

## *Introduction*

### **1 Overview**

Galen's writings on health constitute a fascinating and important resource, in at least three senses. From a social-historical point of view, first of all, they throw vivid light on ancient Graeco-Roman theories, practices and debates regarding the health and care of the body – as well as, in passing, also a whole range of other aspects of everyday ancient life. Secondly, they represent a central element of Galen's own oeuvre, elaborating his views on the nature of the medical art itself, of the role of 'healthfulness' (*to hugieinon*) within this, and of the physiology of the human body in optimal and suboptimal states. Particular topics that the texts elucidate in this area are his understanding of nutrition, the role of fluids (or 'humours') in the body and the biology of aging; they also offer important insights into his understanding of the relationship of 'soul' and 'body', in the context of the healthy life. Thirdly, the treatise *Health* – in Greek, *Ta hugieina*, in Latin *De sanitate tuenda* – has a long and important intellectual history, both as a title or genre of work, and in terms of its own direct influence in subsequent centuries.

Works devoted to and with the title of 'health' (*ta hugieina*) had been written since at least the fourth century BCE; but Galen's is the only surviving ancient medical representative of the genre. Writings in this tradition and with this focus, however, gained great importance and popularity, both within professional medical circles and beyond them, over a very wide geographical and chronological span. They range from the *Health Precepts* of the philosopher Plutarch, about a generation before Galen, through the widely diffused *Regimen sanitatis* of the Salernitan school and that of Maimonides in Andalusia (both of the twelfth century), to works by Thomas Elyot and Girolamo Cardano in sixteenth-century England and Italy – to give just a few prominent examples. Galen's

magnum opus itself, meanwhile, acquired a particular prominence, especially in Renaissance and early modern times, when it was thought to contribute crucially to practical medical knowledge, and received several translations into Latin, including that of Thomas Linacre, dedicated to King Henry VIII, and many printings of those translations. In more recent times it has excited the interest of readers interested in challenging certain aspects of modern medical practice, and in rediscovering, or asserting, the importance of preventive medicine; the role of a range of different dietary, lifestyle and environmental factors in prescriptions for health; and the focus on the individual in clinical practice.

## 2 Galen in the tradition of ‘health’ writings

### 2.1 ‘Healthfulness’

Central to Galen’s health writings is the special role they accord to ‘healthfulness’ in the definition and understanding of medicine and healthy living.

It is worth pausing for a moment here to address a problem of translation. The Greek words used for this subject area are *hugieinē*, *hugieinon* and *hugieina*. All are forms of the adjective meaning ‘healthy’ or ‘healthful’, which, however, in certain grammatical contexts may be used also as nouns. The first, feminine, form may be translated ‘the art concerning health’ (here the feminine noun *technē* is taken as understood); the second, neuter, form may be taken as an abstract noun, ‘healthfulness’, or in some contexts also, with the noun *morion* implied, as ‘the healthful part [of the art]’.<sup>1</sup> The third is the plural form of the second, and may again be translated either as an abstract noun – ‘things/matters concerned with health’ – or as ‘writings concerned with health’.

In the Latin tradition, the standard title of Galen’s work came to be *De sanitate tuenda*, ‘On the preservation of health’, and this title is still often used to refer to the treatise, even though it is really a gloss or interpretation of what is referred to by the title, rather than a translation proper.<sup>2</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *San. Tu.* I.1, 3,3 Ko. (VI.1 K.), with n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, central to ‘healthfulness’ for Galen – and what crucially distinguishes it from the healing art proper, as we shall see – is precisely that it consists in preserving the healthy body in its current state. This Latin title is due to the sixteenth-century translator Thomas Linacre; the first Latin translator, Burgundio da Pisa, in the twelfth century, used the title *De regimine sanitatis* (‘On the regimen of health’) while the reliably literal Niccolò da Reggio in the fourteenth called it simply *Libri sanativi* (‘Health books’). On the Greek title see section 9.2; on the Latin translations see section 9.2, and further the website <https://galenolatino.com>.

