médicales dans la collection Hippocratique* (Paris).

Thompson, D'Arcy W. (1917), *On Growth and Form* (London).

Valiathan, M. S. (2003), *The Legacy of Caraka* (Hyderabad).

University of St. Andrews
ec@st-andrews.ac.uk