

Ann Hanson  
Yale University

### Hippocratic writers and ancient readers: authorship and individuation

The early medical writer who marked his compositions with cross-references that span *Nature of the Child (in Childbirth)*, *Diseases [IV]*, *Diseases of Women [I]*, and perhaps even *Diseases of Young Girls*, neglected to imbed his name within the narratives, as did the historians Herodotus and Thucydides in their first sentences. Galen was fond of *Nature of the Child*, writing a commentary to it, now presumably lost in Greek; he usually named Hippocrates as the author of *Nature of the Child*, although in *Formation of the Fetus* he says, “whether the author is Hippocrates himself, or his pupil Polybos” (54.21-22 Nickel). Of the early medical writer’s works only *Nature of the Child* was included for certain among the at least 18 treatise Bacchius of Tanagra glossed at the middle of the III-century BCE. By the mid-I century CE Erotian listed 31 treatises in his preface, and in his glossary the early medical writer’s *Diseases of Women* was juxtaposed to a similarly-named treatise to form a two-book *Diseases of Women  $\alpha'$ - $\beta'$* , set among therapeutic treatises curing through dietetics. He placed *Nature of the Child* among the etiologic treatises and never mentioned *Diseases [IV]*. The first editions of the Corpus, according to Galen, were brought out in the reign of Hadrian by Artemidorus Capito and Dioscurides (Anastassiou-Irmer, *Testamonien* I (2006) xxvi, and II 1, 483-84). Galen criticized Artemidorus for willfully changing old readings, but did admit that these editions were widely sought after. The lectures John of Alexandria gave in the VII century cover only chapters 12-19 of *Nature of the Child* and are clearly fragmentary, although they do highlight the role that the treatise continued to play in medical education (CMG XI 1.4). The two large manuscripts of the *Corpus*, M (MS Marcianus Graecus 269, X saec.) and Va (MS Vaticanus Graecus 276, XII saec.) present the text of *Generation/Nature of the Child* as separate entities; *Generation* directly precedes *Nature of the Child* in M, while in V it follows (in error). In both manuscripts *Nature of Man* is directly antecedent to *Nature of the Child*, and the *V-pinax* reports the title of *Generation* as *Nature of the Generating Seed*, thereby conferring a specious unity in title, if not in subject matter.

Littré, aware of the medical writer’s cross-references, printed *Generation/Nature of the Child* and *Diseases [IV]* together and numbered their chapters consecutively, with the implication that the grouping represented a continuous work. Joly followed Littré, and so did Lonie in his translation and commentary, arguing, however, that while *Generation* was indeed the introductory section to *Nature of the Child*, the early medical writer considered his *Diseases [IV]* an independent treatise. Grensemann named the early medical writer “Autor C” and printed his contributions to the gynecologies of the *Coprus* apart from the milieu in which they had been traveling at least since Erotian. Whether the early medical writer would be pleased with the current state of the works he joined through cross-references is unclear. In any case, papyrus fragments from Egypt during the

millennium when the country was Greek-speaking further confirm that gynecological treatises, including his own, continued to circulate together: a VI-century codex from Antinoe displays in its fragment 3 the end of *Superfetation* on the front and the beginning of *Diseases of Women I* on the back; fragments from *Diseases of Women II* in the same hand follow (*P.Ant.* III 184).

Medical texts pulled from dessert sands and rubbish heaps are able to inform about which treatises of the Corpus were being read by a provincial population in the later Ptolemaic and Roman periods and these copies also offer details about the state of snippets of the Greek texts. To date, the most popular was *Aphorisms*, and copies account for five items out of a total of 21 or 22 texts of the Corpus in the on-line Mertens-Pack<sup>3</sup>. I want to conclude with some observations about the papyrus evidence for *Aphorisms* and briefly to pursue the suggestion of Anastassiou-Irmer, I (2006) 87, that another III-century papyrus codex needs to be added to the other five examples of *Aphorisms* (*P.Ryl.* III 530, currently MP<sup>3</sup> 2338).

<<http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/index.htm>>

Amneris Roselli  
Università di Napoli 'L'Orientale'

*ἰπποκρατείως ἅμα τε καὶ ἀληθῶς:*  
Ippocrate testimone di verità, da Apollonio di Cizio a Galeno.

