

opening lines recall in their choice of words a Theocritean passage (*Id.* 24.11) and contain a rare use of a plural form (μεσονυκτίοις... ὥραις; see A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*, Cambridge, 1985, p. 181); the setting is a commonplace one in erotic poetry, most familiar from Vergil (*Aeneid* 4.522ff.), and also here recalls the conventional setting for an epiphany (see Dodds on Euripides' *Bacchae* 1084–5); Eros, shut out in the night and demanding admission (6–13), recalls the common motif of the *exclusus amator*; lines 24–30 recall the episode of Odysseus and the bow, especially in vocabulary (24f. πειράσωμεν | τόδε τόξον, εἴ τί μοι νῦν | βλάβεται βραχεῖσα νευρή ~ *Od.* 21.393ff. τόξον... πειρώμενος... μὴ κέρα ἵπες ἔδοιεν; 27 τανύει ~ *Od.* 21.407 ἐτάνυσσε; 29 ἀνὰ δ' ἄλλεται... εἶπε ~ *Od.* 22.2–4 ἄλτο δ' ἐπὶ μέγαν οὐδὸν... ἔειπεν, cited by West *ad loc.*; add 30 ξένε ~ *Od.* 22.27 ξείνε). The phrase ὕγρον ὕδωρ, then, in the light of this close dependence, should be regarded as a distinct allusion to the Proteus episode: Eros, in the manner of Odysseus, relinquishes his suppliant pose and shoots his host; Eros, in the manner of Proteus, reveals his true nature, and his parting words (32)

σὺ δὲ καρδίαν πονήσεις

recall Proteus' words to Menelaus (*Od.* 4.493f.)

οὐδέ σέ φημι
δὴν ἄκλαυτον ἔσεσθαι κτλ.

The University of Western Australia

IAN C. MARTLEW

A NOTE ON [HIPPOCRATES], *DE MORBIS II* 1, 4 A

In the fourth chapter of the Hippocratic treatise *De morbis II* 1¹ an unnamed illness² is discussed which arises allegedly from an overabundance of blood in the vessels around the brain. The author of the chapter, however, disputes this aetiology:³

**Ἦν περὶ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον φλέβια ὑπεραιμύση⁴ – τὸ μὲν οὐνομα οὐκ ὀρθὸν τῇ νόσῳ· οὐ γὰρ ἀνυστὸν ὑπεραιμῆσαι οὐδὲν τῶν φλεβίων οὔτε τῶν ἐλασσόνων οὔτε τῶν μειζόνων· ὀνομαίνουσι*

¹ As is well known, *De morbis II* consists of what are in fact two separate works, one comprising chapters 1–11 and the other chapters 12–75, which derive (independently, in all probability) from a common model: cf. J. Jouanna, ed., *Hippocrate*, Tome X, 2^e Partie, *Maladies II* (Paris, 1983), pp. 11–12 and 25–50; idem, *Hippocrate. Pour une archéologie de l'école de Cnide* (Paris, 1974), 26–126 and 285 n. 1, and I. M. Lonie, 'The Cnidian Treatises of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*', *CQ* 15 (1965), 6–9. (Against Jouanna's identification of the common model of *De morb. II* 1 and 2 with the so-called *Κνίδαι γνῶμαι*, however, cf. most recently Volker Langholf, *Medical Theories in Hippocrates* = Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Band 34 (Berlin and New York, 1990), pp. 12–36, especially 21–5.) I follow Jouanna's terminology (cf. Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 12) and designate chapters 1–11 as *De morb. II* 1.

² In the *recentiores* the tag ἐτέρη νόσος is prefixed to the chapter, but the primary witnesses to the text (θ = Vindobonensis medicus graecus 4 (s. x/xi) and M = Marciianus venetus graecus 269 (s. x/xi)) omit these words.

³ Text and punctuation follow Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134, lines 10ff. Potter in the Loeb edition (*Hippocrates*, Vol. V, with an English translation by P. Potter [London and Cambridge, MA., 1988], 194) ends the parenthesis after ἐσέλθη, but this is clearly wrong, since the clause μετεωρίζονται τε γὰρ αἱ φλέβες καὶ σφύζουσι obviously is meant to explain why the vessels seem to be overfilled with blood. With Potter's punctuation the γὰρ would be unmotivated, and in fact he simply ignores it in his translation. (I express my thanks to CQ's anonymous reader for alerting me to this problem.) On this parenthesis cf. further below.

⁴ Here and throughout the chapter the MSS (θ M) offer forms of ὑπερεμῆν, which is clearly wrong; the correction to ὑπεραιμύσει etc. is due to Ermerins: see Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 4 (on p. 216), and cf. LSJ s.v. ὑπερεμῆω and I. M. Lonie, *CQ* 15 (1965), 8 n. 1.

