

# GALEN ON BAD STYLE (KAKOZĒLÍA): HIPPOCRATIC EXEGESIS IN GALEN AND SOME PREDECESSORS

MARIA BÖRNO · SEAN COUGHLIN\*

**ABSTRACT** · Our paper explores a type of stylistic judgment frequently used by Galen to question the authenticity of a Hippocratic text or the plausibility of a predecessor's emendation: *κακοζήλία* (*kakozēlía*) or 'bad style'. Galen nowhere defines this stylistic criterion, but we can narrow it to a range of meanings by turning to descriptions of the term in contemporary writers on rhetoric; furthermore, we show that we can identify patterns in how he applies it in his Hippocratic commentaries. From these patterns, it becomes clear that one thing Galen means by 'bad style' in the context of textual criticism is that the text in front of him fails to meet his standards for what constitutes good scientific prose. More importantly, we argue that when Galen rejects the Hippocratic provenance of a text or textual variant on stylistic grounds, it reveals something not only about his approach to textual criticism, but also about the Hippocrates he inherited from his predecessors.

**KEYWORDS** · Galen, Hippocrates, Hippocratic Corpus, Textual criticism, Commentary, Exegesis, *Kakozēlía*, Style, Rhetoric, Authority.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**I**N his Hippocratic commentaries, Galen gives three criteria he will use to establish a Hippocratic text.<sup>1</sup> First, he says whenever possible he will adopt the most ancient reading, even if it seems implausible (*ἀπίθανος*) and presents a greater puzzle (*μείζονα τὴν ἀπορίαν ἔχειν*).<sup>2</sup> When an

\* maria.boerno@hu-berlin.de, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.  
sean.coughlin@hu-berlin.de, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

<sup>1</sup> A related question about the texts we now consider to be genuinely Hippocratic has been explored, to our immense benefit, by Elizabeth Craik, a summary of which has recently appeared as CRAIK 2018. We are grateful for the opportunity to dedicate this paper to her.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* VI 2.47 (121.17-18 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.1005 Kühn); *Hipp. Epid.* VI 3.36 (178.17-18 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17B.101 Kühn); *Hipp. Off.* I. pr. (18B.630 Kühn); *Hipp. Epid.* VI 2.21 (83.19-22 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.937 Kühn). The standard reference work for Galen's scholarship remains MANETTI, ROSELLI 1994. For discussions of Galen on philology and language, see BRÖCKER 1885; MÜLLER 1891; MORAUX 1977; KOLLESCH 1981; LÓPEZ FÉREZ 1992; HANKINSON 1994; HANSON 1998; MORISON 2008; MANETTI 2009; NUTTON 2009; and most recently ROSELLI 2020. For Galen's Hippocratic scholar-

ancient reading cannot be maintained,<sup>1</sup> he opts for emendation and he gives two further criteria for what counts as a plausible emendation: it should teach something useful (χρήσιμον) and it should be consistent with the thought (γνώμη) of Hippocrates.<sup>2</sup> Galen is therefore relatively clear about what readings he thinks should be accepted. He is far less clear, however, about what readings, even ancient ones, should be rejected. One of the few programmatic remarks he makes on the subject, that he will accept emendation «whenever it is no longer possible to maintain the text» (μὴ δυνηθέντι δέ ποτε τοῦτο πράξει),<sup>3</sup> is uninformative. His frequent boasts, moreover, that he can interpret ancient readings even when they seem implausible only serves to obscure the criteria he might have in mind.<sup>4</sup> Yet, understanding when and why Galen rejects a text can tell us quite a bit about Galen's exegetical method: it offers us a chance to look behind the scenes, as it were, not only at his approach to textual criticism, but also at the ways he responds to and refines the Hippocrates he inherited from his predecessors.

Although Galen nowhere gives a programmatic procedure for rejecting variant readings in his extant works, we can look instead at his exegetical practice in the Hippocratic commentaries, first identifying patterns in his procedure, and then seeing whether we can find the reasons behind them. In this paper, we focus on one such pattern, which comes up both in discussions of establishing a text and determining its Hippocratic provenance: Galen's use of κακοζήλια (*kakozēlia*).<sup>5</sup>

ship in particular, we have relied on MEWALDT 1909; GARCÍA BALLESTER 1968; HARIG, KOLLESCH 1975; MANULI 1983; DEBRU 1987; LLOYD 1993; ROSELLI 1999; STROHMAIER 2004; VAN DER EIJK 2012; HOLMES 2012; and JOUANNA 2012, esp. pp. 261-359.

<sup>1</sup> Galen suggests that maintaining the ancient reading is the practice of those who are 'more philological' (γραμματικώτεροι). On Galen's criterion of the ancient reading (or *lectio antiquior*), see now ROSELLI (2020, pp. 56-63) and bibliography there. In his pioneering study, BRÖCKER (1885) points out that Galen thinks it is more likely that a difficult text was changed to an easier one than the other way around; however, as noted by ROSELLI (2020, p. 63), this does not mean that Galen relies on the principle of *lectio difficilior*. Instead, more difficult readings are, as she calls them, 'tolerable faults'. On plausibility (πιθανός) as criterion, see ROSELLI 2020, pp. 61-62.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* VI praef. (3.11-4 and 7 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.794 Kühn). On the criterion of the 'useful' (χρήσιμον), see also Gal. *Hipp. Progn.* 3.6 (328.2-22 Heeg = 18B.229-231 Kühn) and discussion by MANETTI, ROSELLI 1994, pp. 1561-1562.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* VI praef. (4.6 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.794 Kühn).

<sup>4</sup> On Galen's self-image as interpreter, see VON STADEN 2009, pp. 133-135.

<sup>5</sup> We were led to an examination of Galen's views on Hippocrates' style independently: one of us, Maria Börno, via the preparation of a critical edition and interpretation of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms* VII; the other, Sean Coughlin, via a study of Galen's views on the Hippocratism of Athenaeus of Attalia (COUGHLIN 2018). We later found that some of the issues that arose in our work had been explored

The term *κακοζηλία* first appears in several Hellenistic and Imperial-age writers on rhetoric. It literally means something like a zeal (or taste) for what is bad – over the top, cringe-worthy, or simply bad style, – although what counts as bad varies from author to author.<sup>1</sup> According to Quintilian, for instance, it extends to any form of expression that is unnatural, inappropriate or superfluous.<sup>2</sup> For Pseudo-Hermogenes, it includes any expression that is unbelievable (*ἄπιστος*) for being «impossible, inconsistent (i.e. incompatible), shameful, sacrilegious, unjust, or contrary to nature».<sup>3</sup> Galen never defines it, but he uses it in similar ways: he says Archigenes uses bad style (*κακοζήλως εἴρηται*) when he describes pains as ‘full’ or ‘diffused’;<sup>4</sup> and he even admits to doing it himself when he uses the obscure phrase ‘sinews of the art’ (*νεῦρα τῆς τέχνης*).<sup>5</sup>

In more general terms, we can characterise the vice of *κακοζηλία* as a non-syntactical error, and contrast it with solecism (*σολοικισμός*), which refers to errors of syntax.<sup>6</sup> As a non-syntactical error, *κακοζηλία* can

earlier by SLUITER (1995a; 1995b), VON STADEN (2002, pp. 109-123), and SINGER (forthcoming), all of whom have taught us a great deal and whose conclusions we mostly confirm.

<sup>1</sup> On the term, see WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF 1900, p. 28; and ROBERTS 1902, p. 286. See also discussions in GRUBE 1961; SCHENKEVELD 1967; GÖRLER 1979; JOCELYN 1980. The earliest ancient discussion is [Demetrius], *De elocutione* 3, 186-189 (156.5-158.3 Roberts) and 239 (178.21-30 Roberts). In addition to [Demetrius], see Lucian, *De saltatione*, 82; Quintilian, *De institutio oratoria* 8.3.56-58 (see note 2 on this page) and [Hermogenes], *De inventione*, 4.12 (see note 3 on this page).

<sup>2</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.56-58: *cum dicitur aliter, quam se natura habet et quam oportet et quam sat est.*

<sup>3</sup> [Hermog.] *Inv.* 4.12 (202.4-8 Rabe): «An affected style occurs either through what is impossible, inconsistent (i.e. incompatible), shameful, sacrilegious, unjust, or contrary to nature – styles especially through which we deny a story when we reject it as incredulous» (τὸ δὲ κακόζηλον γίνεται ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀδύνατον ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀνακόλουθον, ὃ καὶ ἐναντιωματὶ ἐστίν, ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀσχερὸν ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀσεβὲς ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀδικον ἢ κατὰ τὸ τῇ φύσει πολέμιον, καθ’ οὗς τρόπους καὶ ἀνασκευάζομεν μάλιστα τὰ διηγήματα ἐκβάλλοντες ὡς ἄπιστα).

<sup>4</sup> Gal. *Loc. Aff.* II 8.15 (340.12-14 Gärtner = 8.100 Kühn): «What Archigenes says next, that the nerves have ‘full’ pains also when there is a *stenosis*, is said in a bad style. He clarifies nothing more than what he says afterwards, (i.e.) that the pains are ‘least diffused’» (τὸ δ’ ἐφεξῆς εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιγένους, ὅτι καὶ στενοχωρίας πλήρεις ἔχει τὰ νεῦρα τοὺς πόνους, κακοζήλως μὲν εἴρηται τῇ λέξει. δηλοῖ δ’ οὐδὲν πλέον τοῦ μετ’ αὐτό, καθ’ ὃ φησι καὶ ἥμισυα κεχυμένους). For discussion, see LEWIS (forthcoming).

<sup>5</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* VI 1.16 (38.22-23 Wenkebach = 17A.861 Kühn): «and yet some, even if to say it shows rather bad style, are like ‘sinews of the art’» (*καίτοι τινα μὲν, εἰ καὶ κακοζηλότερον εἰπεῖν, οἷον νεῦρα τῆς τέχνης ἐστίν*). Cf. Bion *ap.* Diog. Laert. 4.48: «wealth is the sinews of business» (τὸν πλοῦτον νεῦρα πραγμάτων).

<sup>6</sup> Galen also uses solecism to argue for a text’s inauthenticity. Although solecism, like *κακοζηλία*, features prominently in writings on style by Galen’s contemporaries, it has

describe either *how* something is expressed or *what* is being expressed, i.e., expressions and thoughts: in expression, it refers to mixed-metaphors, pretentious, foreign or archaic vocabulary, abnormal word order, or incomplete figures – what we can describe as *bad style*.<sup>1</sup> In thought (ἡ διάνοια) or subject matter (τὸ πρᾶγμα), it takes on an aesthetic and moral character, referring to crass subjects, double-entendres, awkward metaphors, and generally whatever is in *bad taste*.<sup>2</sup> In both cases, the consensus among ancient writers was that *κακοζηλία* causes an expression to fail. The tension between what the author is trying to say, and the silliness or baseness of the execution ends up making the result seem too implausible to be taken seriously.<sup>3</sup>

In Galen's Hippocratic commentaries, *κακοζηλία* mostly shows up in the sense of 'bad style.' Galen, however, does something with this stylistic judgment that no other ancient author does, at least as far as we know: he uses it as a criterion of textual criticism.<sup>4</sup> In applying *κακοζηλία* to questions of textual criticism, Galen is unique among writers of scientific commentaries. Other authors may accept or reject works or variants on stylistic grounds – a common approach to be sure.<sup>5</sup> But we can find no other writer who explicitly uses *κακοζηλία* to determine questions of authenticity or to judge when emendation is required.<sup>6</sup> Galen adopts it, we believe, precisely because he found it useful for evaluating such questions, regardless of a text's medical accuracy or usefulness. The nuances

– unlike *κακοζηλία* – a long tradition in literary criticism going back as far as Aristotle and even Protagoras, whose definition Aristotle cites at *Soph. cl.* 14 (173b 17 = Fragment 28 line 1-5). We plan to pursue this topic in a sequel to this paper, *Galen on Solcism*.

