

VIVIAN NUTTON

Galen in Byzantium

Galen in Byzantium is one of those titles that becomes ever more problematic the more one studies it, for “Galen” can be understood in a variety of different ways. It can, for example, be taken to mean Galenism, the way in which the medical doctrines of the great doctor from Pergamum came to dominate the whole field of medicine in the Byzantine world, almost from its inception¹. This process was largely complete by the seventh century. But Galen was also a historical personage, and one can ask what the Byzantines knew, or rather, thought they knew of him. Here the relevant sources are drawn largely from authors of the sixth to the twelfth century. Galen was also a writer, and the third section of this paper will look briefly at the fate of the Galenic Corpus, as a scribal object, from the ninth to the fifteenth century. Finally, I want to consider how individual medical men reacted to the words and theories of Galen.

Galenism may be defined as the process whereby the theories and prejudices of a second-century doctor came to dominate the whole world of medicine to such an extent that, in Greek at any rate, the vast majority of medical texts to survive in full from Antiquity are either by Galen; by followers of Galen; and by authors of whom he approved, principally Hippocrates and the Hippocratic Corpus. The only exceptions to this universal Galenism are the half dozen or so treatises that became attached to the Galenic Corpus – like the *Introduction to Medicine* – or filled in major gaps that Galen had left – gynaecology (with Soranos), medical botany (with Dioskorides) and the classification of diseases (with Aretaeos). Everything else is Galenic, written by him and his favoured authors, and setting out a theory of medicine, based on the four humours, phlegm, blood, bile, and black bile, and on Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy. What in Galen’s lifetime (129–216/7) had been a world of vigorous medical debate between vastly different theories had by the sixth century become uniform. The last recorded Methodist in the Greek world lived in the fourth century, although Methodist writers favouring a corpuscular theory of the body continued in Latin-speaking N. Africa for at least another century². Another medical grouping criticised by Galen, the Empiricists, apparently disappears by the end of the third century; the Pneumatists perhaps a little later³. Debates, as we shall see later, centre on interpretations of Galenism, not on alternatives to Galenism.

It is a process already well in train by 350 A.D., at Alexandria, the greatest medical centre of the ancient world, and elsewhere. Around 60% of the extracts that make up the massive medical encyclopedias of Orbasios, the doctor to the Emperor Julian, are taken from Galen, and the percentage increases in the subsequent productions of Aetios and Paul of Aegina. In these authors, passages by authors other than Galen are either dropped or inserted without acknowledgment into sections from Galen, adding to his superiority. By 500, if not much earlier, learned doctors in Alexandria and Constantinople were lecturing upon Galen, and there had developed medical courses in the form of a syllabus of Galenic (and to a much lesser extent, Hippocratic) writings⁴. Proper or formal medicine thus came to be defined as knowledge of certain books, principally those of Galen. This syllabus, or at least part of it, was taught, in Latin, at Ravenna; and in Syriac, in the intellectual centres of the Middle East, from the mid-6th century onwards⁵. Translated into Arabic in the 9th cent., it became the foundation for the medicine of the Arabic world, and subsequently, after a further series of translations, of the universities of the Western Middle Ages. It came accompanied by the paraphernalia of education: there were summaries to help students pick out quickly the main points of Galenic books, and

¹ Fundamental is O. TEMKIN, *Galenism. Rise and decline of a medical philosophy*. Ithaca 1973.

² M. M. TECUSAN, *The fragments of the Methodists*. Leiden 2003, supersedes all earlier collections.

³ K. DEICHGRÄBER, *Die griechische Empirikerschule*. Berlin 1965; *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 9578 (unless “man of the spirit” refers to his being a Christian).

⁴ L. I. CONRAD – M. NEVE – V. NUTTON – R. PORTER – A. WEAR, *The Western medical tradition*. Cambridge 1995, 87.

⁵ P. MUDRY – J. PIGEAUD, *Les écoles médicales à Rome*. Geneva 1991, 285–310; E. LIEBER, *Galen in Hebrew*, in: *Galen; Problems and prospects*, ed. V. NUTTON. London 1981, 167–86, discusses the formation of the oriental Canon(s).

short practical handbooks of Galenic medicine, in Greek and in Syriac, that revealed succinctly the main outlines of Galenic therapeutics⁶.