δὲ καὶ φασιν ὑπεραιμῆν· εἰ δ' ὥς μάλιστα ὑπεραιμῆσειε, νοῦσος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔοικεν ἂν γίνεσθαι· ἀπὸ ἀγαθοῦ γὰρ κακὸν οὐχ οἶόν τε γίνεσθαι· οὐδ' ἀπὸ κακοῦ ἀγαθὸν γένοιτ' ἂν· ἀλλ' ὑπεραιμῆν δοκεῖ ὅταν ἐς τὰς φλέβας χολὴ ἢ φλέγμα ἐσέλθῃ· μετεωρίζονται τε γὰρ αἱ φλέβες καὶ σφύζονται – καὶ ὀδύνῃ κτλ.

Jouanna⁵ translates the conditional protasis εἰ δ' ὥς μάλιστα ὑπεραιμῆσειε 'Mais supposons qu'ils regorgent au maximum de sang.' ὥς μάλιστα is best taken, however, not with the verb, as Jouanna takes it, but as qualifying the entire clause. Potter⁶ gets the translation right ('And even if they really did overflow with blood etc.'). but this idiomatic use of ὥς μάλιστα deserves a word of explanation. In conditional clauses ὥς (or ὅτι or τὰ) μάλιστα imparts a concessive force, in order to emphasize that even granted a (false) premise, a given conclusion still would not follow.⁷ So here the author rejects *a priori*⁸ the notion that the vessels around the brain could have too much blood. But he goes on to argue that *even if they did*, no disease could result from this,⁹ and so the aetiology which explains the disease in question as resulting from an excess of blood cannot be accepted. (In the author's opinion the disease is caused rather by bile and phlegm.¹⁰)

Ermerins¹¹ considered the entire passage from τὸ μὲν οὖνομα to σφύζονται καὶ a later insertion which originated as a marginal gloss, and accordingly deleted it. Certainly the passage represents an addition which did not exist in the model common to both *De morb. II* 1 and 2.¹² Jouanna and Lonie more plausibly suggest that the

⁵ Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134; cf. the almost identical translation in Jouanna, *Hippocrate*, op. cit., p. 47: 'Mais supposons que ces veinules regorgent au maximum de sang'.

⁶ Potter, op. cit., p. 195.

⁷ On this usage see Wankel's note on Demosthenes, *De corona* 21 (*Demosthenes. Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, erläutert und mit einer Einleitung versehen von Hermann Wankel, Erste Halbband [Heidelberg, 1976], pp. 217–18), with the passages and references there cited, especially J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums* (Heidelberg, 1907), p. 417, who cites further passages. Cf. also D. F. Ast, *Lexicon Platonicum* ii (Leipzig, 1836), p. 275. The earliest example of this idiom with ὥς (or ὅτι or τὰ) μάλιστα that I have found (Stahl, loc. cit., cites Homeric examples of a related type with εἰ καὶ μάλα) is in Xenophanes, DK B 34, 3: εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τῆς τετελεσμένον εἰπὼν κτλ. (cf. W. J. Verdenius, *Mnemosyne* ser. IV, 6 (1953), 197; for a different interpretation cf. H. Fränkel, 'Xenophanesstudien', in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* [München, 1968], pp. 345–6 = *The Pre-Socratics. A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by A. Mourelatos [New York, 1974], pp. 126–7). But the idiom becomes frequent only in the late fifth and in the fourth centuries B.C. (cf. Antiphon Orator 5. 27 and 62; Andocides 1.113; Lysias 13.52; 22.1 and 10, all cited by Wankel, loc. cit.; for Platonic passages see Stahl and Ast, loc. cit.; for Demosthenic passages cf. Wankel, loc. cit.; I have found no other instances in the Hippocratic corpus). The logical and argumentative force of εἰ ὥς (or ὅτι or τὰ) μάλιστα emerges clearly from the examples in Antiphon, where the author explicitly states that he will adopt the λόγος of his opponents, and goes on to show that even on their premise their argument is unconvincing (cf. 5. 27: κατ' ἐγὼ συγχωρῶ τῷ τούτων λόγῳ παρεχόμενος μὲν τοὺς μαρτύρας ὥς οὐκ ἐξέβην ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου· εἰ δὲ καὶ ὥς μάλιστα ἐξέβην ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου κτλ.; 5. 62: ἐπειτα δ' εἰ καὶ ὥς μάλιστα ἐβούλετο αὐτὸν ὁ Λυκίνος τεθνάναι — εἰμι γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν κατηγορῶν λόγον — κτλ.).

⁸ On what grounds, the author does not say: οὐ γὰρ ἀνυστὸν ὑπεραιμῆσαι κτλ. (unless we are to suppose that the vessels cannot overflow for the same reason that, even if they did, no disease would result, i.e. because a bad thing cannot come from a good).