<sup>1</sup> This defect of style is one which, according to Galen's contemporary, Pseudo-Demetrius, 'no one of sound judgment' (οὐδ'... τις ἀκριβῶς σωφρονῶν) would use, not even in poetry. [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 3, 188 (156.19-20 Roberts).

<sup>2</sup> [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 4, 239 (178.24-26 Roberts). Pseudo-Demetrius gives the example of someone who, when discussing a case of necrophilia, said that the husband «did not embrace his wife again» (οὐ μὴ γυνῆ αὐτῆς ἀνθρώπου), in other words, he embraced not his wife, but her corpse. The meaning, he says, is «clear even to a blind mind» (καὶ τυφλῷ δῆλον), even if the dry style attempts to hide the author's licence. Pseudo-Demetrius says this kind of style is called *ξηροκακοζηλία* – a dry and bad style.

<sup>3</sup> See BRÖCKER 1885, p. 417; LAUSBERG 1960, §1073; SLUITER 1995a, p. 524.

<sup>4</sup> On Galen's belief that Hippocrates was a good stylist, see SLUITER 1995a, pp. 527-530.

<sup>5</sup> Diels, for instance, rejects the authenticity of the Hippocratic *On Winds* on aesthetic grounds. See DIELS 1893, p. 429; and for comment, SMITH 1979, pp. 36-37.

<sup>6</sup> The question of 'authenticity' for Galen is more complex than we can entertain here. SINGER (forthcoming) suggests that, for Galen, 'authenticity' is a quality that admits of degrees; and not only Galen's explicit pronouncements on a Hippocratic work, but also the amount of commentary a passage receives, nuances in his language, etc. raise difficult questions about the extent to which we can distinguish Galen's *commentary* from his own beliefs about what is true or false or useful.

of his approach and the picture of Hippocrates that emerges as a result are what we explore in this paper.

Yet, Galen's use of *κακοζηλία* also points to a tension between his exegetical theory and practice. For one thing, Galen takes it to be a 'law of interpretation' (*νόμος ἐξηγήσεως*) that one should «clarify [the statements] of each author on the basis of that author himself (*ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*) and not produce whatever nonsense one wishes on the basis of groundless suppositions and indemonstrable statements». <sup>1</sup> When he applies this law explicitly to Hippocratic exegesis, he is even more specific: the good exegete is one who knows that the plausibility or truth of a claim (*πιθανῶς ἢ ἀληθῶς εἴρηκεν*) is not sufficient to establish its Hippocratic provenance; it must also be established «on the basis of Hippocrates himself» (*ἐξ Ἱπποκράτους αὐτοῦ*) and «in accordance with his thought» (*κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνου γνώμην*). <sup>2</sup> Using *κακοζηλία* as a criterion could be consistent with this law, but it certainly need not be. It is not immediately clear that style is part of the thought (*γνώμη*) of an author at all. Even if it were, we need some more assumptions to get us to the conclusion that Hippocrates' style excludes bad varieties. It is at these points of tension that one might explore motivations other than his explicit stylistic ones.

Galen's use of *κακοζηλία* also raises questions about his exegetical practice, especially as it concerns preserving the most ancient readings. When Galen rejects a reading of a Hippocratic text for being *κακόζηλος*, it at least seems to mean it is implausible on stylistic grounds; however, implausibility is something that Galen is ambivalent about using as a criterion, especially when a reading is ancient, and he places the burden on the commentator to make sense of it. <sup>3</sup> It is unclear why he thinks considerations of style should be any different. After all, the fact that some variants or passages, which Galen takes to be *κακόζηλος*, were ascribed to

<sup>1</sup> Gal. *Dig. Puls.* 4.3 (8.958 Kühn): *καὶ γὰρ μοι καὶ νόμος οὗτος ἐξηγήσεως, ἕκαστον τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ σαφηνίζεσθαι καὶ μὴ κεναῖς ὑπονοίαις καὶ φάσεσιν ἀναποδείκτοις ἀποληρεῖν, ὅ τι τις βούλεται*. Tr. Singer. Discussed by ROSELLI 2020, pp. 63-64.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. *Com. Hipp.* 1.5 (182.22-183.2 Mewaldt = 7.646 Kühn): «For one should produce an interpretation of a text on the basis of Hippocrates himself, so that we not only are able to say that it was said persuasively, but also that it was said in accordance with his thought. For I do not think that the good interpreter only inquires whether something was said persuasively or truthfully, but whether it also contains the thought of the author» (*ἐχρῆν γὰρ ἐξ Ἱπποκράτους αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξήγησιν ποιεῖσθαι τῆς λέξεως, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ὅτι πιθανῶς εἴρηται λέγειν ἔχωμεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνου γνώμην. οὐ γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι τοῦτο χρῆναι σκοπεῖσθαι μόνον τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐξηγητὴν, εἰ πιθανῶς ἢ ἀληθῶς εἴρηκεν, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τῆς γνώμης ἔχεται τοῦ συγγραφέως*).

<sup>3</sup> Pace ROSELLI (2020, p. 62); Galen sometimes says he will use plausibility as a criterion, but as von Staden has noted, there is a difference between Galen's «announced exegetical ideals and their lemma-by-lemma realization» (VON STADEN 2002, p. 136).

Hippocrates by Galen's predecessors suggests either that Galen disagrees with them on what constitutes good style, or that they disagree with Galen on Hippocrates' stylistic merits.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, if Galen does not think, as seems to be the case, that Hippocrates' works are absolutely free of *κακοζηλία*,<sup>2</sup> we are again going to need to look for other motives that might explain why he appeals to it when he does.<sup>3</sup>

Some preliminaries before we begin. We have decided to translate *κακοζηλία* and related terms with 'bad style'. We understand this translation differs from the more common translation, 'affectation',<sup>4</sup> but we think this best captures the sense Galen has in mind. Also, we will not address questions about Galen's stylistic sensibilities in comparison to ours. Galen's education will have afforded him an eye and ear for Greek style that we cannot recover from the limited materials available to us.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, as Wesley Smith notes in his introduction to his translations of the *Epidemics*, «we must realize that antiquity's inferences from style and substance are not better than our own – in fact not as good in some respects».<sup>6</sup> Understanding the literary world in which *κακοζηλία* arose, and the aesthetic sense it implies, are fascinating topics, but they are not our primary interest.<sup>7</sup> We are interested, instead, in (1) Galen's argument, that if a purported Hippocratic text is written in bad style, then it is likely to be inauthentic, and (2) how he uses this argument to shape his vision of Hippocrates.

In what follows, we present seven case studies where Galen appeals to *κακοζηλία* in his Hippocratic commentaries. We have divided them

<sup>1</sup> Pseudo-Demetrius, for example, is the only one of Galen's contemporaries or predecessors to discuss Hippocrates' style. He is not a fan. See [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 1.4, (68.19-23 Roberts) on Hipp. *Aph.* 1.1; for discussion, see SLUITER 1995b, pp. 196-197; and our page 155 below.

<sup>2</sup> Pace SLUITER (1995a, p. 524), who briefly discusses *κακοζηλία* and claims Galen absolutely denies it is found in Hippocrates' writing. See our Case VII as an example where Galen admits a defect in Hippocrates' style.

<sup>3</sup> Galen does not always follow his own programmatic remarks concerning what readings he will accept, as shown by VON STADEN (2002, p. 136).

<sup>4</sup> Used by Roberts in his translation of [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 3.186-189 (157 Roberts) and adopted by SLUITER (1995b, p. 524). 'Tastelessness' and 'tasteless' are used by Roberts at [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 4, 239, p.179. The editors suggested to us, 'bad style', which we have graciously adopted.

<sup>5</sup> On which, see SLUITER 1995a, pp. 519-522; 1995b, pp. 194-195; 2005, pp. 25-28; NUTTON 2009, esp. pp. 20-23, 33-34; VON STADEN 2009, p. 132-135; ROSEN 2013, pp. 177-187; COKER 2019 pp. 65-68.

<sup>6</sup> SMITH 1994, p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> These topics, including Galen's relationship to what is sometimes called the 'second sophistic' are addressed by WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF 1900; SLUITER 1995b, pp. 194-200; VON STADEN 1997; MANETTI, ROSELLI 1994; NUTTON 2009; VON STADEN 2009; ROSELLI 2020.

into three groups according to how Galen uses the term. The first group contains cases to do with *authenticity*. The second contains cases to do with *emendation*. And the third contains cases that do not fall under the first two. For each case study, we present (a) the lemma from Galen's text; (b) the relevant section of Galen's commentary; (c) and a discussion.<sup>1</sup> We end with some tentative conclusions.

## 2. AUTHENTICITY

### *Case I: «Food Is Strength»*

Our first study comes from the seventh book of Galen's commentary on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. One of Galen's primary concerns in this commentary is the identification and emendation of aphorisms he takes to be spurious. The seventh book of the *Aphorisms* exhibits the same character as the final sections of many other ancient works: over time, it accumulated more and more material from other sources. Some of these sources Galen recognised: of the eighty-one aphorisms in book 7 that Galen discusses (the Hippocratic tradition knows eighty-seven aphorisms), about one quarter are duplicates from earlier books, mostly book 4.<sup>2</sup> The more exciting cases, however, are aphorisms that are not obvious doublets and whose source Galen did not know.<sup>3</sup> In these cases, ones without known parallels, Galen uses other ways of distinguishing authentic from spurious material. One method is the appeal to *κακοζήλεια*.

#### A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Aphorisms* VII 67 (17A.179.1-3 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Aphorisms* 7.66 (4.598 Littré)

<sup>1</sup> For the lemma, we take the text from the most recent edition. By relevant section, we mean Galen's comments about why the lemma is *κακόζηλος*, and the surrounding context. All translations are our own.

<sup>2</sup> At Gal. *Hipp. Aph.* VII 53 (18A.162.1-15 Kühn) Galen expresses bewilderment at the fact that there are doublets of aphorisms, and he goes on to explain that either Hippocrates himself or the commentators must have interpolated them. To Galen, neither of these explanations are plausible (*πιθανός*), and he leaves it to the reader to draw their own conclusions from this aporetic rhetoric, suggesting that the reader bear in mind the kind of author Hippocrates is (*τοιούτος*) and the knavery (*πανουργία*) the later commentators are capable of displaying.

<sup>3</sup> He hints at the motives of the interpolators at Gal. *Hipp. Aph.* VII 69 (18A.184.14-185.2 Kühn), calling them sophists and saying they seem to have inserted these false (and often unclear) aphorisms in order to build their reputation among the young (*εὐδοκιμοῦσι παρὰ τοῖς μειρακίοις*) by their interpretations. This is especially true since there is «no law established regarding emendations» (*οὐδενός ἐπι τοῖς μεταγράφουσι νόμου κειμένου*): Gal. *Hipp. Aph.* VII 70 (18A.186.9-10 Kühn).

ἦν τις τῷ πυρέσσοντι τροφήν διδῶ, τῷ μὲν ὑγιαίνοντι ἰσχύς, τῷ κάμνοντι δὲ νοῦσος.<sup>1</sup>

If someone gives food to a feverish person, for the healthy person [it is] strength, but for the sick person [it is] disease.