would be possible also to use the transliterated form *Hygieinē*.<sup>3</sup> the English word ‘hygiene’ could until quite recent times still be used in a sense roughly corresponding to Galen’s, although this sense is no longer in everyday use. It is also the case that the title of Galen’s major work on health appears, in references within his other writings, in a number of slightly different forms, and that the precise meaning of some of these is ambiguous.<sup>4</sup> For all these reasons the simpler title ‘Health’ has been preferred for the present volume.

The identification of a distinct domain of ‘healthfulness’, either within or separate from medicine proper, is not unique to Galen. It is in Galen, however, that we find the full justification and elaboration of this identification, in a way that does not appear elsewhere. Both in *Health* and (with more logical precision) in *Thrasymbulus*, Galen is concerned to locate ‘healthfulness’ in its correct position in relation to medicine – or to put it more precisely, within the ‘single art concerned with the body’.

In the latter text, what is at stake is not only the definition and positioning of ‘healthfulness’, but its relationship to the art of the physical trainer, *gumnastikē* – a topic which it pursues with considerable logical and dialectical sophistication, in part as a function of the original argumentative context and intended audience of this text. The argument there belongs within the polemical context of a strategy of elevating the art of the doctor, and denigrating that of the athlete and his trainer (*gumnastēs*), as the appropriate expert to give advice on procedures leading to health of the body. Rather strikingly, in that polemical context Galen expresses himself in much more hostile terms towards trainers, *gumnastai*, in general (and to some individuals amongst them in particular), than he does in *Health*.<sup>5</sup>

## 2.2 *Health; the status of medicine; athletics*

Such, then, in outline, is Galen’s view of the distinct art of ‘healthfulness’, and his attitude to athletic practices. Let us now consider some of the intellectual–historical background to his position.

Galen was a highly educated and literate intellectual, for whom that education and that literate culture fundamentally informed his understanding

<sup>3</sup> As indeed was done by Johnston (2018a) and (2018b).

<sup>4</sup> In particular there is some doubt, in line with the different senses of the adjective just outlined, as to whether the title refers rather to a kind of writing, or to a kind of study, art, theory and practice; on the forms of the title see further below, section 9.2.

<sup>5</sup> For the translation of the terms *gumnastēs* and *gumnastikē*, see *Thras.*, n. 6.

of the human body and his practice of medicine. He had studied both medicine and philosophy – a study which included all the most important ‘classic’ texts within both disciplines – to the highest level.<sup>6</sup> This is relevant here in two ways.

First, Galen takes it that for the correct practice of medicine, or the correct instruction in health care, an understanding of the internal workings of the body is necessary, including a detailed knowledge of its anatomy, elemental composition, and physiology. This understanding he claims himself to have acquired through meticulous training in anatomy and medicine, as well as through detailed attention to the most relevant texts by his predecessors; equally, he is certain that it is not available either to uneducated physical trainers, or to practitioners of other medical sects who either aim to do without, or grossly simplify and distort, such anatomical or physiological knowledge. (The same stricture also applies, in a different way, to the various practitioners of medical specialisms who abounded in the Graeco-Roman world – people whose profession consisted in the performance of, for example, certain eye operations, but who had no broader understanding of the body and its health.)<sup>7</sup>

Also necessary – both in order to acquire the relevant knowledge and in order to stand a chance of distinguishing true from false arguments, and genuine from fake practitioners – is a certain level of training in logic and argumentation, and in particular an understanding of what constitutes a logically sound demonstration (*apodeixis*).<sup>8</sup> Secondly, Galen claims that his understanding of the human body and the art of medicine

<sup>6</sup> On Galen’s biography, education and social background, for accessible accounts see Mattern (2008), (2013) and Nutton (2020); for briefer summaries Hankinson (2008b), Singer (2019a); for more detail Nutton (1973); Boudon-Millot (2007), ‘Introduction générale’; Schlange-Schöninggen (2003). ‘Philosophy’ informs Galen’s work in a number of crucial ways (as summarized by Singer (2016/2021)): he interests himself in certain specialist areas of philosophy, such as ethics and logic; but the philosophical tradition of enquiry into physics and biology is also of direct relevance to his views on the human body and its functioning.

