

Philip van der Eijk
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

The first and the second Hippocrates

This paper will consider the question to what extent the Hippocratic writings are bound together by any sort of intrinsic characteristic that distinguishes them *as a group* from other medical literature and thought of the same period. This is an important question, for if the answer is negative, the justification for treating the Hippocratic writings as a *corpus* or *collection* collapses. And if this is the case, the term ‘Hippocratic’, rather than being some kind of essentialist notion covering a specific body of medical literature with an identity of its own, just seems to stand for all fifth and fourth century medical literature written in Ionic dialect that happens to survive – indeed, which happens to have been preserved possibly for the very reason that it was associated, at some stage of its tradition, with Hippocrates and his school.

In order to answer this question, I will consider – as far as the fragmentary state of the material allows – whether the very substantial amount of ‘non-Hippocratic’ medical literature that was written in the fifth and fourth century BCE can lay at least equal claim to the virtues with which ‘Hippocratic medicine’ is usually credited (e.g. its alleged ‘rationality’). For if this is the case, there is no reason to associate the characteristics of this medicine any closer with the authors of the Hippocratic writings than with, say, the fragments of Diocles or Praxagoras or the works of Aristotle or Plato.

In this connection, I will also consider the question of the anonymity of the ‘Hippocratic’ writings, which stands in stark contrast to the confidence with which contemporaneous authors such as Herodotus and Alcmaeon put their names at the beginning of their works. Were the names of their real authors suppressed in the later tradition (as seems to have happened in the case of Polybus) or is there another reason for this mysterious phenomenon?

In this connection, I will also try to trace the concept of a ‘canon’ of Hippocratic works and consider some key episodes in its historical development, starting in antiquity and leading via the Aldine edition to Littré’s *Œuvres complètes d’Hippocrate*, and I will show how Littré’s concept of a ‘complete Hippocratic Corpus’ was challenged by his contemporary M.S. Houdart in his *Etudes historiques et critiques sur la vie et la doctrine d’Hippocrate et sur l’état de la médecine avant lui* (Paris, 1840) and his *Histoire de la médecine grecque depuis Esculape jusqu’à Hippocrate exclusivement* (Paris, 1856).

Paul Demont
Université de Paris, Sorbonne

Géographie, histoire et organisation de la médecine selon Platon

La communication ne cherche pas à reprendre les débats sur les rapports entre la Collection hippocratique et telle ou telle analyse ou comparaison médicale de Platon, mais plutôt à décrire pour elle-même la présentation de la médecine chez Platon. On proposera ensuite une comparaison globale entre ce tableau et la Collection hippocratique, pour tenter de faire apparaître points communs et divergences. A partir de cette comparaison, on voudrait évaluer dans quelle mesure la constitution et la diffusion de la Collection hippocratique ont pu être influencées par la présentation platonicienne de la médecine. On rappellera à cet égard comment certains aspects de cette présentation ont influencé les représentations médicales ultérieures de l'histoire de la médecine.

Susan Prince
University of Cincinnati

The Peripatetic Hippocrates and other Monists in the *Anonymus Londinensis*

This paper will consider the Peripatetic intervention, as we might call it, into the transmission of Hippocratic doctrine on the monism or pluralism of humoral (and physical) constitution of the human body and aetiology of disease. Both Galen and the writer of *Anonymus Londinensis* are firmly committed to the view that Hippocrates held the four-humour theory as described, and polemically defended, in *On the Nature of Man*. Yet the “Aristotle” cited in *Anonymus*, whom we take to be his Peripatetic pupil Menon, attributes to Hippocrates a doctrine preserved in the treatise *Breaths*, which makes air the single cause of disease (V.35-VI.43). When Galen, in his commentary on *On the Nature of Man*, describes the “Menoneia biblia” containing the doxography of ancient doctors which is the basis for our association of Menon with the papyrus, he notes that none of the ancient books which Menon excerpts spoke of yellow or black bile or phlegm as an element of human nature, but only blood was identified as a single constituent, and that by writers after Hippocrates. Galen then disagrees that this could be an accurate report—although Menon was diligent, he had deficient sources—and cites the opening of *On the Nature of Man* as his refutation. Aristotle, as we know, attributed *On the Nature of Man* to Polybus; meanwhile, blood is the single most important bodily “humour” in his own doctrine. *Anonymus Londinensis* discusses many brands of monism and rejects them in favor of a theory of pluralism and balance attributed variously to Hippocrates, Polybus, Plato and others. This paper will trace the appearances of two these two apparently Peripatetic monisms—that of air and that of blood—and their confluences (e.g. in the views of Erasistratus, XXVI.1-XXVII.24) in the treatise of *Anonymus* and attempt to discern a particular antagonism between the “Hippocratic” pluralism of the writer or his proximate source, which takes Plato’s *Timaeus* as its ally, and a monism of air, blood, or their conflation that may be consistent enough to look like a tradition. This monism, as the writer of *On the Nature of Man* already pointed out, is committed to certain schematic or theoretical principles to describe changes in health and variations in disease and identify their causes. If this bent which is rejected can be called philosophical or “rational,” then a defining feature of Hippocrates’ persona is the anti-rationalist and pro-empiricist streak that characterizes pluralism of constitution and emphasis on regimen for causing health and disease. Both the strange Hippocratic “canon” that appears in *Anonymus—Diseases*, *Breaths* and *On the Nature of Man* – and the conflicting ancient evidence about the authorship of *On the Nature of Man* are results of a core quarrel about which side of the debate between monism and pluralism Hippocrates should be aligned with, and the Peripatetics were the chief advocates of Hippocrates the monist.