Such aids, it must be admitted, were essential in order to trace a path through the many treatises of the prolific Pergamene, but they came with a price. Many of the most interesting features of Galen were lost or downplayed – his emphasis on hands-on experience and on frequent experiment; his willingness to consider alternatives, even if to reject them; his inconsistencies; his personal reminiscences; and even his enthusiastic encouragement of others. They were replaced by dogmatism, systematic or systematised statements and conclusions from which there was apparently no appeal⁷.

How and why this came about is not entirely clear. It was undoubtedly necessary to find some way of comprehending Galen's ideas – he wrote in all more than 300 treatises, almost 200 on medicine alone, a formidable quantity, but why he gained such authority in the first place needs explanation. One might point to his great learning, “far more than any man now can have”, lamented a Byzantine professor, and to his near immaculate powers of argument (if one accepted his premises, many of which he claimed were “commonsense”, then his conclusions followed precisely), and, above all, to his immensely potent rhetoric of certainty. He preached a medicine that was final: Hippocrates had resolved almost all the problems – he was after all, in Galen's eyes, an anatomist, a philosopher, the teacher of Plato, as well as a physician – and the little he had left unfinished, Galen himself had brought to perfection. Time and again Galen thundered that he had the right answer, that radical development was unnecessary, if not impossible, and that, if approached with care and precision, even the most refractory of cases would yield solidity and certainty – and people believed him⁸.

He presented his own career as an exemplar of virtue triumphant, of the local boy from provincial Pergamum, a young genius, who fought off the slings and arrows of his competitors to become the consummate physician to Roman emperors from Marcus Aurelius in the 160s until Septimius Severus, if not Caracalla, fifty years later⁹. About his own great wealth, unusual education, and social connections in Rome, let alone the fact that he was merely one of several imperial physicians at the time, Galen was reticent. What mattered was his self-presentation, as the infallible, authoritative, and, above all, thoughtful physician.

But of the details of his life, the Byzantines knew relatively little. The entry in the *Suda* lexicon, written about 1000, is brief¹⁰: Galen, the most distinguished physician, a Pergamene, lived in the reigns of the emperors Marcus, Commodus and Pertinax in Rome. The son of a land-surveyor and architect, Nikon, he wrote much on medicine and philosophy, besides grammar and rhetoric. Because they are universally famous, I thought it inappropriate to draw up a list of them here. He died aged seventy.

This entry is not without its merits and it is, at least in part, based on the evidence of Galen himself. In all likelihood, it derives from a much earlier biography, perhaps the one written at the end of the sixth century by Hesychios of Miletos. The *Lives* written by Hesychios we know to have been a major source for the *Suda*. But there were other stories circulating in Byzantium that gave different dates for the length of Galen's life. Learned chronographers, like George Hamartolos, John Tzetzes (d. 1080–1085) and Joel (active after 1204), declared that Galen had lived into the reign of Caracalla, i.e. 211/2–217, a date that is incompatible with that in the *Suda*¹¹. It does, however, fit with the tradition in Arabic authors, almost certainly going back to sixth century Alexandria, if not earlier, that placed Galen's age at death as 87, i.e. in 216/217. This I have argued is compatible with data in the Galenic Corpus that puts him alive in 207 or a year later. The *Suda*'s error, which confused scholars for centuries, can be easily explained as a hurried miscopying or misunder-

⁶ Ivan Garofalo will shortly publish an edition of the so-called Alexandrian summaries, preceded by a discussion of their genesis.

⁷ Cf. B. GUNDERT, *Die Tabulae Vindobonenses als Zeugnis alexandrinischer Lehrtätigkeit um 600 n. Chr.*, in: *Text and tradition. Studies in ancient medicine and its transmission presented to Jutta Kollesch*, eds. K. D. FISCHER – D. NICKEL – P. POTTER. Leiden 1998, 91–144.

⁸ A study of Galen's rhetoric is a desideratum, cf. V. NUTTON, *Style and context in the Method of Healing*, in: *Galen's Method of healing*, eds. F. KUDLIEN – R. J. DURLING. Leiden 1991, 1–25.

⁹ S. SWAIN, *Hellenism and Empire*. Oxford 1996, discusses the life of Galen in its social and intellectual context. P. N. SINGER's introduction to *Galen. Selected works*. Oxford 1999, sets out Galen's medical and philosophical ideas.

¹⁰ *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. ADLER, vol. I, Leipzig 1928, s.v. Galenos.