#### B. Galen's Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Aphorisms VII* 67 (18A.179.4-9 and 180.1-10 Kühn)

γράφεται δὲ καὶ οὕτως ὁ ἀφορισμός· «ἦν τι τῷ πυρέσσοντι τροφήν διδῶ, τῷ μὲν ὑγιαίνοντι ἰσχύς, τῷ δὲ κάμνοντι νοῦσος».<sup>2</sup> **ἐκατέρω δ' ἡ λέξις ἀποκεχώρηκε τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐρμηνεύσεως ἐπὶ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ καλούμενον κακόζηλον**· οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι βουληθέντων, ὅσοι διεσκεύασαν οὕτω πολυειδῶς τὸ τέλος τοῦ βιβλίου. (...) ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἔμπροσθεν ἔφη· «τὰ μὴ καθαρὰ σώματα, ὀκίσω ἂν τρέφης, μᾶλλον βλάψεις» καὶ «ἦν ἐκ νόσου τροφήν λαμβάνων τις μὴ ἰσχύη, σημαίνει ὅτι τὸ σῶμα πλείονι τροφῇ χρῆται, ἦν δὲ μὴ λαμβάνοντος τοῦτο γίνηται, εἰδέναι ὅτι κενώσεως δεῖται», καὶ τινὰ τοιαῦτα ἕτερα κατὰ φύσιν ἡρμηνευμένα. ὁ δὲ τὸν νῦν προκειμένον ἀφορισμὸν συνθεῖς κακοζήλως εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῆς τροφῆς, ἡ τῷ ὑγιαίνοντι ἰσχύς αὐτῇ τῷ κάμνοντι νοῦσος, βούλεται γὰρ λέγειν τὴν τροφήν ἰσχύος μὲν εἶναι τοῖς ὑγιαίνουσιν ποιητικῇ, βλάβης δὲ τοῖς νοσοῦσιν· ἢ νῆ Δία τοῖς μὲν ὑγιαίνουσιν αὖξιν τὴν ἰσχύν, τοῖς δὲ κάμνουσι νόσον. ἡρμήνευκε δὲ ἀλλοκότως αὐτὸ τὴν τροφήν αὐτῇ ἰσχύν μὲν τοῖς ὑγιαίνουσιν εἶναι, νόσον δὲ τοῖς κάμνουσιν, οὐτ' ἰσχύν οὔσαν, ἀλλ' ἰσχύος ποιητικῇ, οὔτε νόσον, ἀλλὰ νόσου ποιητικῇ, ἄμεινον δὲ εἰπεῖν αὖξιν τὴν ἰσχύν.

The aphorism is also written as: 'if one gives something to a feverish person as food, for the healthy person [it is] strength, for the sick person [it is] disease.' **Either reading departs from the natural way of expressing things (τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐρμηνεύσεως) towards what is called bad style (τὸ καλούμενον κακόζηλον).**

<sup>1</sup> This is the aphorism as it appears in the *lemma* of the Galenic tradition (in all manuscripts and early printed works, e.g., the Aldine, vol. III.3, p. 154.10; and Basil edition, vol. V, p. 327.8). However, in some manuscripts of the Hippocratic tradition an ἦν ὑγιεῖ (or ἦν ὑγιεῖ) can be found after the διδῶ, while a few others leave it out (cf. Littré 5.598, note 10; Magdelaine vol. II, p. 472, app. ad lin. 8). The phrase ἦν ὑγιεῖ appears in the later editions of Chartier (vol. IX, p. 330 B 4-5) and, following him, Kühn, which suggests Chartier adopted the reading from the Hippocratic tradition. Judging from the complicated situation in the Hippocratic and Galenic manuscripts in this and in many other cases, we should assume there has been a cross-contamination in both directions. For a discussion of problems involved in editing the Galenic *lemmata*, see ECCA 2019. These issues will receive fuller treatment in the forthcoming edition of Galen's commentary on *Aphorisms VII* by Maria Börno.

<sup>2</sup> The difference between the lemma-version and this variant quoted by Galen is quite small, which gives rise to the assumption that one of them is corrupt. Whatever variant Galen is alluding to, it makes no crucial difference for our purposes since he thinks both readings suffer from the same stylistic defect.



I have no idea what they were trying to do when they edited the end of the book with so many uneven styles. (...) For earlier he said, ‘regarding bodies that are not empty,<sup>1</sup> the more you feed them, the more they are harmed;’ and, ‘if someone takes food after being sick and does not become stronger, it is a sign that the body is using too much food, but if this happens when he does not take [food], know that he needs evacuation;’ and other such things expressed in a natural way. But the author of the aphorism now before us said with bad style (*κακοζήλως εἶπεν*) about food, that the same food is strength for the healthy person and disease for the sick person. For he meant to say food is *productive* of strength for the healthy person and of harm for the sick person, or, by god, that it *augments* strength in the healthy person and disease in the sick person; but, he expressed it abnormally (*ἀλλοκότως*), saying that food itself is strength for the healthy person and disease for the sick person, when it is not strength, but *productive*, or to put it even better, *augmentative of strength*, nor is it *disease*, but it is *productive of disease*.

### c. Discussion

This text is paradigmatic of Galen’s use of a style criterion in arguments about a given passage’s provenance. Galen first gives a statement of the *lemma* and its variants; he then states that the style is bad and elaborates on the complaint, giving a more precise diagnosis of the problem (in this case, the expression is ‘abnormal’, *ἀλλοκότως*); finally, he states the lesson he thinks the passage was trying to teach.

The conclusion of the entire passage, however, is in fact Galen’s parenthetical remark that he *has no idea what the editors of the book were trying to do* by including this aphorism. His complaint is not against the lesson of this aphorism – he thinks it is perfectly intelligible. His issue is rather with the style of the book, which he says is ‘uneven’ (*πολυειδῶς*). The exclamation, ‘by god’ (*ὦ Δία*), which he makes when suggesting what the writer should have said, emphasises the distance Galen feels between the literary abilities of this author and those of a good one.

One implication of Galen’s remark is that he does not believe the author is Hippocrates. Presumably, had it been Hippocrates (or even any decent author or editor), the style of this aphorism would not have been ‘abnormal’ and the style of the book not so ‘uneven’. However, there are a few ways we might understand Galen’s claim that the expression is ‘not natural’ (*κατὰ φύσιν*) but ‘abnormal’ (*ἀλλοκότως*), and it is worth pausing to go through the possibilities.

When he says the expression is abnormal, we might think Galen means the style is abnormal *for Hippocrates*, in the sense that it is not

<sup>1</sup> I.e., people whose bowels have not been emptied.

what one finds in Hippocratic works otherwise known to be genuine.<sup>1</sup> This would be in line with Galen's larger Aristarchean ideals of textual criticism – Galen suggests one should «play the part for the mask you are wearing, as if you were in a play»<sup>2</sup> –, according to which one judges the authenticity of a Hippocratic work using Hippocrates' own style as a criterion. He appeals to this principle often in his comments on *Aphorisms VII*. In his comments on the next aphorism, for instance, he says he suspects the author (ὁ συνθεὶς τὸν ἀφορισμόν) not to be Hippocrates, «judging from the fact that the text does not have the same style as his, and, with respect to what is being said, does not have the same precision».<sup>3</sup> A similar procedure is found in other works, as well, when Galen avails himself of stylistic or lexical features not merely of Hippocrates, but of the ancients in general.<sup>4</sup> Both strategies involve comparing a given text to an independent set of texts, and, based on that comparison, inferring something about their provenance. And while Galen can be explicit about the comparison, as he is in *Aphorism VII 68* just mentioned, it is perfectly conceivable that sometimes the stylistic comparison will be implicit – a hunch, to put it bluntly – based on Galen's familiarity with Hippocrates' writings.

On the other hand, Galen may merely be saying the writing is bad. This is as simple as it sounds. Galen believes Hippocrates to be a good stylist, at the very least, better than the one he has encountered here, and if Galen judges the style to be bad, i.e., κακόζηλος or abnormal, then this judgment serves as grounds for questioning the attribution. Whether or not this is a defensible philological strategy, it is worth noting that *someone*, either the author or editor, thought the aphorism sounded perfectly genuine as it was, or at least close enough. Galen may think Hippocrates' style is more refined than what is written here; but that everyone else shared Galen's opinion should not be taken for granted. Pseudo-Demetrius, for example, considered the style of ~~the~~ Hippocrates' aphorism

<sup>1</sup> There are, of course, problems with using such a criterion; nevertheless, it is more or less an objective standard, so long as the corpus of genuine Hippocratic works is agreed on. LLOYD (1975, pp. 171-192) remains the best introduction to the question.

<sup>2</sup> ὡς ἐν δράματι τὸ περικείμενον ὑποκρίνονται πρόσωπον. Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* III 1.4 (in a part titled 'On bad interpretations', περὶ τῶν μοχθηρῶς ἐξηγουμένων: 21.24-22.2 Wenkebach = 17A.515 Kühn); the same image earlier at 16.23-17.3 Wenkebach = 17A.506 Kühn. Galen attributes this method to interpreters from the Empirical school, before Lycus and Quintus. See VON STADEN 2009, pp. 133-135.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Aph.* VII 68 (18A.181.4-8 Kühn) ὑποπτέω γὰρ καὶ τοῦτον οὐχ Ἱπποκράτους εἶναι, τῆ ἰδέξει τεκμαιρόμενος οὐκ ἐχούση τὴν αὐτὴν ἰδέαν ταῖς ἐκείνου καὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἀπηκριβωμένη ὁμοίως τοῖς ἐκείνου.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Gal. *HNH* 2.22 (88.7-11 Mewaldt = 15.172 Kühn); Gal. *Nom. Med.* (31.32-35 Meyerhof-Schacht).

starting 'ὁ βίος βραχύς...' to be easy not to like (εὐκαταφρόνητος).<sup>1</sup> We might imagine some of Galen's medical predecessors sharing that opinion. A positive, normative stylistic criterion would be difficult to maintain without agreement that the author in question was any good.

Of these two options, while we cannot rule out that Galen has a comparative strategy in mind, we think it is more likely that his criticism is about the quality of the writing. Because the criticism is internal to the phrase in question, one does not need to know anything about Hippocrates, his dialect or the Greek language to understand why Galen would say the passage's style is bad. One only needs to agree that it is ridiculous to say food is strength for one person and disease for another.

We are still not told *why* Galen thinks the style is bad. He might be frustrated with the word 'food' being used metaphorically: food is not in any obvious sense either strength or illness, and perhaps he thinks using it metaphorically is unnecessarily unclear or imprecise.<sup>2</sup> Or, more likely, he might think the style is bad because the two words, 'strength' and 'disease' are not antithetical: strength is only a part of health, and not opposite to it, which is the sense that is required.<sup>3</sup>

Still, when he says the expression has bad style, it does seem helpful to us to consider how Galen and his contemporaries might have understood this. In this case, Galen's criticism rests on the form of expression, not the content. He thinks what the author intended to say is perfectly correct and useful for the reader, and he even gives two examples of how the aphorism could have been better written, or, perhaps, how he thinks Hippocrates would have written it.<sup>4</sup> What bothers him, instead, is the style, which he admonishes because it distracts from the medical lesson. And in re-writing the phrase so that it expresses its meaning clearly and precisely, Galen demonstrates for us the kind of scientific prose he thinks is appropriate for a Hippocratic text. At the same time, the fact remains

<sup>1</sup> [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 1.4 (68.21-23 Roberts) on Hipp. *Aph.* 1.1.

<sup>2</sup> On Galen against the use of metaphor in scientific writing, see Gal. *Diff. Puls.* 3.5 (8.675 Kühn), «No homoiomerous body is called either empty or full unless metaphorically, and one should not use metaphor in scientific instruction» (οὐδὲν γὰρ ὁμοιομερὲς σῶμα κενὸν ἢ πλήρες καλεῖται, πλὴν εἰ μὴ κατὰ μεταφοράν, ἧς οὐ χρὴ προσάπτεσθαι κατὰ τὰς ἐπιστημονικὰς διδασκαλίας). For discussion of metaphor in Galen's thought, see VON STADEN 1995. On precision in language, see, e.g., NUTTON 2009, pp. 30-33; and HAVRDA (forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> We owe this suggestion to Vivian Nutton. On incomplete figures being a form of bad style, see [Hermog.] *Inv.* 4.12 (202.13-15 Rabe).