Eric D. Nelson
Pacific Lutheran University

History of an Appendix: What's Hippocratic about the Pseudepigraphics?

As a part of the body of “Hippocratic” medical writings, the Hippocratic pseudepigrapha have had a widely varied estimation over time. Once considered a window into the world and spirit of the author of the “best” writings of the Corpus, the speeches and letters are now sometimes considered the Corpus’ quixotic appendix: a small and irritable appendage whose purpose and usefulness have passed into obscurity.

And yet, even as late-comers to the collection, pseudepigrapha have an interesting role in the history of the Corpus. The earliest, the speeches *Presbeutikos* (*Speech of the Envoy*) and *Epibomios* (*Speech from the Altar*) may have been a catalyst for the Corpus’ eponymous branding in Alexandria and an impetus in the long ensuing history of the “Hippocratic Question.” Later, variations of an epistolary tradition, originating elsewhere, were brought into the Corpus and figured in the ensuing traditions of Hippocratic biography from perhaps the first century BC. However, the pseudepigrapha of the Corpus represent only a fragmentary picture of the Hippocratic lore that burgeoned from the third century BC through the second century AD. This Hippocratica, some of which were eventually incorporated into the Hippocratic *vitae*, included both elaborations of—and backlashes against—Hippocrates’ emerging (or established) stardom.

Within this context, the permutations of pseudepigrapha that attend early compilations of the medical texts provide an opportunity to consider the implications of their selection. Most earlier investigations have focused on the development, possible relations, authorship, or the historicity of episodes (e.g. Philippson 1928; Diller 1933; De Lay 1969; Sakalis 1983; Smith 1990; Rubin-Pinault 1992; Rütten 1992; Jouanna 1999; Nelson 2005). Here, I examine the choices to include pseudepigrapha from the perspective of those who selected or rejected them from among their other options. What do these choices say about those who made them and about the Corpus that they had in mind?

I first consider the pseudepigraphic speeches, whose association with the Corpus appears to go back to its original compilation in Alexandria. The implications of their inclusion in the Corpus depend to a degree on whether the speeches were discovered among (and thus helped form a conception of) materials that became the Corpus, or whether they were added to materials already conceived of as a corpus in the mind of its compilers. I then consider the epistolary episodes included in the major manuscript traditions. In these instances, editors certainly selected or rejected Hippocratica to augment a Corpus about which they already had formed ideas and assumptions. However, like the speeches, the epistolary episodes betray a degree of ambivalence about Hippocrates and, rather than clarify the pseudepigrapha’s relation to the medical texts, seem to make them even more difficult to reconcile.

I use these observations to suggest that the apparent tensions of the pseudepigrapha and the rest of the Corpus arise largely because the narratives and discursive frameworks by which readers often seek to impose coherence on them (such as authorship or the recognition of certain rationalizing elements) were not those that motivated their formation and development. I argue that we might look instead to the developing elite identity of Greek physicians and scholars who associated themselves with the intellectual history for which the Corpus became a touchstone. The assemblage of medical writings, as Smith (1990) has suggested, may have been motivated primarily by the desire to preserve the available examples of this tradition at a moment in time. The pseudepigrapha, however, seem chosen to illustrate a “Hippocratic” Hippocrates. This “Hippocratic,” however, is not identified by the embrace of theoretical or methodological approaches made distinct by the Corpus. Nor is he identified as the author of texts parsed out of the Corpus. Rather, he is recognized as having an elite status through his participation in the tradition that the Corpus represents and by his engagement, based on this status, with other culturally significant individuals and events. Hippocrates’ life and mythology lent itself particularly well to such modeling, and may explain why these aspects were more important, despite their ambiguities, to the compilers of the Corpus than to our own concerns.