¹¹ George Hamartolos (= George the Monk), *Chronicon*, ed. P. WIRTH. Stuttgart 1978, 480; Michael Glykas, *Annales*, ed. I. BEKKER. Bonn 1836, 430; John Tzetzes, *Historiae*, ed. P. A. M. LEONE. Naples 1968, XI 998–XII 28; *Epistulae*, ed. P. A. M. LEONE. Leipzig 1972, 121; Joel, *Chronographia*, ed. F. IADEVAIA. Messina 1979, 707–9. Cf. also George Synkellos, *Ecloga chronographica*, ed. A. A. MOSSHAMMER. Leipzig 1984, 431.

standing of the statement, found in our Arabic sources, that Galen had spent 70 years of his life as a physician – after 17 years as a student¹².

But historical truth is often less potent than falsehood, and two widely circulated stories may have been more influential in establishing the Byzantine picture of Galen than any academic biography. The first, again deriving from a misunderstanding of a Galenic passage, was that Galen had learnt his pharmacology from no less an expert than Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, and had been alive in the time of Nero, indeed in the time of Christ. This story may be connected with another one, circulating in the twelfth century, if not earlier, that Galen had discussed with Mary Magdalene in Rome Christ's healing of the man born blind, John, chapter 9, and had explained to her that such healing was possible because Jesus was well acquainted with the healing properties of mineral earths¹³. It would be nice to have Byzantine evidence for the further story, widespread in the Near East and in W. Europe in the later Middle Ages, that Galen had become a Christian, and had died on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Twelfth-century travellers in Sicily were shown the tomb of Galen, on the left of the road from Misilmeri to Palermo, where Galen had stopped off on his journey to find the friends and acquaintances of Jesus¹⁴.

This story of Galen the Christian convert, or at least the acquaintance of early Christians, may have contributed to the tradition that, in certain Balkan churches, sets a portrait of Galen among those sages, like Plato and Plutarch, who had in some way foretold or acknowledged the coming of Christ¹⁵. The tradition appears in literature in the life of Saint Prokopios, written about 890, where Galen is included among the "philosophers of the kosmos", whose arguments have proved the truth of Christianity. Their message was one and unequivocal. By contrast with the God who made the heavens, all other gods were either created by man, or had simply been called gods; all alike, were doomed to destruction and decay. Galen had believed in a single God, just like Aristotle, Plato, Socrates, Scamander and Hermes Trismegistos¹⁶.

This appropriation of Galen to Christianity, what I have elsewhere termed depaganisation, is particularly marked since Galen's views on the Jews and Christians were far from complimentary. He approved of their morality, but despised their logic and belief in miracles. His ideas, as every reader of Eusebios knew, had inspired an early heresy, that of the Theodotos the shoemaker¹⁷. True, more than one saint, including Cosmas and Damian, was familiar with the works of Hippocrates and Galen, and George of Pisidia, in a splendid trope, could call Christ the true Galen of the soul, but other hagiographers take pains to point to their inadequacy¹⁸. Saint Panteleimon, for example, who had studied the *paideia* of Asclepius, Hippocrates and Galen, gave it all up, on discovering that their works were ultimately trivial and of little use¹⁹. In recension D of the life of Saint Euplos, perhaps by Metaphrastes, Kalvisianos the corrector is challenged by the saint to name his gods, so that he might worship them: Kalvisianos' response is surprising – Zeus, Asclepius, Artemis, – and Galen²⁰.

The word used for worship in this passage, *proskynein*, is the same used by Eusebios when describing the attitude of the heretic Theodotos to Galen in the early 3rd century. Given the magnitude of Galen's achievement, such awe and wonder is not surprising. The range of his interests and writings is enormous, from logic to anatomy, from studies of the language of Aristophanes and the comic poets to physiology, from expositions of the Hippocratic Epidemics to massive tomes on pharmacology, from ethics to slimming, from clinical observation to scientific demonstration, from vivisection of animals to the properties of foodstuffs²¹.

¹² V. NUTTON, Galen Ad multos annos. *Dynamis* 15 (1995) 25–40; IDEM, Galen on theriac: problems of authenticity, in: Galen on pharmacology. Philosophy, history and medicine, ed. A. DEBRU. Leiden 1997, 133–52.

¹³ Glykas, 430. Tzetzes, *Historiae* xi, 397; *Epistulae*, 121. Cf. M. ULLMANN, Kleopatra in einer arabischen alchemistischen Disputation. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 63/64 (1972) 158–75.