<sup>7</sup> On Galen’s attitude to the rival sects of his time, Empirics and Methodists in particular, see further below. For Galen’s attitude to narrow medical specialisms, cf. n. 34, as well as the discussion in *Parts of Medicine*, on which see further the Appendix, ‘Galen and others on the parts of medicine’.

<sup>8</sup> Galen is dismissive of most of the actual practitioners of philosophy in his own time (on which point see in particular *Aff. Pecc. Dig.* II, and Singer 2014a), but regards training in the fundamentals of logical argument as essential in order to be able to form one’s own judgement on the veracity or falsity of arguments, and in this context repeatedly points the student to the essential training in this area offered by one of his own works (now unfortunately lost), *Demonstration* (see esp. *Ord. Lib. Prop.* 1, 90,23–91,12 BM, XIX.52–53 K.). There is a considerable literature on Galen’s theory and practice of demonstration; for an excellent summary and overview see Havrda (forthcoming); further Barnes (1991), (1993), (2003), Hankinson (1991), (2008c), Havrda (2022); Tieleman (1996).

is based closely on the knowledge of the ‘old masters’,<sup>9</sup> most particularly, on the philosophical side, Plato, and on the medical, Hippocrates. (I do not enter here into the vexed ‘Hippocratic question’ – that of which, if any, of the texts in the so-called Hippocratic corpus may be attributed to the historical Hippocrates. For present purposes what matters is *Galen’s* understanding of Hippocrates as a genuine historical figure, who wrote particular works in that corpus – on which point, see further p. 6 with n. 11 below.)<sup>10</sup>

Both these intellectual approaches inform the definition of healthfulness in *Thrasylbulus*, as well as its attack on the ‘perverted art’ of the athletes. Galen’s principal aim in the work is to prove that healthfulness does indeed belong within the domain of the doctor, not that of the trainer. Underlying the hostility to the athletic model is the notion of balance, and the view that the athletic goal of achieving a ‘peak’ takes away from and endangers that balance. But the means by which Galen aims to establish his main *probandum* are deeply connected with his commitment and self-alignment to that philosophical and medical tradition of ‘the old masters’. First, he does so through a sophisticated argumentative procedure, which displays his skill in the deployment of Aristotelian terminology and dialectical techniques. Secondly, in his attitude to athletes, and in his dismissal of the skill of the trainer as a ‘perverted art’ or form of ‘flattery’, he relies on a close engagement with, and detailed textual citation from, those masters, in the former case Hippocrates and in the latter Plato’s *Gorgias* and *Republic*. Galen is able, as it were, to enlist Plato’s cultural support for the view that physical training or athletics – at least as actually practised – represents an unbalanced, perverted form of health.

It is in relation to his Hippocratic and Platonic forebears, too, that he constructs his intricate argument for the distinct status of *to hugieinon* within the doctor’s art, as sanctioned by the tradition: his views on this point are in agreement with theirs, he claims, even though they did not

<sup>9</sup> Galen typically uses the term *hoi palaioi*, usually translated ‘the ancients’, in his respectful references to personages in this grand tradition. (See below, section 2.3, with n. 23, on the opposed term *neōteroi*.)

