

Lorenzo Perilli (ed.): *Galenii vocum Hippocratis Glossarium/Galeno, Interpretazione delle parole difficili di Ippocrate. Testo, Traduzione e Note di Commento*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2017 (*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* 5,13,1). xx, 417 p. € 179.95. ISBN: 978-3-11-048196-9.

This new volume of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* provides the first critical edition, Italian translation, and commentary of an interesting, but hitherto neglected Galenic work, the so-called *Glossary of Hippocratic Terms*. It consists of around 880 glosses of Hippocratic terms and gives us an important perspective on Galen's role as a lexicographer. It is preceded by a proem in which Galen explains his writing intentions. It was composed for his friend Teuthras as a sort of guide to Hippocratic terminology. As to the contents, there are a variety of entries, from the usual references to medical instruments and names of elements of *materia medica* to rare cases of architectural terms. Among Galen's named sources are well-known ancient authorities on the relevant subjects, such as Theophrastos and Pedanios Dioscorides as well as authors whose works are now lost, such as the Herophilean Dioscorides Phakas, Krateuas, Dioscorides the glossographer (author of a Hippocratic glossary and several Hippocratic commentaries), and Pamphilos (author of lists of synonymous terms for plants and animals).

The book consists of three main sections. The first starts with a lengthy description of the twenty-eight Greek manuscripts of the text (25–49), which may be divided into two groups of fourteen manuscripts. The first, the so-called *classis prior*, consists of those codices that transmit the complete version of the text, while those of the *classis posterior* preserve an epitomised version with no proem and a considerable number of glosses either completely omitted or reduced in length. Bearing in mind that the author of this edition, Lorenzo Perilli, has spent a very long time working on this Galenic text, it would surely be worth publishing an edition of the epitomised version too in the future. This would give modern scholars a better idea of the various versions of the text that were available and circulating in the medieval period, which is essential from a cultural perspective, and, in particular, in connection with the various stages in the history of any given text.

Interestingly, the earliest manuscript of the *classis posterior*, Marcianus gr. 269 (tenth century), is about two centuries older than Laurentianus plut. 74.3 (late twelfth/early thirteenth century), the earliest manuscript of the *classis*

*prior*. Lorenzo Perilli has made every effort to describe each codex in detail, providing information about contents and palaeographical characteristics. The *Glossary* has mainly been transmitted in medical manuscripts, most often those of the Hippocratic corpus. References to particular catalogues for each collection are not included in the manuscript descriptions. Although for the majority of the manuscripts the relevant catalogues are now outdated, such as those for the Greek manuscripts in Paris,<sup>1</sup> in other cases, such as Monacensis gr. 71, it would be worth giving a reference to the most recent and very detailed catalogue by Marina Molin Pradel for the reader interested in looking at further details on this particular codex.<sup>2</sup> The next sub-section focuses on the relationship between the various manuscripts and overall is very well argued and gives a comprehensive presentation (49–80). I particularly enjoyed Perilli's discussion of textual contamination, something which has been observed in various copies (79–80), and refers to the practice of a scribe comparing more than one earlier version when writing in his copy. This phenomenon was quite normal in the Byzantine period, although it has not always been given due attention by editors. Later on, the editor introduces his readers to the text's reception through editions and translations, dating from the sixteenth century up to the modern day (80–91). Remarkably, there were at least four editions and four different Latin translations of the work or parts of it as early as the sixteenth century.

The second section of the book constitutes a detailed critical introduction to the text with specific parts devoted to the title and date, structure and characteristics, sources, and reception by medieval authors (92–132). I very much liked Perilli's discussion of the work's authenticity, in which he convincingly shows that – despite some earlier scepticism – the work should most probably be considered a genuine Galenic product.