¹⁴ V. NUTTON, God, Galen and the depaganisation of ancient medicine, in: *Religion and medicine in the Middle Ages*, eds. P. BILLER – J. ZIEGLER. York 2001, 18–32 [30–32].

¹⁵ NUTTON, God 18.

¹⁶ A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Analecta Hierosolymitana*, V. St Petersburg 1898, 19.

¹⁷ Eusebios, *Ecclesiastical History* 5, 28,13–14. R. WALZER, Galen on Jews and Christians. London 1949; S. GERO, Galen on the Christians: a reappraisal of the Arabic evidence. *OC* 56 (1990) 371–411.

¹⁸ N.N., *Vita sanctorum Cosmae et Damiani*. *AnBoll* 1 (1882) 589–90; George of Pisidia, *Hexaameron* 1544, cf. 1388–9, ed. R. HERCHER, *Claudius Aelianus, Varia*. Leipzig 1866, II 651, 646.

¹⁹ P. FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, Note agiografiche 7 (*StT* 49). Vatican 1928, 41.

²⁰ FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, Note agiografiche 27.

²¹ See Galen's *On my own books*, trans. by P. N. SINGER, in: *Galen. Selected works*. Oxford 1997, 3–22.

Within these treatises, some of them a mere handful of pages long, others taking up over five hundred pages in the standard edition, Galen found time to offer his thoughts on almost every conceivable topic, from the fighting habits of the mongoose to Swiss yoghurt. The longwindedness of Galen was a constant complaint, from doctors and philosophers alike: Galen should have known how to wear the bridle, complained one rhetorician²². Famously, Galen does not figure personally in the satire *Timarion*, because he is away scribbling, adding yet more information to an ever-growing (and never-finished) supplementary volume on fevers²³.

But how much of Galen's writings did the Byzantines know? Certainly, by 500 at the latest, all traces of his philological writings had disappeared, save for his Hippocratic glossary, and much of his philosophical and scientific output was in danger. Marinos of Sicheon in the early sixth century is, I think, the last Greek philosopher to have a detailed acquaintance with Galen's Platonic summaries, although they survived to be translated into Arabic in the late 9th century by Hunain ibn Ishaq²⁴. Hunain's celebrated *Risala* (Missive), detailing the Arabic and Syriac translations of Galen, and his second letter on the works of Galen left out of his autobiographical, give us a remarkable snapshot of what survived in Greek around 850²⁵. From a comparison with what can be read in Greek today it is easy to see that what was then available of Galen's strictly medical writings has remained largely intact. Major exceptions are the second half of his big book on anatomy, *On anatomical procedures* (available in Arabic) and his work *On the eye*²⁶. His own summary of his *Method of healing*, lost in Greek, will be published very soon for the first time, again from Hunain's Arabic²⁷. Several of his Hippocratic Commentaries, notably those on the Oath, Airs, waters, and places, and the Epidemics, were lost in Greek and remain only or for the most part in Arabic translation²⁸. But large chunks of his philosophical and scientific writings, which were already difficult for Hunain to acquire, have now disappeared totally or almost totally in Greek, and many of them have yet to be found in Arabic or other oriental versions. Major losses include the big book *On scientific demonstration*; and his Platonic summaries and commentaries²⁹.

Hunain's comments on the difficulty with which he obtained copies of many of these philosophical works of Galen suggest that most of these would have been lost in Greek by 1000, rather than in the crusader sack of Constantinople. 1453, however, may have been more damaging to Galen's legacy, for several of the minor works of Galen that had been translated into Latin by Niccolò da Reggio in the first half of the fourteenth century no longer survive in Greek, or, like the recently (re)discovered *On movements hard to explain*, only in a fragmentary form³⁰. Niccolò, a doctor, diplomat and translator at the Angevin court of Naples, relied on manuscripts available to him in S. Italy or in Constantinople, although precise details of where he obtained

²² TEMKIN, *Galenism* 67.

²³ *Timarion*, lines 715 ff. (75 ROMANO).

²⁴ Damascius, *Life of Isidore* 199 (ZINTZEN).