<sup>10</sup> For overviews of the Hippocratic corpus see Jouanna (1992/1999); Craik (2015). The term ‘Hippocratic corpus’ itself has been problematized in recent scholarship, especially by van der Eijk (2015a). The ‘corpus’ as we have it is essentially a Renaissance collection; given the lack of agreement amongst scholars as to the authenticity of any of the works in this corpus, as well as about the nature of the historical figure of Hippocrates, and given the arbitrariness and murkiness of the historical processes by which texts came to be included in the ‘corpus’, it seems methodologically sounder to abandon the term altogether, and to use more historically precise terminology, e.g. that of ‘classical’ Greek medical texts for those of the fifth–fourth centuries BCE.

in classical Greek usage have the explicit *terminology* of *to hugieinon*. Hippocrates wrote expertly on this subject area, but it was a subject area which had not yet come to be regarded separately or given the heading to *hugieinon* or *hugieinē*; therefore the relevant works are not so called. The fact that Plato talks of physical training (*gumnastikē*) but not *to hugieinon* is, Galen claims, partly due to the different perceived needs of his time.<sup>11</sup> We shall also explore further the social and cultural status of athletic practices in Galen's time, and his response to that, in section 3.1 below; and use of and engagement with the Platonic texts in this work further in section 8.5.

Thus Galen elaborates his view of 'healthfulness' as a part of the medical expertise, but distinct from 'the healing part' (*therapeutikon*) of that art. The notion of healthfulness occupying this liminal role recurs a number of times in *Health*, where some topics – those more directly concerned with disease, or those involving *drugs* rather than *foods* – are deferred for discussion elsewhere, but on the other hand a certain level of discussion of 'morbid symptoms' is appropriate within the treatise on health too.<sup>12</sup>

Central to his position, however, in both works, and in spite of subtly shifting statements in different places, are the two propositions of (1) the *singleness* of the art of medicine (or more precisely: the art concerning the

<sup>11</sup> Galen claims that Hippocrates' writing on *to hugieinon* is not given this title, but consists of the works 'on daily regime' and 'on waters and airs and places' (that is to say, the treatises *Regimen* and *Airs, Waters, Places*); and that Plato uses the term *gumnastikē* to refer to healthfulness as a whole because 'he did not see a need for daily regime in general in the case of healthy persons' (*Thras.* 39, 87,8–13 H., V.881 K.; for Plato's view cf. also 34, 80,18–23 H., V.872 K.). The latter claim doubtless involves an archaizing or nostalgic view of the superior health of people of previous ages, due to their not having succumbed to the decadent morals of more recent times. When referring to the former Hippocratic work just mentioned, Galen in fact sometimes subtly alters its title to 'on daily regime for the healthy person [or, for the health-practitioner]' (*Peri diaitēs hugieinōi*) (*HVA* I.17, 135,2 H., XV.455 K.), while he insists on the alternative title 'on the healthful daily regime' (*Peri diaitēs hugieinēs*) for another work, traditionally regarded as the third part of *The Nature of the Human Being*, but in his view a separate work appended to the latter in error (*HNH* III, *praef.*, 89,1–14 M., XV.174–175 K.). On early Greek dietetics see Smith (1980), who offers an important reflection on the relationship between empirical or traditional elements and theoretical systematization in 'Hippocratic' and later (Diocles, Mnesitheus) works on diet, as well as on Galen's response to that; further Craik (1995); Jouanna (2008/2012); and on the relationship of dietetics to pharmacology Totelin (2015). For the early history of *diaita* in relation to health, including in non-medical sources, see Wöhrle (1990), especially 31–95; prominently attested for their interest in diet are the early Pythagoreans, and an important (though controversial) figure in the early history was Herodicus, whom we shall encounter in Plato's account of him in book III of the *Republic*.

<sup>12</sup> Further on Galen's theory and practice in relation to drugs (*pharmaka*) see Debru (1997a), esp. the chapters of Debru, Jacques, van der Eijk and von Staden; Scarborough (2010); Petit (2017); Singer (2020b) and (2022a); Wilkins (2020). See e.g. *San. Tu.* IV.1, 103,7–12 Ko. (VI.233–234 K.), and further below on the parallel function of *Health* and *The Therapeutic Method*.

body) and (2) the fact that this art is one requiring a high level of logical training, as well as a high level of knowledge of human physiology and pathology as a whole. (This conception of the singleness of the art of medicine is connected with his view of the subordinate role of narrow specialisms, already mentioned.)

