1 Introduction

Peter E. Pormann

Hippocrates remains a figure shrouded in mystery. We have next to no indubitable facts about his life. Although a large number of texts attributed to Hippocrates have come down to us, we cannot be certain that any one of them was written by the historical Hippocrates. One of the most eminent historians of medicine, Philip J. van der Eijk, has recently argued that we should abandon the moniker 'Hippocratic' and simply talk about early Greek medicine, as the so-called *Hippocratic Corpus* is so diverse and contains writings from the fifth century BC to the first and second century AD. Not everybody, of course, would agree with this view, yet it shows that Hippocrates remains a hot topic of debate, which attracts an ever growing amount of scholarship.

Hippocratic studies have grown enormously since the late nineteenth century. In the early twentieth century, there was a clear focus on editing texts according to the latest philological methods. The great editorial project *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* began in 1904 with the publication of a manuscript catalogue by Hermann Diels (1904–5). One of the questions that scholars hotly debated since antiquity is the so-called Hippocratic Question: what texts in the *Hippocratic Corpus* were written by the historical Hippocrates? Already in the nineteenth century there emerged a view that one can divide the treatises of the *Hippocratic Corpus* into Coan and Cnidian, the former more rational or characterised by prognostic, the latter more empiric and diagnostic. In the second half of the twentieth century, a number of scholars tried to discern certain Coan and Cnidian layers within individual treatises, notably by paying close attention to language and style.

The great French editor of Hippocrates, Émile Littré (1801–81), placed the treatise *On Ancient Medicine* at the beginning of his

Complete Works, arguing that it exemplified the outlook of the true Hippocrates: an aversion to theorisation and an emphasis on practical experience and own observation. This was a strange reversal of fortune, as Galen of Pergamum (ca. 129–216), the greatest and most influential commentator on Hippocrates, had dismissed this text as spurious. Nowadays, few scholars would say that they can confidently identify even a single treatise in the *Hippocratic Corpus* that was undoubtedly written by the historical Hippocrates. Nor do they still uphold the distinction into Coan and Cnidian treatises. Yet, an eminent Harvard historian of Greek science and medicine, Mark Schiefsky (2005), argued that *On Ancient Medicine* is our best bet, if we want to find a truly Hippocratic text, just as Littré did more than a century and a half later.

The richness and growth of Hippocratic studies can perhaps best be illustrated with a short overview of a conference series, called *Colloque Hippocratique* or *Hippocratic Colloquium* that began in 1972 in Strasburg and has since taken place every three to four years. From their inception, these were truly international and interdisciplinary meetings, with scholars coming from different countries and traditions.[1] The first meetings still focussed on the *Hippocratic Corpus* and its place in medical history or Hippocratic medicine more generally.[2] Soon, however, special topics emerged such as the history of ideas,[3] the Hippocratic *Epidemics*,[4] nosology,[5] philosophy,[6] therapy,[7] and the normal and pathological.[8] The first decade of the new millennium witnessed three colloquia with a greater English-speaking presence, focussing on the context of the *Hippocratic Corpus*,[9] medical education,[10] and the idea of the Hippocratic.[11] In 2012, the Colloque Hippocratique returned from Texas to Paris,

1 See Jouanna and Zink (2014), i–iii, who reviews the history of these encounters.
2 Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg (1975); Joly (1977); Grmek and Robert (1980); López Férez (1992).
3 Lasserre and Mudry (1983). 4 Baader and Winau (1989).
5 Potter, Maloney, and Desautels (1990). 6 Wittern and Pellegrin (1996).
7 Garofalo (1999). 8 Thivel and Zucker (2002). 9 van der Eijk (2005b).
10 Horstmanshoff (2010). 11 Dean-Jones and Rosen (2016).

France[12] and in 2015 was held in Manchester, England, exploring the commentary tradition, both East and West.[13] The next meeting will take place in Rome on 25–27 October 2018 and is organised by three of our authors, Lorenzo Perilli, Daniela Manetti, and Amneris Roselli, as well as two other scholars.

In Hippocratic scholarship in general, we can see a movement towards greater awareness of and concern with the social setting in which it took place. Concepts such as the medical marketplace in which practitioners of various types competed became more prominent, as did the place of women. Over the last thirty years or so, one can also note a greater interest of historians of philosophy in the *Hippocratic Corpus*. Of course, the overlap between so-called Pre-Socratic (or perhaps better, Early Greek) philosophy and Hippocratic thought had been known for a long time, yet more and more proper philosophers are paying close attention to Hippocratic writings, just as they do to medicine more generally. Three areas that have proved particularly fertile are epistemology (how to know whether treatments work); the anatomy of the body (how the different parts function); and the body–mind interface, for instance, how the body influences the mind, how mental illnesses come about, and how physiological processes such as mixtures interact with psychological ones such as moods.