<sup>4</sup> The fact that Galen agrees with the content may also explain why he chose to comment on the aphorism at all, rather than to delete it from the *Aphorisms* altogether, as he did with the aphorisms that follow his number 81. These are not transmitted as *lemmata* in Galen's commentary and are only mentioned by Galen as a group.

that the authors and editors of *Aphorisms VII*, the very ones who composed the book which Galen is reading and commenting on, presumably saw no inconsistency with the style of this aphorism and the style of Hippocrates. It cannot be overstated that Galen's argument for its inauthenticity is motivated primarily by his belief, not about the medical import of the aphorism, but about what constitutes good scientific prose.

### Case II: 'Vomiting Uprisings'

For the first book of the *Prorrhethics*, the situation of authenticity is – at least from Galen's point of view – similar to the one of the seventh book of the *Aphorisms*: he regards *Prorrhetic I* as a mixture of both genuine and spurious Hippocratic material drawn from many sources, but he valued the work enough to devote a lengthy commentary to it.<sup>1</sup> The passage below is taken from the section discussing bad (or fatal) signs. The Hippocratic lemma seems to have been regarded as problematic not just by Galen, but by many others throughout its history, given the numerous variants in manuscripts and editions.<sup>2</sup>

#### A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Prorrhethics I* 2.50 (91.1-3 Diels = 16.674 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Prorrhethics* 1.83 (5.530 Littré)

ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀλγήματος ἀναδρομαί εἰς καρδίην πυρετώδεις, φρικώδεις, ἀνεμοῦσαι ὕδατώδεια, λεπτά, πλέονα, παρενεχθεῖσαι, ἄφωνοι ἐμέσασαι μέλανα τελευτώσιν.

Uprisings of pain out of the lower back towards the heart, with fever and chills, vomit up watery, thin, copious material, become deranged and lose their speech, and they end by vomiting dark matter.

#### B. Galen's Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Prorrhethics I* 2.50 (91.4-9 Diels = 16.674 Kühn)

ἤθροισται κἀνταῦθα συμπτώματα πολλὰ μοχθηρὰ μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐπισημαίναν εἶναι κακόζηλον. αἱ γὰρ ἀναδρομαί, φησὶν, ἐμέσασαί τε καὶ παρενεχθεῖσαι, δέον αὐτοὺς ἐμέσαντάς τε καὶ παρενεχθέντας εἰπεῖν. ἀλλὰ σύ γε καὶ τῶν συμπτωμάτων ἐκάστου τὴν δύναμιν εἰδὼς οὐ χαλεπῶς εὐρήσεις, εἰς ὅσον ὁ κάμων ἔχει κινδύνου. τοῦτο δ' ἐπιτέλει τοῦ Προγνωστικοῦ παραίνεσας ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἠρκέσθη.

<sup>1</sup> On this, see ROSELLI 2015, pp. 533-560; and POTTER 1995, pp. 168-169.

<sup>2</sup> Including the most recent edition and translation by Paul Potter.

And here, many bad symptoms have been cobbled together, **along with the fact that the style of expression is also bad**. For, he says, the uprisings (*ἀναδρομαί*) are vomiting and going mad, when he should have said *they* (i.e., the people) were vomiting and going mad.<sup>1</sup> But of course you will also discover, when you know the capacity of each of these symptoms, the extent to which the patient is in danger. For Hippocrates sufficiently advised about this at the end of the *Prognostics*.

### c. Discussion

Galen criticises this passage for similar reasons to those mentioned in Case I, namely that he thinks it is not good scientific prose. Unlike the first example, however, here he criticises both the thought and the style of the passage: first, in thought, that many bad symptoms have been listed without anything unifying them;<sup>2</sup> second, in style, that it is bad. Galen again explains in detail why he thinks this is so: the uprisings (*ἀναδρομαί*) should not be the subject of the entire sentence and thus of the participles *παρενεχθεῖσαι* and *ἐμέσασαι*. As it is, Galen is right that the phrase paints quite an odd picture. Literally, the author is saying that the uprisings of pain, not the persons experiencing them, are going mad and vomiting.<sup>3</sup> Galen thinks the author should have explicitly added a new subject, namely, the people or the patients (*αὐτοί*), to avoid such an abuse of style.

As in the *Aphorisms VII* passage above, the issue for Galen is not that there is something wrong with the content of what was said. A simple

<sup>1</sup> Galen does not seem to know the variant reading which adds the *ῆσιν* at the beginning of the aphorism (Women in whom a pain...) that solves all grammatical problems for the rest of the sentence. Cf. Hipp. *Prorrh.* 1.139 (5.560 Littré): *Οἷσιν ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀναδρομὴ ἐς κεφαλὴν, καὶ χεῖρας ναρκώδεις, καρδιαλγικοί, ἰχωρῶδεις, αἰμορραγέουσι λάβρως, καὶ κοιλίη καταρρήγνυται*. Potter's translation: «Patients in whom a pain shoots up from the loins to the head...».

<sup>2</sup> Galen raises this criticism against the author of the *Prorrhetics* in his *Epidemics III* commentary at Gal. *Hipp. Epid. III* 1.4 (13.7-12 Wenkebach = 17A.500-501 Kühn): «The poor quality of what is written in the *Prorrhetics* has been shown at greater length in three commentaries which we produced on it. For the writer of that book frequently appears to draw universal conclusions from one or two instances of his observations. And it has been shown that the writer cobbles together many *syndromai* from signs of different kinds» (*ἐδείχθη δ' ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἡ μοχθηρία τῶν ἐν τῷ Προρρητικῷ γεγραμμένων ἐν τρισὶν ὑπομνήμασιν, οἷς ἐποιησάμην εἰς αὐτό. φαίνεται γὰρ ὁ γράψας ἐκεῖνο τὸ βιβλίον πολλὰς ἐξ ἐνὸς ἢ δυοῖν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ὀφθέντων αὐτῷ καθολικὰς ἀποφάσεις ποιοῦμενος. ἐδείχθη δὲ καὶ συνδρομὰς γράφων πολλὰς ἐξ ἀνομογενῶν σημείων ἠθροισμένας*). Cf. Gal. *Hipp. Prorrh.* I 2.51 (91.10-17 Diels = 16.674-5 Kühn).

<sup>3</sup> Thanks to P. N. Singer for help on interpreting this passage.

modification is all he requires to make it reasonable prose.<sup>1</sup> Again, Galen's issue seems to be that the prose sounds unscientific or unclear, perhaps due to the improper use of metonymy: the disease stands for the people that suffer from this disease.

*Case III: 'Uprisings of the Lower Back'*

In his *Epidemics III* commentary (2.11), Galen mentions a passage from the *Prorrhethics* that was discussed by his predecessors in their commentaries on that work. He objects to the authenticity of the *Prorrhethics* passage, arguing that, since the style is bad, for this reason it is not by Hippocrates.<sup>2</sup> What is interesting in this case is that Galen tells us how he thinks the genuine Hippocrates would have expressed himself by quoting a passage from the *Prognostics*, a work he thinks is authentic. The question for us is why he thinks the style of the former is bad and the latter is not.

Here is the passage from the *Prorrhethics* which he refers to:

A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics III* 2.13 (103.4 Wenkebach = 17A.638 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Prorrhethics* 1.69 (5.526 Littré)

ἔξ ὀσφύρος ἀναδρομῆς<sup>3</sup> ὀφθαλμῶν ἰλλωσις κακόν.

Squinting of the eyes from an uprising of the lower back is bad.

B. Galen's Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics III* 2.13 (103.3-14 Wenkebach = 17A.638-639 Kühn)

εἰρημένου τοῖνον ἐν τῷ Προρρητικῷ «ἔξ ὀσφύρος ἀναδρομῆς ὀφθαλμῶν ἰλλωσις κακόν», διὰ τοῦτο τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ἀναμιμνήσκουσιν ἐν τοῖς περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐν τῷ Προρρητικῷ ῥήσεως. ἔστι μὲν οὖν, ὡς ἐδείχθη, τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα μοχθηρά, γινωσκόντων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ καθόλου τὴν διαστροφὴν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν οὐκ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι σημεῖον, ἐάν τ' «ἔξ ὀσφύρος ἀναδρομῆς» ἐάν θ' ὀπωσοῦν γένηται, μετὰ τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> Galen does not take an alternative interpretation of this passage into consideration that does not take the ἀναδρομαί as the subject throughout, but instead assumes that a new personal subject is tacitly introduced at some point. This would create a somewhat anacoluthic sentence, but it can often be seen in Hippocratic writing.

<sup>2</sup> Interestingly, Galen does not comment on the style of this expression where one might expect, namely in his commentary on the *Prorrhethics*. See Gal. *Hipp. Prorrh. I* 2.34 (80.13-23 Diels = 16.652 Kühn), and a parallel passage Gal. *Hipp. Prorrh. I* 3.47 (154.17-155.7 Diels = 16.801 Kühn).

<sup>3</sup> In their texts of the *Prorrhethics*, Littré and POTTER (1995, p. 184) print ἀναδρομή; Wenkebach in Gal. *Hipp. Epid. III* and Diels in Gal. *Hipp. Prorrh. I* 2.34 (80.13-23 Diels = 16.652 Kühn) print ἀναδρομῆς (Diels also prints ὀφθαλμοῦ).

κακόζηλον εἶναι τὴν ἐρμηνεῖαν καὶ πόρρω τῆς Ἱπποκράτους λέξεως. οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἶπεν «ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀναδρομῆς», ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν τῷ Προγνωστικῷ κατὰ τήνδε τὴν λέξιν· «αἱ δὲ σὺν πυρετῷ ὀδύνηαι γινόμεναι περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν καὶ τὰ κάτω χωρία, ἦν τῶν φρενῶν ἄπτωνται τὰ κάτω ἐκλείπουσαι, ὀλέθριον κάρτα».<sup>1</sup>

Because in the *Prorrhethics* it is said that 'a squinting of the eyes from an uprising of the lower back is bad,' for this reason when commenting on this passage from the *Prorrhethics*, they recall this woman [sc. just mentioned in the *Epidemics*].<sup>2</sup> Surely, as it has been shown, all such things are bad symptoms (μοχθηρά), since we know that in general a distortion of the eyes is not a good sign, whether it is 'from an uprising of the lower back' or anywhere else, **in addition to the fact that the expression has bad style and is far from the language of Hippocrates.** For he [i.e. Hippocrates] would not say, 'from an uprising of the lower back', but as in the text of the *Prognostics*, 'when the pains with fever arise about the lower back and the lower places, if they leave the lower parts and touch the midriff, death is certain.'

### c. Discussion

As in the previous example, Galen again uses a double approach to explain why he thinks the passage is spurious: (1) it makes a claim at the wrong level of generality, and (2) the style is bad. As part of his second point, however, Galen distinguishes the fact that it has bad style from the fact that it is far from how Hippocrates would normally express things. One might think that the latter is filling in what he means by the former: that, for the style of the passage to be bad is for it to be far from the language of Hippocrates. If this were the case, then Galen would be saying that for an author's language to have bad style is the same as for it to be un-Hippocratic, although the question would remain whether bad style is, for him here at least, a relative concept – whether the entire expression means something like 'a stylistically bad imitation of Hippocrates'. If, on the other hand, Galen is not using these as equivalent concepts, then he is using bad style as a criterion in addition to a more local, Hippocratic one.

Galen's verdict of bad style seems to rely on the expression 'an uprising from the lower back' (ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀναδρομῆς): it falls somewhat short and does not quite correctly say what is meant. As in Case II, Galen may not like the use of 'uprising' (ἀναδρομῆ) as a metaphor for a kind of pain. Whenever the 'lower back' (ὀσφύς) is mentioned in the *Prorrhethics*, it is always in connection with pains, and the author likely had in mind some kind of pain (ὀδύνη, ἀλγῆμα, πόνος) rising up from the lower back. In

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hipp. *Progn.* 19.1 (54.6-55.1 Jouanna = 2.164 Littré).