### 2.3 Galen's relationship with the medical tradition on health

It was observed earlier that the treatise *Health* belongs within a long existing tradition on this topic; in fact, Galen himself is one of the main sources of evidence for this previous tradition, listing a number of previous authors who were particularly prominent and influential in this tradition of 'health' writing; in *Thrasylbulus* the following names appear as a list of respected predecessors in the discipline: 'Hippocrates, Diocles, Praxagoras, Philotimos, Erasistratus, Herophilus'.<sup>13</sup> (His attitude to some of his predecessors is, however, at least somewhat fluid: he takes issue with Erasistratus, Herophilus and Praxagoras elsewhere, on particular points of physiology; and he has specific criticisms of Erasistratus' views even with the domain of health, as we shall see.)

Diocles of Carystus (fourth century BCE) wrote a work on health (*Hugieina pros Pleistarchon*); Galen is clearly indebted to his work in certain areas, although he does not discuss Diocles in *Health*, nor in *Thrasylbulus* apart from the two honorific mentions just cited.<sup>14</sup> Erasistratus (third century BCE) also wrote a work of this title, and Galen implies that he coined a usage, sometimes also adopted by Galen himself, whereby *ho hugieinos* (i.e. the masculine singular of the same

<sup>13</sup> *Thras.* 38, 85,22–23 H. (V.879 K.); the list is repeated almost identically at 47, 99,16–17 H. (V.898 K.). And similar lists of the 'most distinguished' predecessors appear in other contexts in his work too, e.g. at *Cris.* III.5 (IX.728 K.): 'Diocles, Pleistonius, Praxagoras, Philotimos'; *Di. Dec.* I.2 (IX.775 K.): 'the followers of Philotimos, Diocles and the other ancients, and before them the followers of the most sainted Hippocrates'; *MM* I.3 (X.28 K.) (in sarcastic mode, a list of the medical authorities over whom the upstart Thessalus ludicrously claims his superiority): 'Herophilus ... his fellow student Philotimos, his teacher Praxagoras ... alongside and before these Erasistratus, Diocles, Mnesitheus, Dieuches, Philistion, Pleistonius, Hippocrates himself'.

<sup>14</sup> Galen does, however, preserve an extensive and important fragment from Diocles' treatise at *Alim. Fac.* I.1, 202,26–203,21 H. (VI.456 K.) = (fr. 176 van der Eijk), where the discussion is of the correct empirical approach to the assessment of the capacities of foods, drinks and drugs, a theme central to Galen's work in this area. (As Galen presents him, whether reliably or not, Diocles is less theoretically grounded in his approach to diet than 'Hippocrates'; on this point see Smith 1980.) Diocles' focus on the importance of leisure for the optimal healthy lifestyle (fr. 182 van der Eijk) is also strongly echoed in Galen's approach, as we shall see. On Diocles see further van der Eijk (2000/2001); and for his importance to Galen in the specific context of his theory of melancholy, see Pormann (2008).

adjective) may refer to the expert in this branch of the art.<sup>15</sup> (This is translated below as ‘health-practitioner’.)

Galen quotes directly and apparently approvingly – although only very occasionally – from this work of Erasistratus, for example in the passage just cited from *Thrasylbulus*. Praxagoras and Philotimos also receive positive mentions, and indeed contemporaries are criticized for paying insufficiently detailed attention to their writings. An opposition is set up here between these serious medical authorities on the one hand and trainers, such as Theon, who write specialist works on physical training (*gymnastika*) but who distort the reality through insufficient understanding both of the body and of the writings of ‘the ancients’.