Apollonio di Cizio (I sec. a.C.), l'autore di trattato peri; a[rqrwn, allievo dell'ippocrateo Zopiro (κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον Ἴπποκράτει κατακολουθῶν) e, credo, egli stesso medico ippocrateo, è il primo tra coloro che ci sono noti per aver collegato il nome e l'insegnamento di Ippocrate all'enunciazione di una dottrina che è caratterizzata dal suo contenuto di verità.

In una sezione destinata a confutare un passo dell'erofileo Egetore (p. 78,24–94,8 Kollesch-Kudlien) sulla possibilità di ridurre stabilmente la lussazione della testa del femore (un problema molto discusso come documenta Galeno nel *Commento ad Articolazioni*), Apollonio, che la ritiene possibile, usa come unica strategia argomentativa il ricorso all'autorità del trattato ippocratico περὶ ἄρθρων ἐμβολῆς. In uno scontro paragonabile ad un dibattito giudiziario, Apollonio oppone ad Egetore l'Ippocrate di *Articolazioni* (citando passi da *tutto* il trattato, non solo dalla sezione sul femore); il presupposto di Apollonio è che Ippocrate, in ogni caso, è testimone veritiero (per quattro volte egli è indicato come φιλαλήθης) e non reticente, sia per quanto riguarda i suoi insuccessi sia per quanto riguarda le difficoltà incontrate nella pratica terapeutica (dunque il silenzio di Ippocrate su di un fallimento terapeutico, suo o di altri, prova che non c'è alcun fallimento terapeutico).

Già Eraclide di Taranto, tuttavia, aveva qualificato Ippocrate come testimone μάρτυς ἀξιοπιστότατος proprio nel contesto della discussione sulla lussazione del femore (Gal. *In Hipp. Art.* 18.a 735).

Galeno, a sua volta, definisce Ippocrate ἀληθείας ἐταῖρος e traccia nel *de atra bile* un breve ritratto di Ippocrate come ἀληθείας ἐραστής opponendolo ai più recenti medici σοφιστικῶς ληροῦντες. Verità dei fatti (ἡ πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια, τὸ ἀληθὲς αὐτό) e opinione di Ippocrate (ἡ Ἴπποκράτους γνώμη) sono per Galeno perfettamente complementari ed assumono lo stesso valore dimostrativo come mostrano le espressioni ἰπποκρατείως ἅμα τε καὶ ἀληθῶς nel *de diebus decretoriis* e una sua variante τὴν Ἴπποκράτειόν τε ἅμα καὶ ἀληθῆ μέθοδον nel *de methodo medendi*.

Attraverso l'analisi di alcuni testi intendo illustrare:

- a) il ruolo giocato dall'esegesi dei trattati chirurgici nella costruzione del modello di Ippocrate come testimone veritiero,
- b) il parallelo affermarsi di un fenomeno analogo nella tradizione della letteratura di argomento astronomico (Arato, Ipparco, Tolomeo)
- c) la funzione argomentativa delle citazioni di testi di Ippocrate nelle opere di Galeno.

Rebecca Flemming  
Jesus College Cambridge

From Corpus to Canon(s): Debating the Hippocratic in the Roman Empire

In many ways the formation of the Hippocratic Corpus did not itself draw a decisive boundary around the 'Hippocratic': both in the sense that the Corpus remained open to at least a few later additions, and in the sense that disputes rapidly arose about the authenticity, significance and utility of the texts within in. Indeed, extant ancient discussions about criteria for counting a treatise, or doctrine, as 'Hippocratic', are very much focused on these internal affairs.

Erotian, and most especially Galen, offer the fullest insight into these questions in the Roman imperial period, and an educational Hippocratic canon was to be established, in a reasonably settled form, in the schools of late antique Alexandria. Galen has, of course, his own agenda, wants to make a particular version of Hippocratism, a particular set of Hippocratic texts, canonical; but it is also possible to see him, in his Hippocratic commentaries and other works, responding to existing patterns of engagement, and prioritisation. Moreover, some of these patterns become clearer when considered alongside Erotian, and the surviving Hippocratic papyri from the Empire, as well the evidence of the later commentary traditions.

This paper will, therefore, investigate the formation of a Hippocratic canon, or competing canons, the debates about the Hippocratic, in the medical culture of the Roman Empire, before Galen. Is it possible to discern an established set of textual priorities within those encompassed by the Hippocratic Corpus which Galen inherits, and reacts to, and, indeed, a pre-existing set of disputes and discussions, around such texts, their doctrines and contents, and on what grounds? On what kind of critical terms did the learned physicians of the Empire approach the Hippocratic writings?