<sup>2</sup> This woman was mentioned in the lemma of the *Epidemics* Galen is commenting on, Hipp. *Epid.* III 2.11 (3.60 Littré).

the passage quoted by Galen, however, the word for pain is missing, and based on the expression alone the reader could not know exactly what it is that is rising up from the lower back. Galen's point, therefore, is that the manner of expression is imprecise.

This hypothesis is supported further by parallels in other Hippocratic works,<sup>1</sup> primarily the *Coan Prenotions*, with one major difference in the wording:

<i>Prorrhethics I</i>	<i>Coan Prenotions</i>
Ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀναδρομῆ... (69, 5.526 Littré)	Ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀναδρομῆ <b>πόνου</b> ... (308, 5.652 Littré)
Οἷσιν ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀναδρομῆ ἐς κεφαλήν... (139, 5.560 Littré)	Οἷσιν ἐξ ὀσφύος <b>ἀλγήματος</b> ἀναδρομῆ ἐς κεφαλήν... (302, 5.650 Littré)

The authenticity of the passage, therefore, is again questioned by Galen on the basis of its style, not of its content and probably not only on the grounds that it resembles other genuinely Hippocratic works.

### 3. EMENDATION

#### Case IV: 'Aroused Humours'

The following example is taken from Galen's commentary on *Epidemics VI*. The *lemma* in question is quite hard to understand and we try to convey this in our translation, which does not smooth over any anacoluthic or ungrammatical structures.<sup>2</sup> The passage caused problems for Galen's predecessors, who he claimed had emended the text in various ways. He rejects those emendations on the basis of *κακοζήλια*.

#### A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* 2.9 (65.20-22 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.907 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Epidemics* 6.2.1 (5.276-278 Littré)

ἄλλον χυμὸν μὴ τὸν ἰόντα ἄγειν, τὸν δὲ ἰόντα συνεχχυμοῦν, ὀργάσασθαι τὸ ὅμοιον, οἷον ὀδύνη ὀδύνην παύει.

Induce another humour, not the one running, but help evacuate the one running, soften the similar, like pain stops pain.

<sup>1</sup> The lemma cited in Case II is another example of this expression being combined with a word for pain (see page 156). There is a further case in Hipp. *Epid.* 6.8.3: Ὅσφυν ἀλγέοντι, ἀναδρομῆ ἐς τὸ πλευρόν.

<sup>2</sup> It is discussed by MANETTI, ROSELLI 1994, p. 1626.



## B. Galen's Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* 2.9 (66.15-17; 66.22-27; 70.16-24 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.908-909; 916 Kühn)

καὶ τινὲς μὲν τὴν δευτέραν συλλαβὴν διὰ τοῦ γ καὶ ι γράφουσιν, «ὀργίσασθαι», τινὲς δὲ τὴν πρώτην διὰ τοῦ ε καὶ ρ, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν διὰ τοῦ γ καὶ α, «ἐργάσασθαι τὸ ὅμοιον». [...]

τό γε μὴν διὰ τοῦ γ καὶ ι γραφόμενον «ὀργίσασθαι» πάνυ κακόζηλόν ἐστι καὶ πόρρω τῆς Ἱπποκράτους ἐρμηνείας, ἔάν τε ἐφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἔάν τε ἐπὶ τῶν θεραπευομένων λέγηται μορίων ἔάν τε ἐπὶ τῶν χυμῶν. τὸ γὰρ οἶον εἰς ὀργὴν αὐτὰ προτρέψαι καὶ ἐπεγεῖραι πρὸς τὴν ἔκκρισιν ἡγούνται δηλοῦσθαι διὰ τοῦ «ὀργίσασθαι» ῥήματος. [...]

δύναται δ' ἴσως, ὥσπερ ὤθηθησαν ἔνιοι, τὸ «ὀργίσασθαι» ἐκ μεταφορᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ὀργώντων εἰρῆσθαι ζώων. καὶ γὰρ φαίνεται<sup>1</sup> χρώμενος αὐτὸς οὕτως, ὅταν εἴπῃ: «φαρμακεῦειν ἐν τοῖσι λίην ὀξέσιν, ἣν ὀργᾶ, αὐθημερόν». ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐτοιμοτάτων εἰς ἔκκρισιν ἐπειγομένων τε πρὸς κένωσιν ὑγρῶν ἐνταυθὰ τε καὶ κατ' ἄλλους Ἀφορισμοὺς φαίνεται χρώμενος τῇ «ὀργᾶν» φωνῇ. οὕτως οὖν καὶ νῦν εἰκόσ φασιν εἰρῆσθαι περὶ τῶν χυμῶν «ὀργίσασθαι» τὸ πρὸς ἔκκρισιν ἐτοιμοὺς αὐτοὺς παρασκευάσαι.

And some [of those emending ὀργάσασθαι in the ancient reading] spell the second syllable with γ and ι, 'ὀργίσασθαι', while some spell the first syllable with ε and ρ, the second with γ and α, 'ἐργάσασθαι τὸ ὅμοιον'. [...]

Nevertheless, spelling it with a γ and ι, 'ὀργίσασθαι' [sc. to be aroused], is terrible style (πάνυ κακόζηλόν ἐστι) and far from Hippocrates' manner of expression, whether it refers to us ourselves, or the part being treated, or the humour. For they take the word 'ὀργίσασθαι' to indicate that these are, as it were, urged on in excitement and roused to emission. [...]

Perhaps it is possible, as some think, that 'ὀργίσασθαι' is being used metaphorically, from animals when they are aroused (τῶν ὀργώντων). For he apparently is also using it in this way, when he says, 'in very acute cases, if there is arousal (ὀργᾶ), administer drugs on the first day.' In fact, he apparently uses the word 'to be aroused' (ὀργᾶν) both here and in other aphorisms in cases where things are ready for emission and eager for evacuation of fluids. Therefore, they say here too, concerning humours, he uses 'ὀργίσασθαι' in the sense that the fluids are preparing for emission.

## C. Discussion

In this passage, Galen wants to preserve the transmitted text and tries to avoid emendation. He acknowledges that part of the *lemma* 'seems to be said improperly' (οὐκ οἰκείως φαίνεται λέγεσθαι), that the 'meaning is not plausible' (ἐκατέρως λεγόμενον οὐδετέρως ἐστὶ πιθανόν), and that

<sup>1</sup> Wenkebach adds αὐτῶ after φαίνεται, which we ignore.

‘one of the words is obscure’ (ἐν ὄνομα τὴν ἀσάφειαν ἔχει). Nevertheless, Galen finds a way to explain the text as it is transmitted, although – judging from the length of this explanation – it was no easy task even for him.

Galen’s solution involves understanding the word ὀργάσασθαι in an unconventional way.<sup>1</sup> After informing the reader about the fact that some people suggested emendations for the word ὀργάσασθαι, he returns to the topic several times. On the first occasion he is very reluctant to accept one of the proposed emendations (ὀργίσασθαι) on the grounds that the style is terrible (πάνυ κακόζηλόν ἐστι) and that it is far from authentic Hippocratic language. As in Case III, it is unclear whether these are equivalent concepts or not. The reason is that the term in question is so uncommon: ὀργίσασθαι shows up nowhere else except in Galen, Erotian, and some manuscripts of Hippocrates. It seems, therefore, to be true to say that it is far from anyone’s language, not only Hippocrates’. The judgment that the style of expression is bad would be a distinct claim: if one went to a doctor who spoke of boils or pimples as ‘aroused’, then one might question their credentials, whether or not it was Hippocrates. This might suggest they are not equivalent concepts.

On the other hand, the term was taken to be Hippocratic language by others. Erotian’s *Glossary* contains something very close to what Galen here rejects:

Galen

τὸ γὰρ οἶον εἰς ὀργὴν αὐτὰ (sc. οἱ χυμοί) προτρέψαι καὶ ἐπεγεῖραι πρὸς τὴν ἐκκρισιν ἠγούνηται δηλοῦσθαι διὰ τοῦ «ὀργίσασθαι» ῥήματος.

For they take the word ‘ὀργίσασθαι’ to indicate that these (humours) are, as it were, urged on in arousal and led to emission. [...]

Erotian, *Glossary*<sup>1</sup>

ὀργίσασθαι: τὸ ὀρμὴν ἔχειν πρὸς τι καὶ ὀργᾶν τὴν γῆν πρὸς τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ καρποῦ. ὀργίσασθαι οὖν εἶπε τὸ εἰς παράστασιν ἀγαγεῖν τὰ ὑγρὰ καὶ πρὸς ἐκκρισιν ἐτοιμάζειν.

ὀργίσασθαι: to be aroused (ὀρμὴν) at something. e.g., the earth is aroused at the fall of the fruit. Therefore, by ὀργίσασθαι, he means the fact that fluids are brought to the fore and prepared for emission.

It may be that the text of Erotian’s *Glossary* has been contaminated with Galen’s gloss; however, on the assumption that Erotian is a witness, as

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* VI 2.9 (70.1-3 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.915 Kühn): «But if someone also would want to understand the ‘ὀργάσασθαι’ with respect to changing and altering and concoction, in this way too the sentence would have a medical sense» (εἰ δὲ κάπλι τοῦ μεταβαλεῖν καὶ ἀλλοιωῶσαι καὶ πέψαι βούλοιτό τις ἀκούειν τὸ ὀργάσασθαι, καὶ οὕτως ἂν ἔχοι νοῦν ἰατρικὸν ἢ λέξις).

<sup>2</sup> Erot. *Gloss.*, ο entry 9 (65.1-4 Nachmanson).

Nachmanson prints in his edition, then this was a reading attributed to Hippocrates, and so there was disagreement about how near it was to Hippocrates' style. Galen's point, therefore, may be more inferential: because the style of the metaphor is so bad, it is not something Hippocrates would ever have written – in this case, implicitly castigating his predecessors, like Erotian, who thought it was.

When Galen returns to *ὀργίσασθαι* on the second occasion, he neutrally presents the textual tradition: the version of the old manuscripts and the version known to the oldest commentators is *ὀργάσασθαι*.<sup>1</sup> As an explanation Galen resorts to a general statement about the character of the Hippocratic writing (in the *Epidemics*), namely that it is 'like notes written for himself' and 'symbolic as well as short' and that the phrase '*ὀργάσασθαι τὸ ὅμοιον*' is an example of this.<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting, however, that Galen does not make an *explicit* statement here that the ancient reading should be taken over, even though it might be hard to understand at first sight.

The third time he revisits the topic, Galen is even more impartial, considering what the text would mean if it were emended as others had done. In the case of *ἐργάσασθαι*, Galen claims the meaning would be the same: «we will also come to the same interpretation with the other reading, in which the first syllable is written with an 'ε' and 'ρ' (*ἐργάσασθαι*)».<sup>3</sup> For the second emendation, into *ὀργίσασθαι*, he gives a parallel passage from the *Aphorisms*,<sup>4</sup> and he goes out of his way to give possible interpretations for this emendation that align well with Hippocratic thought.

In the end, Galen makes his choice of reading clear, and his stylistic reasons for rejecting *ὀργίσασθαι* as a possible emendation suggest he simply did not like the implication that Hippocrates would use such a metaphor. Galen thinks the metaphor implied by the emendation can be given a plausible justification, but he thinks on philological and stylistic grounds that no such emendation should have been proposed in the first place.

<sup>1</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* vi 2.9 (69.16-19 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.914 Kühn).

<sup>2</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* vi 2.9 (69.19-22 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.914 Kühn): εἴη ἂν οὖν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ὡς ἐν ὑπομνήματι γεγραφὼς ἑαυτῷ καθάπερ ἄλλας πολλὰς συμβολικῶς τε καὶ βραχέως, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ὀργάσασθαι τὸ ὅμοιον.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* vi 2.9 (70.12-14 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17A.916 Kühn): τὴν δ' αὐτὴν ἐξήγησιν ποιησόμεθα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἑτέραν γραφήν, ἐφ' ἧς ἡ πρώτη συλλαβὴ διὰ τοῦ ε καὶ ρ γέγραπται.