It is also important to consider Galen’s indebtedness to a health tradition, or to specific writings and authors on health practices, which he does *not* explicitly acknowledge. Such matters as the care of small children, the use of milk and the choice of nurses, for example, as also about the value of exercise in everyday life, including for its psychological effects – to take just some particularly prominent examples – were established topics of discussion in the medical tradition (as well as in some less technical literature), before Galen. They were treated by a number of prominent and influential authors of recent generations whom Galen either does not mention at all, or does not mention in this context (e.g. Antyllus, Athenaeus, Herodotus, Rufus), as well as by those authors that he does mention approvingly as writers in the health tradition (e.g. Diocles, Mnesitheus) – but even in the latter case, he gives no acknowledgement of such discussions or contributions, nor any account of his own agreement or disagreement with them on points of detail. It would be possible to draw detailed connections between Galen’s views in these areas and what is known of this previous discourse, much of which comes to us mainly through quotations in later authors, especially the fourth-century Oribasius; but in Galen’s time they would have been known, and in some cases influential, authors. (On the problem of Galen’s vagueness with regard to recent influences, as well as a particular area of fairly clear influence from Antyllus and Herodotus, see further below, p. 38.)<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> *Thras.* 38, 86,17–87,5 H. (V.880–881 K.); *San. Tu.* I.15, 35,34–37 Ko. (VI.77 K.). And Galen suggests that this is in some sense the proper usage: *San. Tu.* II.8, 60,17–21 (VI.135 K.).

<sup>16</sup> For the references to Praxagoras and Philotimos see *San. Tu.* IV.4, 112,26–28 Ko. (VI.255 K.); IV.6, 122,9–17 Ko. (VI.276–277 K.) and IV.6, 123,6–9 Ko. (VI.278 K.). Elsewhere too, especially in relation to the theory of fluids (*chumoi*), Galen aims to assimilate his own views to those of Diocles, Praxagoras and Philotimos (as well as those of Hippocrates, Plato and Aristotle): see *Nat. Fac.* II.8, 186,10–14 H. (II.117 K.); II.9, 203,6–22 H. (II.140–141 K.) and III.10, 230,8–13 H. (II.178 K.). (On the distortion of Praxagoras’ views involved here, see Lewis (2017): 194.) For

Galen's attitude to the medical predecessors that he *does* acknowledge in the health tradition, meanwhile, is not uncritical. Erasistratus, for example, is taken to task (it seems inaccurately) for disapproving of exercise;<sup>17</sup> and Praxagoras and Philotimos are respectable practitioners within the tradition, not authorities to be followed uncritically.

It will be worthwhile to consider this in relation to the broader question of Galen's self-positioning within the medical tradition – his attitude to the respected 'ancients' (*palaiōi*), and to the authority of Hippocrates, on the one hand, and to various contemporaries and 'more recent' (*neōteroi*) figures, on the other. Much has been written on this subject. Galen wishes to present himself as authentically Hippocratic – as, in a sense, an avatar of Hippocrates, whom he regards as at once an exemplar of scientific method, an expert in medical theory and practice, and an ethical model. But already by Galen's time there was both (a) an advanced scholarly debate about the authenticity of different works handed down under the name 'Hippocrates', as well as about their interpretation in detail, and (b) a wide discrepancy, amongst doctors, as to how important it was to study these works.

Let us consider Galen's position in relation to both these conflicts. In response to (a) the scholarly-scientific debate, Galen retrojects his own views onto Hippocrates – one might more dramatically say, constructs Hippocrates in his own image – by both selecting the core texts which he regards as authentic and interpreting them in such a way that they can be shown to support Galen's own views. And he uses a repertory of sophisticated scholarly techniques of textual criticism – many of them still familiar to classical scholars to this day – to that end. Texts inconsistent with the Hippocratic (or Galenic) doctrine are rejected as spurious; apparent departures from such doctrine may be accounted for by changes in the meaning of Greek words since classical times, as well as by corruptions or insertions at particular points in the text; and much is to be explained by the well-known Hippocratic *brachulogia* – the brevity or concision whereby information is often conveyed in laconic utterances, or in summary form.