²⁵ G. BERGSTRÄSSER, *Hunain ibn Ishaq, Über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XVII 2)*. Stuttgart 1925; IDEM, *Neue Materialien zu Hunain ibn Ishaq's Galen-bibliographie (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XIX 2)*. Stuttgart 1932. An English summary, based on the first text alone, was given by M. MEYERHOF, *New light on Hunain Ibn Ishaq and his period. Isis* 8 (1926) 685–724, reprinted, with identical pagination, in M. MEYERHOF, *Studies in medieval Arabic medicine*. London 1984.

²⁶ Galen, *Anatomicarum Administrationum Libri qui supersunt novem*, ed. I. GAROFALO; earundem interpretatio arabica Hunaino Isaaci filio ascripta. Naples 1986–2000: IDEM, *Galeno, Procedimenti anatomici*, Milan 1991 (containing a translation of the Arabic books 10–15). How much of Galen's treatise on the eye is subsumed in ninth century Arabic ophthalmology is disputed, see E. SAVAGE-SMITH, *Hellenistic and Byzantine ophthalmology: trachoma and sequelae. DOP* 38 (1984) 168–86.

²⁷ I. GAROFALO, *Una nuova opera di Galeno: La Synopsis del De Methodo Medendi in versione araba. Studi classici e orientali* 47 (1999) 9–19.

²⁸ The Epidemics commentaries were published by E. WENKEBACH and F. PFAFF in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* series, Berlin and Leipzig 1934–1960, and the edition of that of Airs, waters and places, by G. STROHMAIER, is imminent in the same series. For the commentary on the Oath, see F. ROSENTHAL, *An ancient commentary on the Hippocratic Oath. Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 30 (1956) 52–87.

²⁹ I. VON MÜLLER, *Über Galens Werk vom wissenschaftlichen Beweis. Abhandlungen der Münchener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 20 (1895) 403–78, but more fragments have since reappeared in Arabic; P. KRAUS – R. WALZER, *Compendium Timaei Platonis*. London 1951; H. O. SCHRÖDER – P. KAHLE, *Galenus in Platonis Timaeum Commentarius*. Berlin – Leipzig 1934.

³⁰ C. J. LARRAIN, *Galen, De motibus dubiis: die lateinische Übersetzung des Niccolò da Reggio. Traditio* 49 (1994) 171–233.

them are not forthcoming³¹. Certain of the choice texts he turned into precise Latin were alluded to in the twelfth century in Michael Italos' funeral oration on the doctor Michael Pantechnes, as Aimilios Mavroudis has recently demonstrated³². But texts like *On the parts of medicine* and *On antecedent causes* were scarcely the everyday reading of the average doctor, in the West as much as in Byzantium. One Latin manuscript of Niccolo's versions was discovered through its awful smell as it rotted away on top of a cupboard in a German library³³. One can hardly blame the Byzantine doctor from shying away from the bulk, and the enormous expense, of a total Galen – after all, even today, few medical historians or classicists have read Galen from cover to cover, and still fewer have done it twice. Byzantine doctors restricted themselves to the main outlines of the old syllabus, or to summaries and abridgments, like that in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale fonds grec 2332, which presented some unfamiliar treatises as a series of extracts in sequence³⁴. Anything beyond that was a mark of the truly learned.

This restriction of Galen in the middle years of Byzantium largely to his medical writings, and a relatively small selection of those, means that Byzantine Galenism has a very different stamp from that in Islam, or in the Late Medieval West, influenced by Avicenna, Averroes and the like. There is little understanding of Galen as an independent philosophical thinker of stature. A few Aristotelian commentators repeat their disdain for his refusal to pronounce on the eternity of the world, but there is not the detailed engagement with Galen's philosophical position as we find in Rhazes, Avicenna, and Maimonides³⁵. The sixth-century theologian Isidore of Pelusium's refutation of Galen's views on the soul is a rarity, not least in its acuity³⁶.

Similarly, as far as medicine was concerned, Byzantine doctors rarely challenged, modified or questioned their Galenic legacy to any great extent. There are no Byzantine doubts on Galen, save for Simeon Seth (who was probably imitating Arabic authors), no debates on the proper use of Galenic material from less familiar works, such as we find between Ibn Ridwan and Ibn Butlan³⁷. There are few, if any, disputes in Middle and Late Byzantium parallel to that mentioned by Alexander of Tralles in the 6th century between himself, a thinking Galenist, and his rigorist opponent, unwilling to go beyond the words of Galen even if the patient died³⁸. One looks in vain for any evidence of systematic anatomy – and, pace Browning, Bliquez, and Kazhdan, for almost any anatomy at all³⁹. One cannot write a history of the vivifying impact on Byzantine medicine of the discovery or rediscovery of Galenic texts as Luis Garcia Ballester and Nancy Siraisi have done for Western Europe⁴⁰. At best the Byzantine Galen remains an unchallenged substrate, to which new therapies can be added, along with their traditional Galenic explanations.