The aim of the present *Cambridge Companion* is to provide the uninitiated reader with a first overview of the rich topic that is Hippocrates and the *Hippocratic Corpus*; and to provide easy and multiple ways into it. The '*Hippocratic Corpus*' and Hippocrates are not mere synonyms, as we have already seen, and they exist in a creative tension that is felt throughout this volume. The *Corpus* encompasses many different and often widely divergent treatises that tell us a lot about early Greek medicine. Many of the chapters included here explore their plurality, but also the common features that one can find among them. Likewise, the powerful attraction that

[12] Jouanna and Zink (2014). [13] Pormann (in press).

the figure of Hippocrates exerted over generations and generations of patients and practitioners also deserves full scrutiny. Hippocrates was constructed and reconstructed across time and space in myriad ways. This lavish legacy often surpassed the historical and textual record. Hippocrates became a symbol, a token for the ideal physician, who already in a Greek (often mythical) past prefigured contemporaneous best practice. For this reason, in temporary terms, this *Cambridge Companion* pays a great deal of attention to what one could call the afterlife of Hippocrates, beginning in Hellenistic times and continuing nearly until today.

Both Hippocrates and the *Hippocratic Corpus* are multifaceted; similarly, the approach taken here is equally diverse. The different authors all tackle the topics from their particular viewpoint, which are often diverse. The first two chapters, both written by extremely eminent scholars from different traditions, already illustrate this; generally speaking, I have not tried to impose doctrinal unity or impose one interpretation. The different approaches can stand next to each other. Likewise, the authors of the chapters come from different countries and traditions, and are at different points of their academic career. There sometimes is, or at least is perceived to be, a substantial divide between 'continental' and 'Anglo-Saxon' scholarship, the former more focussed, for instance, on philology and the latter on social history and critical theory. This difference in approach can nicely be discerned, for instance, in the two chapters on 'aetiology' by Jim Hankinson and 'epistemologies' by Lorenzo Perilli: whereas the former is clearly indebted to a more analytical tradition, the latter sometimes waxes lyrical in its metonymies and metaphors in the style of continental philosophy.

This *Cambridge Companion* is written in English, the lingua franca of modern science and scholarship, and encroaching more and more even in the field of the humanities. Yet, there can be no doubt that anyone who wants to delve deeply into scholarly debates and make his or her own original contribution needs to read French, German, and Italian; possess excellent knowledge of Greek and

Latin; and ideally also master some of what our continental colleagues call the 'Oriental' languages (e.g., Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac). This, in a way, was one of the challenges in editing this *Companion*: to make what is often very recondite scholarship in languages other than English accessible to the general reader without any previous knowledge – linguistic or otherwise. To this end, four chapters included here were translated, from French (Jouanna, Boudon-Millot), German (Leven), and Italian (Perilli). In the case of the chapter on the textual history, I myself abridged and simplified a much longer contribution (now published as Jouanna 2017), and translated it into English. I am personally particularly pleased that I was able to include this chapter, as it is the first time in a *Cambridge Companion* that textual history and criticism, and the branch of philology concerned with producing critical editions – what the French call 'ecdotique' – is fully explained and explored in a separate chapter.

Most specialists refer to Hippocratic works by their Latin titles and abbreviations, which, in a way, is strange, as they were written in Greek and have titles in Greek. Here, however, we have used English titles throughout. For ease of use, however, the appendix lists all treatises in the *Hippocratic Corpus* according to their English titles together with their standard Latin ones in full and abbreviated format. Therefore, those who want to venture further can easily understand the somewhat recondite nomenclature used in specialist scholarship.

Elizabeth Craik opens the volume with an overview chapter of both what we know (or rather, do not know) about the historical Hippocrates and about the structure and content of the *Hippocratic Corpus*, or, as she prefers to call it, the *Hippocratic Collection*. Craik begins by reviewing briefly the information about Hippocrates, and argues that although many later sources are clearly apocryphal, we should perhaps pay greater attention to them. Internal evidence from the *Hippocratic Collection* for Hippocrates' life is virtually nonexistent; however, one can glean some information about the authors of individual treatises such as *Epidemics* from their content.