⁹ Since bad (disease) cannot come from good (blood): ἀπὸ ἀγαθοῦ γὰρ κακὸν οὐχ οἶόν τε γίνεσθαι· οὐδ' ἀπὸ κακοῦ ἀγαθὸν γένοιτ' ἂν.

¹⁰ In the humoral pathology espoused by the author of *De morb. II* 1 bile and phlegm are the habitual agents of disease; cf. Jouanna, *Hippocrate*, op. cit., pp. 91 n. 2 and 92ff.

¹¹ Cf. *ad loc.* in his edition: F. Z. Ermerins, *Hippocratis et aliorum medicorum graecorum veterum reliquiae* II (Utrecht, 1862), pp. 184–5, cited by Jouanna, *Hippocrate*, op. cit., p. 89 with n. 2 and idem, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 5 (on pp. 216–17).

¹² As can be seen by comparison of *De morb. II* 1, 4 with the parallel chapter 17 in *De morb. II* 2 (Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 151, lines 17ff.). Cf. further on this passage Jouanna,

addition is due to the author of *De morb. II* 1 himself. Jouanna argues¹³ that the author's critical attitude towards his model is conceivable only at a time when the doctrine of the model no longer exercised the force of dogma and when philosophic preoccupation with the *ῥηθόρης* of language was widespread. The rhetorically sophisticated character of the argument¹⁴ employed in this passage points in the same direction, and is hardly compatible with Ermerins' theory of a marginal gloss.

Georgia State University

GERARD PENDRICK

Hippocrate, op. cit., pp. 88–92; idem, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 5 (on pp. 228–9); Lonie, *CQ* 15 (1965), 8.

¹³ Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 5 (on pp. 228–9).

¹⁴ On the form of the argument cf. Wankel, loc. cit., and especially the informative note of Wilhelm Fox on Demosthenes, *De corona* 95 (W. Fox, *Die Kranzrede des Demosthenes* [Leipzig, 1880], n. 73 on pp. 300–301)(cited by Wankel).

A NOTE ON THE DATING OF DEMETRIUS' *ON STYLE*

Anyone who studies antiquity is surely accustomed to the tenuousness and often wild variances of the dating of many of our texts. But even if this is taken for granted, the dating of Demetrius' *On Style* seems more problematic than most: the text has been assigned a date anywhere from the late fourth century B.C. to the late first century C.E.¹ Attempts to narrow this wide range have been made using internal linguistic data, but these have not proved definitive, although a late date is now tentatively accepted by most.² But a possibly more convincing argument for a late date may be found in a reference to architecture in paragraph 13 of *On Style*.

In paragraph 13, Demetrius compares the members of a period to the stones that support 'rounded roofs' (*periphēris stegas*). If this refers merely to vaulted ceilings, then this passage will offer us no help in dating, as vaults were known from the early ancient world, as far back as even the fourth millennium B.C.³ This phrase has been taken in this way by at least one translator.⁴ But if the phrase refers to domes, then this would rule out an early date for *On Style*, as domes were not widely known in the west before the first century C.E.⁵ 'Rounded roofs' would seem a more appropriate label for domes than for vaults, especially since *periphēris* can have the more specific meaning of 'spherical', as opposed to merely 'curved' or 'rounded' in

¹ See the introduction by T. A. Moxon, *Poetics of Aristotle, On Style by Demetrius* (London, 1934) x–xi; and W. R. Roberts, *Demetrius On Style* (Cambridge, 1902) 49–64, and his later *Demetrius On Style* (Cambridge, MA, 1927) 257–87, esp. 268–77.

² For the linguistic evidence, see Roberts (1902), 55–9; in the introduction to the 1927 edition, 271–7, he conjectures that it was written in the second half of the first century C.E. by the Demetrius mentioned by Plutarch in *On the Cessation of Oracles*, but even he himself admits that his evidence is slim. An early date (first half of the third century B.C.) is accepted by G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, NJ, 1963) 286, following the suggestion of G. M. A. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style* (Toronto, 1961) 39ff. A late date (first century C.E.) is accepted by D. M. Schenkeveld, *Studies in Demetrius On Style* (Amsterdam, 1964) 135–48, and more tentatively by G. A. Kennedy, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 1, *Classical Criticism* (Cambridge, 1989), 196.

³ On the history of vaults, see M. S. Briggs, *Everyman's Concise Encyclopaedia of Architecture* (London, 1959) 354–6; on vaults in Roman architecture, see W. L. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire* (2 vols., New Haven and London, 1982) vol. 1, 3–8.

⁴ Moxon, op. cit., 203.

⁵ On the history of domes, see Briggs, op. cit., 109–10; and MacDonald, op. cit., 24, and his detailed discussion of the Pantheon (ca. 125–8 C.E.) 94–121.