<sup>4</sup> *Hipp. Aph.* 4.10 (4.504 Littré): «In very acute cases, if there is orgasm, purge on the first day» (φαρμακεύειν ἐν τοῖσι λίην ὀξέσιν, ἣν ὀργᾶ, αὐθημερόν) (Jones tr.).

## Case v: «Worry Is Like Taking a Walk»

In this passage from *Epidemics VI*, Galen rejects a variant found in most manuscripts and which was accepted by nearly all the commentators. Instead, he accepts an emendation proposed by Dioscorides, and he justifies this unusual move by saying the text found in most manuscripts had bad style.<sup>1</sup> The passage is long, but it shows the extent to which Galen is willing to defend an emendation even when a variant is better attested – i.e., even when it is found in most copies and in all the commentators.

## A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* 5.11 (280.6-7 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17B.262 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Epidemics* 6.5.5 (5.316.9-10 Littré).

ψυχῆς περι παντὸς φροντίς ἀνθρώποις.

Above all, people have a concern for the soul.

## B. Galen's Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* 5.11 (280.8-281.6 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17B.263-264 Kühn)

[Pfaff's German translation from the Arabic] <Diese Worte finden sich nicht in allen Hss nach dieser Lesart, sondern in den meisten steht statt «über alles» «der Marsch,» so daß die Worte folgendermaßen lauten: «Die Sorge ist der Marsch der Seele bei den Menschen.»><sup>2</sup> τὸν «περίπατον» ἀντὶ τοῦ γυμνασίου πάντες ἤκουσαν οἱ ἐξηγησάμενοι τὸ βιβλίον, ἔν' ὁ λόγος ἦ τοιόσδε· «τοῖς ἀνθρώποις αἱ φροντίδες γυμνάσιον», νομίσαντες αὐτὸν τῇ προσηγορίᾳ κεχρησθαι τῇ τοῦ «περιπάτου», δηλούσης τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης εἰδός τι γυμνασίου. **κακοζήλου δὲ τῆς ἐρμηνεύσεως οὐσης, εἰκότως αὐτὴν ὁ Διοσκουριδῆς φυλαττόμενος, οὐ «περίπατος» ἔγραψεν, ἀλλὰ προσθεῖς τὸ ν γράμμα «περὶ παντὸς», ὥστε γενέσθαι τὴν λέξιν τοιάνδε· «ψυχῆς περι παντὸς φροντίς ἀνθρώποις», ἔν' ἢ δηλούμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς· «περὶ παντὸς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀσκητέον ἐστὶ τὸν λογισμὸν.» αἱ γὰρ τοὶ διανοήσεις ὀνομάζονται «φροντίδες», ὅθεν καὶ τὸν Σωκράτην «φροντιστὴν» ἐκάλουν καὶ «φροντίδας» τὰ σοφὰ βουλευόμενα τάνδρως**

<sup>1</sup> We have an independent witness who seems to have accepted the variant Galen rejects: a fragment of Athenaeus of Attalia, preserved at Orib. *Coll. Med. (Lib. Inc.)* 21.1-8 (112.14-33 Raeder). On Athenaeus and Galen on Hippocrates, see footnote 2 on page 165 below in the discussion.

<sup>2</sup> In his *apparatus criticus*, Wenkebach indicates that Hunayn's text begins differently from the Greek text. Wenkebach did not print it, but we do not share his hesitation. It is common for Galen to mention a variant immediately after the text he prints as he does, e.g., in our Case I. Pfaff has provided the German translation of Hunayn's Galen.

ὠνόμαζον, ὡς κἀν ταῖς Ἀριστοφάνους Νεφέλαις <ἔστιν> εὐρεῖν, ἐνθα κωμωδεῖ καὶ σκώπτει τὸν Σωκράτην ὡς ἀδολέσχην.

<These words are not found in all copies of the text; rather, in most we find *περίπατος* instead of *περὶ παντός*, so that the phrase is as follows: ‘For people, concern is a walk (*περίπατος*) of the soul.’> All the book’s commentators take *περίπατος* to mean exercise, so that the claim would be something like, ‘concerns are an exercise for people,’ thinking he (sc. Hippocrates) used the noun ‘walk’, since this word means a kind of exercise. **But since the style of the expression is bad, Dioscorides reasonably avoided it, not writing ‘περίπατος’ but ‘περὶ παντός’, having added the letter v.** Thus, the text became: ‘for people, above all there exists a concern for the soul’, and what is meant by this is, ‘above all, people ought to practice reasoning.’ For, acts of thinking are called ‘concerns’, which is also why Socrates used to be called ‘concerned’ and the man’s wise counsels were called ‘concerns’, as we find in Aristophanes’ *Clouds*,<sup>1</sup> where he makes fun of and mocks Socrates as an idle-talker.

### c. Discussion

Galen seems to accept Dioscorides’ emendation; but his stated reason, that the phrase with *περίπατος* is stylistically bad, hides a debate between Galen and the followers of Athenaeus of Attalia, founder of the Pneumatist medical school.<sup>2</sup> From independent sources, we know that Athenaeus considers thinking to be a kind of exercise, which could directly affect one’s bodily mixture (*κρᾶσις*), and so one should practice thinking because it is good exercise. Galen thinks this is implausible; instead, he wants the passage to say that one should care for the soul as well as the body. Now, Galen and Athenaeus agree that medicine should involve care for the soul; however, they disagree about what this means and how to defend their belief. Attributing one or the other view to Hippocrates is a way of establishing an authorial basis for the claim, and this seems to be the game Galen is playing.

This still leaves some questions, and we have divided the text up into two parts to make it clearer for discussion. First, Galen establishes the *status quaestionis*: most manuscripts and commentators read *περίπατος*, but this is stylistically bad, and so Dioscorides amended it to *περὶ παντός*, which changed the passage from «for people concern is a walk of the soul» to «for people, above all there exists a concern for the soul». Then, Galen defends Dioscorides’ reading by trying to explain away another problematic term: concern (*φροντίς*). The term normally refers to care or anxiety, but Galen wants it to mean reasoning (*αἰ διανοήσεις*) more

<sup>1</sup> E.g., the *φροντιστήριον* at Ar. *Nub.* 94; *λόγοισι καὶ φροντίσι* at Ar. *Nub.* 951.

<sup>2</sup> COUGHLIN 2018, pp. 126-129.

generally. To make his case, he appeals to the writings of Aristophanes, rather than Hippocrates, a strategy he defends in *Medical Names*.<sup>1</sup> He believes that since the writers of Old Comedy would use language in a way that ordinary people could understand, their writings are a more reliable starting point for deciphering the meanings of words than scientific ones. Galen may be right about this, but the point is moot, since his predecessors attributed to it a different meaning. This is another case where we catch a glimpse of Galen constructing his Hippocrates in response to others.

#### 4. OTHER USES

##### *Case VI: 'The Life of Food'*

This passage is very different from the ones we have seen so far: it is not the style of a text that is said to have bad style, but a way of understanding a text. Galen offers two other ways one could interpret the Hippocratic text that are acceptable. In his critique of the third way of interpreting the text he seems to quote and address a specific exegete that offered this interpretation, but he does not mention his name.

##### A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* 5.21 (299.14-15 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17B.282 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Epidemics* 6.5.14 (5.318 Littré)

Τὰ ἀσθενέστερα σιτία ὀλιγοχρόνιον βιοτὴν ἔχει.

Rather weak foods have a short time of life.

##### B. Galen's Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics VI* 5.21 (299.16-21 Wenkebach-Pfaff = 17B.282 Kühn)

«Σιτίον ἀσθενές» οὐκ ἄλλο τι δυνατόν ἐστιν ἀκούειν τοῦ βραχεῖαν τροφήν διδόντος τῷ σώματι, τοιαῦτα δ' ἐστὶ τὰ τε λάχανα καὶ τῶν ἀκροδρύων τὰ πλείστα. ταῦτ' οὖν, φησὶν, «ὀλιγοχρόνιον βιοτὴν ἔχει», τουτέστι τοὺς χρωμένους αὐτοῖς ὀλιγοχρόνιους ἐργάζεσθαι πέφυκεν, ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ σιτία ταχέως ἐκ τοῦ σώματος κενοῦται. **κακόζηλον δ' ἐστὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι μονὴν τῶν σιτίων ζῶην ἀκούειν αὐτῶν.**

It is not possible to take 'weak food' to mean anything other than providing momentary nourishment to the body, things like vegetables and all the tree

<sup>1</sup> Gal. *Nom. Med.* (31.35-43 Meyerhof-Schacht). For discussion, see NUTTON 2009, pp. 30-31; and COKER 2019, pp. 66-68.

fruits. Thus, he says, these have ‘a short lifespan’, i.e., when they are used by them, they are worked up in a short amount of time, or the foods themselves are evacuated from the body quickly. **It shows a lack of style to read it as, ‘the life of the foods themselves persisting in the body’.**

### c. Discussion

Galen’s complaint does not apply to the whole phrase, but the term βιοσπήν, which he thinks someone might take to mean something like ‘life span’. He suggests that interpretations themselves can determine whether a reading has bad style or not. When saying it is impossible to read the passage in any other way, he is clearly being hyperbolic, as he goes on to give an alternate reading; his point, however, seems to be that understanding it in any other way entails that the interpreter cannot tell good style from bad.

Galen is extending the application of bad style from textual criticism to interpretation more generally. In this case, Galen thinks it is impossible to understand the text in any other way (οὐκ ἄλλο τι δυνατόν), not because it is in fact impossible, but because the text could only mean something else if one fails to grasp the appropriate standards of Greek style. The implication is, if a charitable interpretation is available, we should adopt that one; but, what counts as a charitable reading for Galen is, as for most interpreters, only what he thinks he can plausibly attribute to that author, and not what the ambiguity of the text makes possible.

#### Case VII: ‘Tasteful Despair’

This example is unique. Galen does not use bad style to reject the authenticity of a passage. Instead, he attributes this infelicitous style to Hippocrates himself.

#### A. The Lemma

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates’ Epidemics III* 3.77 (169.2-3 Wenkebach = 17A.751 Kühn), comment on Hippocrates, *Epidemics* 3.3.17 (3.108 Littré)

πρὸς δὲ τὰ γεύματα ἀπονενοημένως εἶχεν.

She was desperately averse to tastes.

#### B. Galen’s Commentary

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates’ Epidemics III* 3.77 (168.24-169.5 Wenkebach = 17A.751 Kühn)

ἐχρήσατο δ’ ἐν τῇ διηγήσει τῆς ἀρρώστου τῆσδε κακοζηλότερον τῇ λέξει ὁ Ἱπποκράτης, καίτοι πολιτικῶς ἅπαντα τὰ κατὰ τὸ βιβλίον ἡρμηνευκῶς.

γέγραπται δ' οὖν ἡ λέξις οὕτως: «πρὸς δὲ τὰ γεύματα ἀπονεινομένης εἶχεν», ὑπερβολὴν ἀνορεξίας καὶ τοῦ πρὸς αὐτὰ μίσους ἐνδεικνυμένης τῆς φωνῆς· ὅπερ ὅτι τῶν μοχθηρῶν ἐστὶ σημεῖον, εἴρηται πολλακίς.<sup>1</sup>

**In the statement of this case-study, Hippocrates used rather bad style,** and yet, he expressed everything in the book in ordinary language. The passage is written as follows: 'she was desperately averse to tastes (τὰ γεύματα),' using an exaggerated phrase to indicate 'anorexia' and 'hatred for tastes'. It has often been said that it is one of the bad signs.