The difficulty, however, remains, that one cannot be sure who this author was – whether the historical Hippocrates or someone else.

Craik then surveys the *Hippocratic Collection* and emphasises its diverse nature in terms of themes, styles, and date of composition. She discusses various methods of classifying the texts: Littré, for instance, had eleven categories; some scholars distinguished between Coan and Cnidian works; others used subject matters. Yet, ultimately all these systems are flawed, and modern scholarship has largely abandoned them. Despite these caveats, it is possible to group certain texts together and show that they were probably written by the same person, or at least come from the same milieu. She also cautions us against following previous fads and favouring some treatises over others: the Oath, for instance, is so unique in its impact that it has wrongly removed other ethical (or 'deontological') treatises from people's attention.

Despite all the diversity within the *Hippocratic Corpus* and all the difficulties to discern the historical Hippocrates from among a mass of later legends and stories, Craik pleads against the idea of abandoning the notion of Hippocrates. The long tradition clearly saw a unifying principle that somehow binds the various texts together; and these texts cannot be separated from the historical Hippocrates, who, in a way, marks the beginning of the Hippocratic tradition. She sees the present *Cambridge Companion to Hippocrates* as evidence for this assessment.

Any study of the *Hippocratic Corpus* needs to be based on a sound understanding of the texts within it. One can come to such an understanding, however, only through an awareness of how the texts were transmitted. Why do we read the Greek texts as printed in our modern editions; how did the editors arrive at their choices when deciding between variant readings; and how did the texts survive over a period of more than 2,500 years? Jacques Jouanna provides answers to these questions by approaching the textual history of the *Hippocratic Corpus* in a twofold way. He first tells the story of the Hippocratic text from the earliest time, the late fifth century BC until

the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. He shows what we know, but also hints at the great loss of information that characterises so much of classical Greek culture. Both Plato and Aristotle mention Hippocrates, but then for the next 300 years, we have only the most limited information about the transmission of the *Hippocratic Corpus*. Yet, we can learn about the first Alexandrian editions and the many commentaries, which are so crucial to textual scholarship.

Jouanna also recounts how the editions of our time are the product of a long tradition, beginning with the Renaissance printings in the early sixteenth century. The most accepted Greek text resulted from the first editions by the Aldine Press, and later editors often followed their text, even when they had access to better manuscripts with superior readings. As it happened, this was also the case for the great French editor of Hippocrates, Émile Littré, whose edition and French translation of the *Complete Works of Hippocrates* (1839–61) remains the standard reference. It is only with the development of textual criticism and stemmatics in the late nineteenth century that things changed. A science emerged that endeavoured to understand how the different manuscripts related to each other, in order to reconstruct the earliest form of the text, the so-called archetype. To do so, it is important to distinguish between the direct tradition – the Greek manuscripts and papyri containing works by Hippocrates – and the indirect tradition, consisting of the many quotations in commentaries, glossaries, and other works. The last century and a half then saw many critical editions, often the result of large-scale projects and international collaborations.

Brooke Holmes then takes us into debates about the Hippocratic body. Taking her cue from discussion in contemporary debates in critical theory, she shows that the concepts of the body in general, and in the *Hippocratic Corpus* in particular, are constructed. There is not just the body as an objective reality that is described in its complexities; rather, we conceptualise the body through our own assumptions, be they cultural, societal, sexual, personal, or otherwise. Holmes then traces ideas about the body (Greek *sôma*) from Homer

to the *Hippocratic Corpus*, and then looks at how the different Hippocratic writers conceptualise it as a space that can be mapped and as a dynamic entity that fulfils various functions.

The inside of the human body was largely hidden from Hippocratic authors. They conceived of it in terms of receptacles such as the bladder and vessels, which carried the various bodily matters, including the humours, from one receptacle to another. The texture of the bodily parts also played an important role: some are spongy and porous, others hard and dense. These attributes were also used to distinguish between men and women, the latter having looser and more porous flesh.

The humours such as phlegm or bile occupy a prominent place in many Hippocratic treatises; when one prevails, this may lead to certain character traits and bodily disorders: phlegm, for instance, can cause epilepsy. Various powers (or 'faculties', Greek *dynámeis*) also play an important part: different organs possess different powers contributing to the overall function of the body as a whole. Some powers counter others, and the body becomes the arena of conflict between competing elements, both internal and external. Digestion is a case in point: the innate heat concocts the food, a necessary phenomenon, that, when it goes wrong, can again lead to disease. Therefore, one needs to take care of the body in its complexity to maintain health (and life itself).