True, Galen does not use his own agreement with content as the sole criterion of authenticity, nor does he find himself obliged to agree with

extracts of discussions from previous authors on the early care of children, choice of nurses and use of milk, for example, see Oribasius, *Libri Incerti* 30–38, 121–138 Raeder, a selection which is followed by substantial extracts on healthy lifestyle in general by both Athenaeus and Diocles (ibid., 39–41, 138–148 Raeder) – with neither of which, again, Galen engages explicitly.

<sup>17</sup> See *San. Tu.* I.8, 18,20–24 Ko. (VI.37 K.), with n. 68.

*everything* in texts that he regards as authentic – nor, vice versa, wholly to reject the value of works which he does not actually believe to have been written by the master. His scholarly approach is more complex and subtle than that; moreover, he does also allow the possibility of a certain (fairly limited) degree of scientific progress since the time of Hippocrates. The central view, however, that emerges, and that Galen is at pains to emphasize, is of Hippocrates as representing the highpoint of the medical art, and of the fundamental continuity between Galen's theories and practice and the work of the master, passages from which he frequently cites as authority or support for his own views, both in his work on health and elsewhere. Galen indeed devoted many voluminous commentaries to the explication of the Hippocratic texts which he regarded as most important – especially *Aphorisms*, *The Nature of the Human Being*, four books of the *Epidemics* – in what was far from a merely scholarly exercise.<sup>18</sup>

So, within *Thrasylbulus* and *Health*, and in accordance with his usual practice, Galen at various points cites passages from several different Hippocratic texts, passages which he takes to provide support for his arguments, and for his polemical attacks on opponents. Examples are the statement about the unhealthiness of the athletic state, and the summary of the effect of different qualities and amounts of massage. (It is worth mentioning that he does not primarily, or indeed frequently, quote from the Hippocratic work 'on daily regime' (*Peri diaitēs, Regimen*), and that – in a further ramification of the complexity of approach outlined above – he seems not actually to consider it an authentic work of Hippocrates, although he is happy to cite it from time to time for support.)<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Purely scholarly study of works in the 'Hippocratic corpus' had begun in Hellenistic times, and was particularly associated with Alexandria. It seems, however, that the approach which combined such scholarship with a reverential attitude to Hippocrates as a central source or foundation of medical knowledge – the notion of the 'father of medicine' familiar to us from Galen and still in a sense current today – was a comparatively recent development in Galen's time. On Galen's attitude to and use of Hippocrates, and on his own Hippocratic scholarship, see Smith (1979); Manuli (1984); Von Staden (1992); Manetti and Roselli (1994); Singer (1996), (2021b); Dean-Jones and Rosen (2015); Börno and Coughlin (2020); Coughlin (forthcoming). For Galen's views on the limited, but significant, scope for scientific progress from the level of knowledge of the ancients, see Hankinson (1994b). Further on Galen's construction of authority and techniques of argumentation in relation to 'ancients' and 'moderns', see Lloyd (1993); Vegetti (1999a), (1999b); Von Staden (2009); and on ancient medical authors' attitudes to their predecessors also van der Eijk (1999b) and König and Woolf (2017), esp. the chapters of Lehoux, Lloyd and Rosen.

<sup>19</sup> At *HVA* I.17, 135,2–10 H. (XV.455 K.) he mentions a number of other figures to whom the text has been attributed, commenting that it may actually be a text that *predates* Hippocrates. As a still further ramification of the complexity, one should consider Grimaudo's observation (2021) that Galen almost wholly ignores the Hippocratic text *Ancient Medicine*, even though it seems to chime quite closely with his views in the domain of health.