### c. Discussion

In this passage, Galen attributes 'rather bad style' to the phrase 'desperately averse to tasty foods', and he opposes this stylistic error from the style of the rest of the work, which he says is written in ordinary language (πολιτικός, πολιτικῶς).<sup>2</sup> So the opposition here is between the (almost apologetic) 'rather bad style' (κακοζηλότερον τῇ λέξει) with whatever Galen associated with ordinary language.

What he means by 'ordinary language' is explained in his commentary on *Epidemics III*: there he attributes the use of ordinary language to Hippocrates' son Heraclides, who, he says, «appears to use the most familiar and for this reason the clearest terms, which the rhetoricians usually call 'ordinary' (πολιτικά)». <sup>3</sup> It is, therefore, language that is familiar and hence clear and easy to understand.<sup>4</sup>

Given Galen associates ordinary language with clarity, it seems plausible that something said with 'rather bad style' implies the opposite. What he may have in mind is the phrase πρὸς τὰ γεύματα ἀπονεινομένης εἶχεν: literally, 'to be in a state of despair regarding things that are tasted'.

<sup>1</sup> We have omitted Wenkebach's addition of ἄν at the beginning of the passage (ἐχρήσατο δ' <ἀν>). We felt it was superfluous. Wenkebach also notes a variant reading for κακοζηλότερον in his apparatus (found in L and all editions). πολιτικῶς is not found in any Greek manuscript. It has been reconstituted from the Arabic translation. M has πονικῶς, which makes no sense, but it is easy to see how it could have been misread from an original πολιτικῶς.

<sup>2</sup> We borrow 'ordinary' as a translation from VON STADEN (2002, p. 112 n. 12; 2015, p. 139 n. 30); NUTTON (2009, p. 30); and BARNES (2015, p. 114). In addition to his appeals to ordinary words in *Medical Names* discussed above (pp. 165-166), Galen claims to have written several books on the topic: *Three Books of Ordinary Words in Eupolis* (τῶν παρ' Εὐπόλιδι πολιτικῶν ὀνομάτων τρία); *Five Books of Ordinary Words in Aristophanes* (τῶν παρ' Ἀριστοφάνει πολιτικῶν ὀνομάτων πέντε); *Two Books of Ordinary Words in Kratinos* (τῶν παρὰ Κρατίνῳ πολιτικῶν ὀνομάτων δύο). See Gal. *Lib. Prop.* 20.1 (173 Boudon-Millot = 19.48 Kühn). The sense is clear from Galen's explication.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Epid.* III 3.33 (126.14-15 Wenkebach = 17A.678 Kühn): φαίνεται συνηθεστάτους τε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο σαφεστάτους ὀνόμασι κεχρημένους, ἃ καλεῖν ἔθρος ἐστὶ τοῖς ῥητορικοῖς «πολιτικά».

<sup>4</sup> See Case v discussion and note 1 on p. 166 above.



It is not easy to understand what this phrase is supposed to mean. It could mean having an aversion to foods, but it could also mean an aversion only to foods that are tasty, or it could mean a despair that one does not have any food or anything to taste. The word γεύματα, 'things that are tasted', is not an ordinary one. The term is obscure enough that Athenaeus of Naucratis included it in a discussion of unfamiliar culinary diction in *The Sophists at Dinner*.<sup>1</sup> Galen may be flagging its use because of its ambiguity: is it anything tasted, is it standing in for foods generally, is it specifically tasty foods? We are not told. In addition, the phrase πρὸς τὰ γεύματα ἀπονενοημένως is not found in any Hippocratic work other than *Epidemics* III.<sup>2</sup> It is not, therefore, ordinary language. How he arrives at his conclusion that the phrase means, although said in an exaggerated way, 'anorexic' is left unexplained. He claims these are mentioned as bad signs elsewhere, perhaps suggesting he felt his interpretation needs to be reinforced by parallels.

Still, despite the passage's bad style and lack of clarity, Galen does not question its authenticity or claim the text is corrupt. Hippocrates' expression, he says, has only 'rather bad style', which sounds apologetic. If Galen is excusing the fact that style is not a criterion of authenticity in this case, then we are left wondering why he remarks on the passage at all, unless he is trying to show that he can make better sense of and explain what others took to be an unusual or implausible phrase, which is, as we saw at the beginning of this essay, precisely what Galen boasts he is better able to do than his predecessors.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Galen's use of bad style suggests that it is, for him, one more criterion for judging the Hippocratic provenance of a claim: if the style of a passage, variant, emendation or interpretation is bad, then this is one more reason for denying that its author is Hippocrates. Sometimes, Galen's claim seems to be motivated primarily from a sense that the style is out of place, or that Hippocrates could not plausibly have written it. Sometimes, Galen seems to be excluding certain forms of writing from the Hippocratic canon, preferring passages that avoid polysemy and display the kind of precision Galen thinks is emblematic of good scientific writing.<sup>3</sup> And sometimes, it seems that there are other, more dogmatic

<sup>1</sup> Ath. *Deipn.* 9.25.

<sup>2</sup> Galen mentions 'indifferent' (ἀνεπιστρέπτως) as a synonym at *Hipp. Gloss.* α entry 135 (174 Perilli = 19.84 Kühn).

<sup>3</sup> See note 2 on page 155 and Case IV ('aroused humours') above. In his comments on *Hipp. Epid.* 6.1.4-5 (*Gal. Hipp. Epid.* VI 1.5, 20.13-24 = 17A.825 Kühn), Galen mentions that

motivations for which bad style is a proxy, as when he argues with his contemporaries through Hippocratic exegesis or emendation.

What is interesting, however, is how *ad hoc* Galen's methods tend to be, even when applying a single criterion like bad style. As with other criteria, the unevenness of application is likely a function of how Galen constructs his commentaries, by responding to issues raised by his predecessors in such a way that the variety of their questions and the methods they use determine the content of Galen's discussions.<sup>1</sup> His aims are those of most commentators: to have something to say about those passages which one should have an opinion about, and to resolve textual issues in one's own way. This is precisely how Galen uses bad style.

Stylistic considerations like these might seem too subjective to be of much use today. Galen nevertheless never hints that he thinks bad style is a subjective criterion. Rather, he takes it to be self-evident that, for an authority like Hippocrates, an effective style is as much to be expected as the truth of what he writes. His use of style as a criterion manifests the same exegetical logic that he attributes to students when they first come across a spurious passage:

Whenever an obviously false statement is found in the writings of an intelligent author, it is normal for those who study him to become puzzled. At first, they doubt themselves and do not trust that they understand what is obvious; then, after a while, they suspect something of what they are reading is false.<sup>2</sup>

For Galen, good and bad style, like truth and falsity, are objective criteria of Hippocratic authority, perhaps not as reliable, but, still, more reliable than imputing to Hippocrates one's own beliefs about what he should have said, and infinitely more appropriate than abandoning Hippocrates altogether.<sup>3</sup>

some people calling themselves Hippocrateans (οἱ καλέσαντες ἑαυτοὺς Ἱπποκρατεῖους) take the term ἐκλάμψεις to be used metaphorically (ἐκ μεταφορᾶς) from the image of a flame growing as it consumes fuel, while Zeuxis and some Empiricists think it is being used as an emphatic metaphor (ἐμφατικῶς ἄγαν τῆ μεταφορᾶ χρησάμενος) for puberty. On Hippocrates' precision (ἀκριβεία) in writing, see, e.g., Gal. *HNH* 2.7 (75.14-76.14 Mewaldt = 15.147-8 Kühn), Gal. *Hipp. Elem.* 2 (58.15-17 De Lacy = 1.415-416 Kühn); and on his being precise in general, Gal. *Die. Decr.* (9.798 Kühn) (ὅ γέ τοι πάντων ἰατρῶν ἀκριβέστατος... Ἱπποκράτης).

<sup>1</sup> See VON STADEN 2009, pp. 133-135.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. *Hipp. Aph.* 6.34 (140.17-20 Savino = 18A.55 Kühn) Ὅποταν ἐν ἀνδρὸς φρονίμου συγγράμματι λόγος εὐρεθῆῖ προφανῶς ψευδής, εἰκότως ἀπορεῖσθαι συμβαίνει τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας αὐτόν, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπιστεῖν, ὡς μὴδὲ τὰ φανερά γινώσκουσι, εἰθ' ἐξῆς ὑποπτεῖν, μὴ τι τῶν ὑποκειμένων ψευδὲς εἴη.

<sup>3</sup> Earlier versions of this paper were read at Philip van der Eijk's Montagskolloquium at the Institut für Klassische Philologie, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and at "Behind and Beyond Hippocrates" organised by Elizabeth Craik and held during the 2018 Celtic

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Editions*

- VÉRONIQUE BOUDON-MILLOT (ed.), *Galien I. Introduction générale. Sur l'ordre de ses propres livres. Sur ses propres livres. Que l'excellent médecin est aussi philosophe.* Texte établi, trad. et annoté par Véronique Boudon-Millot, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2007.
- JOACHIM CAMERARIUS (ed.), *Galeni Pergameni... opera omnia, pars quinta*, Basel, Cratander & Bebel, 1538.
- RENÉ CHARTIER (ed.), *Hippocratis Coi et Galeni... Opera, tomus IX*, Paris, Pralard, 1689.
- PHILLIP DE LACY (ed.), *Galeni De elementis ex Hippocratis sententia*, edidit, in linguam Anglicam vertit, commentatus est Phillip de Lacy, CMG v 1,2, Berlin, Akademie, 1996.
- HERMANN DIELS (ed.), *Galeni In Hippocratis Prorrheticum I commentaria III*, edidit H. Diels, CMG v 9, 2, Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1915.
- FLORIAN GÄRTNER (ed.), *Galeni De locis affectis I-II, edidit, in linguam Germanicam vertit*, commentatus est Florian Gärtner, CMG v 6, 1, 1, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2015.
- JOSEF HEEG (ed.), *Galeni In Hippocratis Prognosticum commentaria III*, edidit Josef Heeg, CMG v 9, 2, Leipzig et Berlin, Teubner, 1915.
- CARL GOTTLÖB KÜHN (ed.), *Claudii Galeni Opera omnia, vols. 17B-18A*, editionem curavit C. G. Kühn, Leipzig, Karl Knobloch, 1829.
- ÉMILE LITTRÉ (ed.), *Œuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, traduction nouvelle avec le texte grec en regard ... par Émile Littré, Paris, J. B. Baillière, 1839-1861.
- ALDUS MANUTIUS (ed.), *Galeni librorum pars tertia*, Venice, Aldus Manutius, 1525.
- JOHANNES MEWALDT (ed.), *Galeni In Hippocratis De natura hominis commentaria III*, edidit Johannes Mewaldt, CMG v 9, 1, Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1914.
- JOHANNES MEWALDT (ed.), *Galeni De comate secundum Hippocratem*, edidit Johannes Mewaldt, CMG v 9, 2, Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1915.
- MAX MEYERHOF, JOSEPH SCHACHT (eds.), *Galen Über die medizinischen Namen*, arabisch und deutsch herausgegeben von Max Meyerhof und Joseph Schacht, Berlin, Akademie, 1931.
- ERNST NACHMANSON (ed.), *Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio cum fragmentis*. Recensuit Ernst Nachmansson, Uppsala, Appelbergs Boktrycker, 1918.

Conference in Classics in St. Andrews, Scotland. We would like to thank Elizabeth Craik, Philip van der Eijk, Jutta Kollesch and Amneris Roselli for helpful comments. Special thanks to P. N. Singer for invaluable suggestions on Galen's text and to the editors, Laurence Totelin and Vivian Nutton, for comments on the final paper. Any errors remain our own. This project was supported by funding from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) - Exzellenzcluster 264 *Topoi. Die Formation und Transformation von Raum und Wissen in den antiken Kulturen* - Projekt-ID 39235742, the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies, Einstein Centre Chronoi and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) - SFB 980 *Episteme in Bewegung. Wissenstransfer von der Alten Welt bis in die Frühe Neuzeit* - Projekt-ID 191249397.