The third section consists of the edition with a parallel Italian translation on the opposite page (132–379). Perilli's splendid edition often considers a va-

1 H. Omont: *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale*. 3 vols. Paris 1886–1888.

2 M. Molin Pradel: *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, vol. 2: *Codices graeci Monacenses 56–109*. Wiesbaden 2013, at 129–139.

riety of additional texts such as the surviving Galenic commentaries on various Hippocratic works.<sup>3</sup> There are three very useful *apparatus*, namely one for the Hippocratic texts in which the relevant term appears, where the most common references are to gynaecological works (mostly *On Diseases of Women* 1, 2), nosological treatises (most often *On Diseases* 2 and *On Internal Affections*), and various books of the Hippocratic case histories, *Epidemics*; the traditional *apparatus criticus* and an *apparatus* of similar passages from other Galenic works as well as later sources, including Byzantine lexicographical works such as Hesychios' dictionary and the *Suda* lexicon. What makes Perilli's edition very useful is not only the accurate Italian translation but also the rich interpretive and philological commentary provided at the end of the book for the vast majority of the entries with references to other sources, further bibliography, and potential explanations of conjectures or problematic textual passages.

To return to the actual text of this Galenic treatise and to give the reader a better idea of its structure, let me cite some examples. In some cases, Galen simply refers to earlier authorities in order to confirm the synonymy of certain terms without further analysis, as in the case of the Hippocratic term ἀγρίη κολοκύνθη (150, α.4), which is equated with κολοκυνθίς (colocynth), followed by brief citations of three names of earlier authors, i.e. Krateuas, Dioscorides, and Pamphilos, who employed this term in their works. In other cases, Galen makes a detailed reference to the title of the relevant source(s) and cites a particular quote in which a certain term that he refers to appears, as in the case of the Hippocratic μυρτίδανον (238, μ.42), for which a reference from Dioscorides' *De materia medica* (1.112) is provided: Διοσκοουρίδης δὲ ὁ Ἀναζαρβεὺς ἐν τῷ α' Περὶ ὕλης, “ἐπίφυσιν ἀνώμαλον καὶ ὀχθώδη, περὶ τὸ τῆς μυρρίνης πρέμνον”. Furthermore, we can sometimes see a direct reference to the relevant Hippocratic work(s), which specifies the particular passage that Galen is citing, as, for example, in the case of τέρθρον [...] ὃ δὲ Ἴπποκράτης ἐν τῷ β' τῶν Γυναικείων [...] φησὶν “τὸ τέρθρον ἢ τοῦ πάθεος” (270, τ.6). More interestingly, Galen sometimes compares various sources before giving an interpretation, as in the case of ἰνδικόν (209–210, ι.6), which was either described by earlier

3 I have only noticed two mistranscriptions and one textual emendation. The title in **FG** reads ἀλφάβητον not ἀλφάβετον (92). **A** reads ἀσθενῶς (150, α.6); I would like to thank Georgi Parpulov for deciphering this reading. E.82 should read εὐκάρδιον not εὐκάρδιον (202).

authors as a synonym for ginger or as a substance similar to pepper; thus, he presents the views of different authors.

The book ends with a group of very detailed indices, i.e. a) Index nominum, b) Index verborum, c) Voces, quae in LSJ desiderantur, d) Index nominum plantarum et animalium, and e) Index locorum Hippocraticorum (382–417), which are indeed extremely helpful. Overall, this exceptional edition of the *Glossary of Hippocratic Terms* is very welcome and is likely not only to appeal to scholars of ancient medicine but also to those working on Greek and Latin lexicography and the linguistic development of the Greek language.

---

Petros Bouras-Vallianatos, Edinburgh  
petros.bouras-vallianatos@ed.ac.uk

**www.plekos.de**

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Petros Bouras-Vallianatos: Rezension zu: Lorenzo Perilli (ed.): Galeni vocum Hippocratis Glossarium/Galeno, Interpretazione delle parole difficili di Ippocrate. Testo, Traduzione e Note di Commento. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2017 (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5,13,1). In: Plekos 22, 2020, 119–122 (URL: <http://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2020/r-perilli.pdf>).

---