But to seek for Galenic revivals in Byzantine medicine is to ask the wrong question. For the Byzantines Galen was always there, something familiar, and for that reason unlikely to have the challenging force that he had when arriving afresh in translated form to extend or refine existing knowledge. But how widespread that knowledge of Galen's writings was and the extent to which it influenced medical practice in general are

³¹ L. THORNDIKE, Translations of the works of Galen from the Greek by Niccolò da Reggio. *Byzantina Metabyzantina* 1 (1946) 213–35; the background is given by R. WEISS, The translators from the Greek of the Angevin court of Naples. *Rinascimento* 1 (1950) 195–226. M. R. McVAUGH, Niccolò da Reggio's translations of Galen. *Early Science and Medicine* 11 (2005) 275–301.

³² A. D. MAUROUDES, Ο Μιχαήλ Ιταλικός και ο Γαληνός. *Hell* 43 (1993) 29–44.

³³ R. STAUBER, Die Schedelsche Bibliothek. (Repr.) Nieuwkoop 1969, 249.

³⁴ H. OMONT, Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Pars 2, Paris 1888, 242: a copy of this manuscript is Vienna, med. gr. 15.

³⁵ J. C. BÜRCEL, Averroes contra Galenum. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 1967, 265–340.

³⁶ Isidore of Pelusium, Ep. IV125. *PG* 78, 1192–204.

³⁷ TEMKIN, Galenism, 119; for Seth's knowledge of Arabic authors, see G. HARIG, Von den arabischen Quellen des Symeon Seth. *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 2 (1967) 248–68. Cf. J. SCHACHT – M. MEYERHOF, The medico-philosophical controversy between Ibn Butlan of Baghdad and Ibn Ridwan of Cairo: a contribution to the history of Greek learning among the Arabs. Cairo 1937.

³⁸ Alexander of Tralles, II 83 (155 PUSCHMANN).

³⁹ L. J. BLIQUEZ – A. KAZHDAN, Four testimonia to human dissection in Byzantine times. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 58 (1984) 554–7; R. BROWNING, A further testimony to human dissection in the Byzantine world. *ibid.* 59 (1985) 518–20. Of their testimonia, to which I add Athanasios of Sinai, Quaestiones 92. *PG* 89, 730, only one, Theophanes, refers to an actual event (and Synkellos' reasoning may be wrong): Ps. Eustathios, Athanasios, Symeon and Tornikes are quoting Galen (directly or indirectly, cf. Origen, Philocalia fr. ii, 2), as could be Michael Italos, whose rhetorical flourishes should not be pressed as hard as Browning wants.

⁴⁰ L. GARCÍA BALLESTER, The New Galen: a challenge to Latin Galenism in thirteenth-century Montpellier, in: Text and tradition. Studies in ancient medicine and its transmission presented to Jutta Kollesch, eds. K. D. FISCHER – D. NICKEL – P. POTTER. Leiden 1998, 55–84; N. G. SIRAIISI, Taddeo Alderotti and his pupils. Two generations of Italian medical learning. Princeton 1981.

still questions in need of much more research. One would like to know, for example, if it was only elite doctors in Constantinople who had access to or who read manuscripts of Galen beyond the standard syllabus. The recent discovery of a fragment of Galen's Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms copied in Syria (Damascus ?) perhaps as late as the fifteenth century serves as a warning against assuming a metropolitan monopoly of Galenic manuscripts⁴¹.

Such a re-evaluation of Byzantine Galenism would be a major task, yet there are several indications that the attempt would be likely to bring forth fruit. Firstly, a variety of references suggest that a knowledge of Galen was not confined to medical men. Germanos of Constantinople, around 700, can quote from Galen's On sects in his On predestined terms of life⁴². Four hundred years later Theophylaktos of Ochrid, around 1088–1089, asked his friend Nikolaos Kallikles for the loan or a copy of a book of Galen, perhaps On the opinions of Hippocrates and Plato. His request was answered, and we have Theophylakt's poem of thanks to prove it⁴³. His contemporary, John Merkuropoulos of Jerusalem, patriarch of Jerusalem, cited Galen to the effect that the sting of pain was not removed until a cut has been made airtight⁴⁴. Psellos could quote Galen on sensation, as well as alluding to his praise of a naturally large head⁴⁵. Far more needs to be done by Byzantinists to evaluate the extent of this non-medical interest in Galen.