- HUGO RABE (ed.), *Hermogenis Opera (Pseudo-Hermogenes On Invention)*, edidit Hugo Rabe, Stuttgart, Teubner, 1985.
- WILLIAM RHYS ROBERTS (ed.), *Demetrius on Style*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- CHRISTINA SAVINO (ed.), *Galenii In Hippocratis Aphorismorum librum VI commentarium*, edidit, in linguam Italicam vertit, commentata est Christina Savino, CMG V 12,6, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2020.
- ERNST WENKEBACH (ed.), *Galenii In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum III commentaria III*, edidit Ernst Wenkebach, CMG V 10,2,1, Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1936.
- ERNST WENKEBACH, FRANZ PFAFF (eds.), *Galenii In Hippocratis Epidemiarum libri VI commentaria I-VI*, edidit E. Wenkebach et commentaria VI-VIII in Germanicam linguam transtulit F. Pfaff. Editio altera lucis ope expressa, CMG V 10,2,2, Berlin, Akademie, 1956.

#### Secondary Literature

- JONATHAN BARNES, *Mantissa, Essays in Ancient Philosophy IV*, ed. Maddalena Bonelli, Oxford, Clarendon, 2015.
- LUDWIG OSKAR BRÖCKER, *Die Methoden Galens in der literarischen Kritik*, «Rheinisches Museum», 40, 1855, pp. 415-438.
- AMY COKER, *Galen and the Language of Old Comedy: Glimpses of a Lost Treatise at Ind. 23b-28*, in *Galen's Treatise Περὶ Ἀλγυπίας (De Indolentia) in Context: A Tale of Resilience*, edited by Caroline Petit, Leiden, Brill, 2019, pp. 63-90.
- SEAN COUGHLIN, *Athenaeus of Attalia on the Psychological Causes of Bodily Health*, in *Mental Illness in Ancient Medicine*, edited by Chiara Thumiger, Peter Singer, Leiden, Brill, 2018, pp. 109-142.
- ELIZABETH M. CRAIK, *The 'Hippocratic Question' and the Nature of the Hippocratic Corpus*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hippocrates*, edited by Peter Pormann, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018, pp. 25-37.
- ARMELLE DEBRU, *Galien commentateur d'Hippocrate: le canon hippocratique*, in *Hippocrate et son héritage, Colloque Franco-Hellénique d'Histoire de la médecine, Lyon 9-12 octobre 1985*, Lyon, Fondation Marcel Mérieux, 1987, pp. 51-56.
- GIULIA ECCA, *Editing the Lemmata of Galen's Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms, Book 5*, in *Sicut dicit: Editing Ancient and Medieval Commentaries and Authoritative Texts*, edited by Shari Boodts, Pieter De Leemans, Stefan Schorn, Turnhout, Belgium, Brepols, 2019, pp. 163-183.
- PHILIP VAN DER EIJK, *Exegesis, Explanation and Epistemology in Galen's Commentaries on Epidemics, Books One and Two*, in *Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition*, edited by Peter Pormann, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2012, pp. 25-48.
- LUIS GARCÍA BALLESTER, *El hipocratismo de Galeno*, «Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Historia de la Medicina», 8, 1968, pp. 22-28.
- WOLDEMAR GÖRLER, 'Ex verbis communibus κακοζήλια'. *Die augusteischen 'Klassiker' und die griechischen Theoretiker des Klassizismus*, in *Le Classicisme à Rome aux 1ers siècles avant et après J.-C.*, edited by Hellmut Flashar, Vandoeuvres-Geneva, Fondation Hardt, 1979, pp. 175-202.

- GEORGES M. A. GRUBE, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1961.
- ROBERT JAMES HANKINSON, *Usage and Abusage: Galen on Language*, in *Language. Companions to Ancient Thought 3*, edited by Stephen Everson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 166-187.
- ANN ELIS HANSON, *Galen: Author and Critic*, in *Editing Texts/Texte edieren*, edited by Glenn W. Most, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, pp. 22-53.
- GEORG HARIG, JUTTA KOLLESCH, *Galen und Hippokrates*, in *La Collection hippocratique et son rôle dans l'histoire de la médecine: colloque de Strasbourg, 23-27 octobre 1972 / organisé par le Centre de recherches sur la Grèce antique avec le concours des Facultés de philosophie et des langues classiques*, Leiden, Brill, 1975, pp. 257-274.
- MATYÁŠ HAVRDA, *Logic and Scientific Method*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Galen*, edited by Julie Laskaris, Ralph Rosen, Peter N. Singer, Oxford, Oxford University Press, forthcoming.
- BROOKE HOLMES, *Sympathy between Hippocrates and Galen: The Case of Galen's Commentary on Hippocrates' 'Epidemics', Book Two*, in *Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition*, edited by Peter Pormann, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2012, pp. 49-70.
- HENRY D. JOCELYN, *Vergilius cacozelus (Donatus Vita Vergilii 44)*, in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, vol. 2, edited by Francis Cairns, Liverpool, Cairns, 1980, pp. 77-109.
- JACQUES JOUANNA, *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen*, Leiden, Brill, 2012.
- JUTTA KOLLESCH, *Galen und die Zweite Sophistik*, in *Galen: Problems and Prospects*, edited by Vivian Nutton, London, The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1981, pp. 1-11.
- HEINRICH LAUSBERG, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1990.
- ORLY LEWIS, *Perceiving and Diagnosing Pain according to Archigenes of Apamea*, in *Pain Narratives in Antiquity*, edited by Han Baltussen, Daniel King and J. Clarke, Leiden, Brill, forthcoming.
- GEOFFREY E. R. LLOYD, *The Hippocratic Question*, «Classical Quarterly», 25, 2, 1975, pp. 171-192.
- GEOFFREY E. R. LLOYD, *Galen on Hellenistics and Hippocrateans: Contemporary Battles and Past Authorities*, in *Galen und das hellenistische Erbe*, edited by Jutta Kollesch, Diethard Nickel, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1993, pp. 125-143.
- JUAN ANTONIO LÓPEZ FÉREZ, *Galen, lector y crítico de manuscritos*, in *Tradizione e ecdotica dei testi medici tardoantichi e bizantini, Atti del Convegno internazionale, Anacapri 29-31 ottobre 1990*, edited by Antonio Garzya, Napoli, D'Auria, 1992, pp. 197-209.
- DANIELA MANETTI, *Galen and Hippocratic Medicine: Language and Practice*, in *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, edited by Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh, John Wilkins, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 157-174.
- DANIELA MANETTI, AMNERIS ROSELLI, *Galeno commentatore di Ippocrate*, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2.37.2, 1994, pp. 1529-1635, 2071-2080.
- PAOLA MANULI, *Lo stile del commento. Galeno et la tradizione ippocratica*, in *Formes*

- de pensée dans la Collection Hippocratique, Actes du IVe Colloque international Hippocratique, Lausanne 1981*, edited by François Lasserre, Phillippe Mudry, Geneva, Librairie Droz, 1983, pp. 471-482.
- JOHANNES MEWALDT, *Galenos Über echte und Unechte Hippocratica*, «Hermes», 44, 1, 1909, pp. 111-134.
- PAUL MORAUX, *Unbekannte Galen-Scholien*, «Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik», 27, 1977, pp. 1-63.
- BENJAMIN MORISON, *Language*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Galen*, edited by Robert James Hankinson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 116-156.
- IWAN VON MÜLLER, *Galen als Philologe*, «Verhandlungen der 41. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner», München, 1891, pp. 80-91.
- VIVIAN NUTTON, *Galen's Library*, in *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, edited by Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh, John Wilkins, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 19-34.
- PAUL POTTER (ed.), *Hippocrates VIII*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1995.
- WILLIAM RHYS ROBERTS, *Demetrius on Style*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- AMNERIS ROSELLI, *Notes on the Doxai of the Doctors in Galen's Commentaries on Hippocrates*, in *Ancient Histories of Medicine: Essays in Medical Doxography and Historiography in Classical Antiquity*, edited by Philip van der Eijk, Leiden, Brill, 1999, pp. 359-381.
- AMNERIS ROSELLI, *Galeno sull'autenticità del Proreptico I*, in *The Frontiers of Ancient Science: Essays in Honor of Heinrich von Staden*, edited by Brooke Holmes, Klaus-Dietrich Fischer, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2015, pp. 533-560.
- AMNERIS ROSELLI, *Galen's Practice of Textual Criticism*, in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts could and could not be Changed*, edited by A. Aejmelaeus, D. Longacre, N. Mirotadze, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020, pp. 53-72.
- RALPH M. ROSEN, *Galen on Poetic Testimony*, in *Writing Science: Medical and Mathematical Authorship in Ancient Greece*, edited by Markus Asper, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2013, pp. 177-189.
- DIRK M. SCHENKEVELD, *Studies in Demetrius: On Style*, Chicago, Argonaut, 1967.
- PETER N. SINGER, *Beyond and Behind the Galenic Commentary: Galen on Hippocrates on Elements*, forthcoming.
- INEKE SLUITER, *The Embarrassment of Imperfection: Galen's Assessment of Hippocrates' Linguistic Merits*, in *Ancient Medicine and its Socio-cultural Context, Papers Read at the Congress Held at Leiden University, 13-15 April 1992*, edited by Philip van der Eijk, Herman F. J. Horstmanshoff, Pieter H. Schrijvers, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1995a, pp. 519-535.
- INEKE SLUITER, *The Poetics of Medicine*, in *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of Dirk Marie Schenkeveld*, edited by Jelle G. J. Abbenes, Simon Roelof Slings, Ineke Sluiter, Amsterdam, Vrije University Press, 1995b, pp. 193-213.
- INEKE SLUITER, *Textual Therapy. On the Relationship between Medicine and Gram-*

- mar in Galen, in *Hippocrates and Medical Education: Selected Papers Presented at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium, Universiteit Leiden, 24-26 August 2005*, edited by Herman F. J. Horstmanshoff, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 25-52.
- INEKE SLUITER, *The Violent Scholiast: Power Issues in Ancient Commentaries*, in *Writing Science: Medical and Mathematical Authorship in Ancient Greece*, edited by Markus Asper, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2013, pp. 191-214.
- WESLEY D. SMITH, *The Hippocratic Tradition*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1979.
- WESLEY D. SMITH (ed.), *Hippocrates. Volume VII. Epidemics 2, 4-7*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1994.
- HEINRICH VON STADEN, *Science as Text, Science as History: Galen on Metaphor*, in *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*, Volume 2, edited by Philip van der Eijk, Herman F. J. Horstmanshoff, Pieter H. Schrijvers, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1995, pp. 499-518.
- HEINRICH VON STADEN, *Galen and the 'Second Sophistic', Aristotle and After*, edited by Richard Sorabji, London, Blackwell, 1997 («Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement», 41, Special Issue 68), pp. 33-54.
- HEINRICH VON STADEN, 'A Woman does not become Ambidextrous.' *Galen and the Culture of Scientific Commentary*, in *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, edited by Roy K. Gibson, Christina Shuttleworth Kraus, Leiden, Brill, 2002, pp. 109-139.
- HEINRICH VON STADEN, *Staging the Past, Staging Oneself: Galen on Hellenistic Exegetical Traditions*, in *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, edited by Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh, John Wilkins, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 132-156.
- GOTTHARD STROHMAIER, *Galen's Not Uncritical Commentary on Hippocrates' Airs Waters Places*, in *Philosophy, Science & Exegesis*, London, Blackwell, 2004 («Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies», 47, Special Issue 83/2), pp. 1-9.
- ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Asianismus und Atticismus*, «Hermes», 35, 1, 1900, pp. 1-52.

© COPYRIGHT BY FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE, PISA · ROMA