In his chapter on 'aetiology', Jim Hankinson discusses views about the causal origins of disease (and by extension of conditions of health), and causal theory more generally construed. He shows the many competing and often conflicting accounts of how disease comes about that we find in the *Hippocratic Corpus*, which itself, as we have seen, contains texts composed over a period of several centuries and written from a variety of different, and at times incompatible, theoretical standpoints. He focuses on the treatises dating to the fifth and fourth centuries BC, especially those concerned with theoretical debates, such as *Epidemics; Prognostic; Ancient Medicine; Art; Nature of Man; Regimen; Sacred Disease; Breaths; Airs, Waters,*

Places; Affections; Diseases; and *Places in Man*. These treatises differ very widely from one another in their understandings of the origins of diseased conditions and the type of theoretical entity any responsible aetiology needs to posit. Despite their differences, however, these texts share a general commitment, notably a belief in the physical causality of disease and a corresponding rejection of any appeal to divine intervention, at least in specific cases. Hankinson discusses the various methods by which the different theorists seek to commend their own particular views, in particular in regard to their relations with empirical evidence and confirmation. He does so by frequently letting the texts speak for themselves, thus providing a wonderful flavour of the debates that raged in the medical circles of classical Greece.

Aetiology is closely linked to the topic of the next chapter, epistemology: after all, the theory of causation, aetiology, also involves knowing the causes, something that falls within the compass of the theory of knowledge, epistemology. Yet, Perilli, who tackles the latter topic, approaches it quite differently from Hankinson. Perilli begins his discussion with the key episode from the *Iliad* around the wrath of Achilles, the greatest Greek hero: he is angry with Agamemnon, who leads the expedition against Troy, and is minded to withdraw from combat and return home. Achilles says about Agamemnon that he 'does not know how to look/think/understand (*noêsai*) before and after'. This ability to classify events in order to learn from the past to predict and influence the future is what Perilli calls 'Achilles' paradigm'. He argues that although the medical writings of the *Hippocratic Corpus* are manifold and diverse, we find here for the first time a critical self-reflection about one's own methods, a realisation, so to speak, of Achilles' paradigm. The intellect (Greek *noûs*) creates knowledge (*epistḗmē*), and this is a crucial part of the medical art (*téchnē*). Yet, equally important is the practical knowledge, the 'astute intelligence' (*mêtis*) that is a key attribute of the eponymous hero of the other Homeric epic, Odysseus. Whereas Achilles exemplifies the virtuous hero able to know the past, act in

the present, and be aware of future consequences, Odysseus, the anti-hero, uses his many wiles (*polýmētis*) to his advantage. Hippocratic medicine, Perilli concludes, encompasses both: knowledge (*epistḗmē*) and practical intelligence (*mêtis*).

He arrives at this conclusion after a rollercoaster ride through the epistemological aspects of the *Hippocratic Corpus*. At the origin of medical knowledge stands observation: the physician sees the signs of health and disease, and records them faithfully. The next step is to classify the data, to arrange it, in order to make sense of it. This then allows one to identify diseases ('diagnosis') and to foretell their course ('prognosis'). Moreover, treatments are developed on the basis of these classifications. The Hippocratic physician records not only positive cases, but also negative ones; the error and the awareness about it is crucial to the progress of medical knowledge. Perilli also emphasises the fact that many Hippocratic texts such as *Sacred Disease* make a clear distinction between natural and supernatural agency, and reject the latter as an explanation for health and disease. This said, other texts remain in the previous paradigm and employ magical remedies.

Like epistemology, ethics is a topic that generally comes under the heading of philosophy. In the next chapter, Karl-Heinz Leven explores the ethical aspects of Hippocratic medicine. Of course, the most famous ethical text within the *Corpus* is the Oath. It is the most famous medical text from antiquity, and casts an enormous shadow. And yet, as Leven argues, it only became famous from the first century AD onward, and is, in many ways, at odds with other treatises in the *Corpus*. Therefore, it is unlikely that it dated back to Hippocrates' lifetime, nor does it reflect the medical ethics of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. For this reason, Leven begins by considering the question of medical ethics from a different vantage point. He first gives an overview of the other treatises on medical deontology within the *Corpus*, namely *Law*, *Art*, *Physician*, *Decorum* and *Precepts*; many of these texts, too, are of a rather late date, and therefore not a reliable guide to the situation in classical times. It is therefore