Secondly, the researches of Carlos Larrain in the Escorial library have brought to light fragments, some substantial, of unusual works by or attributed to Galen included among theological miscellanies, perhaps copied for theological purposes, perhaps casually bound together⁴⁶. Paul Moraux's publication of some Galenic scholia has also shown how an unknown author could use a wide knowledge of Galen to interpret some basic Galenic texts⁴⁷. A survey of the manuscript context of the various treatises within the Galenic Corpus would lead to some interesting results.

Finally, the more we know about unfamiliar Byzantine medical and theological authors and practitioners, the more extensive the influence of Galen and Galenism may be seen. The French palaeographer and Byzantinist Brigitte Mondrain has recently surveyed the manuscripts associated with Demetrios Angelos, teacher and doctor at the Kral hospital in the first half of the fifteenth century⁴⁸. Not only did Demetrios own and commission manuscripts, but he also commented extensively in their margins on Galen's theories and observations, comparing them with his own experiences in practice. We have here a rare opportunity to penetrate into the working practices of a Byzantine Galenist, of some stature and intelligence, and to see his engagement with his great predecessor. Western medievalists and Renaissance scholars have long been familiar with this methodology, but, to my knowledge, little has been done for Byzantium⁴⁹.

These exhortations may not compel scholars to leave their desks and descend on the shelves of Athens, Athos, or even the rue de Richelieu in search of another Demetrios. Rather, they serve as a warning that this brief sketch of the vicissitudes of Galen in Byzantium, and particularly its last section, is no more than a provisional survey, as much the result of this author's ignorance as of his understanding. The proper history of the afterlife and influence of Galen of Pergamum in the Byzantine period, and particularly from the tenth century onwards, still remains to be written. But that is a challenge, not a complaint.

⁴¹ V. NUTTON – N. SERIKOFF, A Greek Fragments of Galen's Commentary on the Hippocratic Aphorisms from a Christian Arabic Manuscript, in: *Trasmissione e ecdotica di testi medici greci*, a cura di A. GARZYA – J. JOUANNA. Naples 2003, 385–400.

⁴² Germanos, On predestined terms of life, tr. C. GARTON – L. G. WESTERINK. Buffalo 1979, 10–2.

⁴³ Theophylact, Ep. 57. *PG* 126, 476B–C; S. G. MERCATI, *Collectanea Byzantina*. Rome 1970, 361–2.

⁴⁴ A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Analecta Hierosolymitana*, I. St Petersburg 189, 324.

⁴⁵ M. Psellos, *Philosophica Minora II*, ed. D. J. O'MEARA. Leipzig 1989, 58, 93.

⁴⁶ Above, note 29; C. J. LARRAIN, *Galens Kommentar zu Platons Timaios*. Stuttgart 1992 (although the fragments here edited are very unlikely to come from this commentary or even directly from Galen.)

⁴⁷ P. MORAUX, *Unbekannte Galen-Scholien*. *ZPE* 27 (1977) 1–63; *idem*, *Anecdota Graeca Minora VI*. Pseudo-Galen, *De signis ex urinis*, *ibid.* 60 (1985) 64–74 (one of whose manuscripts, Naples, BN Gerol. XXI.1, contains a block of material on medicine alongside a more substantial body of Aristotelian philosophical writings).

⁴⁸ B. MONDRAIN, Jean Argyropoulos, professeur à Constantinople et ses auditeurs médecins, d'Andronic Éparque à Démétrios Angelos, in: *ΠΟΛΥΠΛΑΕΥΡΟΣ ΝΟΥΣ*. *Miscellanea für Peter Schreiner* zu seinem 60. Geburtstag, eds. C. SCHOLZ – G. MAKRISS (*Byzantinisches Archiv* 19). Leipzig 2000, 222–50.

⁴⁹ Cf. also my discussion of some 16th-century bilingual notes on Galen, Marginally significant. *The Osler Library Newsletter* 95 (2001) 1–4; but see now V. BOUDON-MILLOT, *Galien*, tome I. Paris 2007, XCI–CCXVIII.