

THE CHRONOLOGY OF GALEN'S EARLY CAREER

THE last decade has witnessed a widespread resurgence of interest in Galen of Pergamum that is without parallel since the early seventeenth century. New studies of Galen's concepts of psychology and medicine have examined afresh his position in the development of scientific thought,¹ and historians have begun to realize the wealth of material for the social history of the Antonine Age that he provides.² But, despite the earlier labours of Ilberg and Bardong to restore a chronological order to the many tracts that flowed readily from his pen, many of the events of his life still lack the precise dates that would enable even more valuable information to be extracted, especially upon the careers of his friends.³ New discoveries and new arguments can now be brought to clarify much that was obscure to Ilberg when he wrote *Aus Galens Praxis*, a survey that remains even today the finest introduction to Galen the man,⁴ and a fresh investigation of the evidence for his career before his summons to the emperors at Aquileia in 168 will resolve, or at least redefine, several old problems.

I

The dates of Galen's first stay in Rome are crucial for the chronology of his whole life, since they can be closely tied to events well known from other literary, numismatic, and epigraphic evidence and thus fixed precisely. It is clear from *On prognosis*, 14. 647, that Galen left Rome before Lucius Verus returned from his Parthian War: Λούκιος γὰρ ἀπεδήμει τῆς πόλεως ἔνεκα τοῦ Παρθικοῦ πολέμου, and 14. 649 confirms that Lucius had not yet reached Rome when Galen embarked at Brundisium for Greece in fear that αὐτὸς ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ γνούς μου τὴν ἔξοδον . . . ἐπανελθεῖν κελεύσειεν. The joint triumph of the two emperors over the Parthians was celebrated on the twelfth day of October 166, and other evidence suggests that Lucius was back in Rome by

Unless otherwise stated, Galen is always cited by the pagination of the edition of C. G. Kühn (Leipzig, 1821-33).

¹ R. E. Siegel, *Galen's system of physiology and medicine* (Basle/New York, 1968), henceforward cited as Siegel: *Galen on Sense Perception* (Basle/New York, 1970). His opinions have not always found favour, see J. Bylebyl and W. Pagel, *Medical History* xv (1971), 211-29; L. García Ballester, 'La psique en el somaticismo médico de la antigüedad; la actitud de Galeno', *Episteme* iii (1969), 195-209; C. H. S. Harris, *The Heart and Vascular System in Ancient Greek Medicine* (Oxford, 1972).

² G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969); J. Kollesch, 'Aus Galens Praxis am römischen Kaiserhof', *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt* ii

(Berlin, 1965), 57-61; G. Strohmaier, 'Der Arzt in der römischen Gesellschaft', *Acta Conventus XI—Eirene* (Warsaw, 1968), 69-73. A two-volume study of Galen by Dr. García Ballester is in the press.

³ J. Ilberg, 'Über die Schriftstellerei des Klaudios Galenos', *Rh.M.* xlv (1889), 207-39; xlvii (1892), 489-514; li (1896), 165-96; lii (1897), 591-623; K. Bardong, 'Beiträge zur Hippokrates- und Galenforschung', *N.G.G.* 1942, 577-640.

⁴ *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* xv (1905), 276-312 (= Ilberg, *Nf.*), reprinted in H. Flashar (ed.), *Antike Medizin* (Darmstadt, 1971), 361-416. For English readers a similar introduction is given by D. E. Eichholz, 'Galen and his environment', *G. and R.* xx (1951), 60-71.

late August in that year.¹ Thus the departure of Galen from Rome can be assigned to early August 166 at the very latest, possibly to June or July. Against this apparently precise date must be set Galen's confession in *On his own Books*, 19. 15, that he left Rome as soon as the plague broke out there, which, if the traditional account of the great plague is accepted,² was introduced by the army of Lucius Verus on its return and may thus indicate that Galen's departure followed, rather than preceded, Lucius' arrival. But this is not a serious objection; for the disease may have spread much faster than the army could advance or we may suppose that Galen when he wrote *On his own Books* in his old age transposed the order of two events closely connected in time to emphasize the effect of the famous plague.³ Certainly, if fear of infection was the prime reason for his flight from Rome, it is strange that his journey should take him to those very lands where the disease was rampant and not to the healthier provinces of the west and south.⁴ The account that is given in *On prognosis* of the reasons for his departure and of the order of events is thus preferable to the later version and permits the conclusion that Galen's departure from Rome took place in early or mid summer 166.

We know from 19. 15 that his stay in Rome lasted for three years or so after his cure of Eudemus and after the first public demonstrations of his ability, and also that his treatment of Eudemus occurred in the middle of his first winter in Rome.⁵ Winter 163/4 can thus be ruled out, as only two years are left between then and summer 166, and the express reference, 14. 613, to Lucius Verus' absence on campaign in Mesopotamia, which, as the *profectio* coins make clear,⁶ began in 162, excludes winter 161/2. The fact that Eudemus, a native of Pergamum, a friend of Galen's father, possibly even Galen's philosophy tutor, and a man well acquainted with all that went on in Roman intellectual circles, did not know until winter 162/3 that Galen was a practising physician suggests that Galen is unlikely to have arrived in Rome in the first months of 162,⁷ although if the young man treated at the beginning of autumn, 14. 609 and 624, resided in Rome, as is implied, Galen was already in Rome by September 162.

With the consolidation of these two terminal dates of 162 and 166 we can proceed to the precise dating of the month and year of Galen's birth. The month is known: from the statement that he was just entering his twenty-eighth year when the high priest took office at the autumnal equinox, 13. 599, Greenhill had long ago concluded that he was born in late August or early September.⁸ But each of the four years from 128 to 131 has found a supporter,

¹ *Vita Marci* 12. 8; *Vita Commodi* 11. 13; *ILS* 366.

² As given by A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1966), 202.

³ See the criticism of the theory of J. F. Gilliam, 'The plague under Marcus Aurelius', *A.J.P.* lxxxii (1961), 225-51, expressed by F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), p. 13 n. 4.

⁴ W. Ruge, *RE* xvii (1936), 233, treats of plague at Nicaea; see also C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam, 1968), 96-8, 166 f.

⁵ 19. 15, ἔτεσι δὲ τρισὶν ἄλλοις ἐν Ῥώμῃ

διατρίψας; 14. 608.

⁶ *BMC* IV, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, nos. 200 ff.

⁷ 14. 608. Galen calls him διδάσκαλος twice: at 14. 613. 10, where the text is corrupt, and at 14. 624. 3, where the reference may be to the lecture Eudemus has just delivered to him on the malice of the Roman doctors rather than to any formal instruction in philosophy.

⁸ W. A. Greenhill in *Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography* ii (London, 1854), 207-17 [208], henceforward referred to as Greenhill. The same argument was used by

and Galen himself implies two different years.¹ At 19. 15 we are told that the refutation of his Roman opponents was made when he was a young man, τέταρτον ἔτος ἄγων καὶ τριακοστόν, and certainly before summer 163. From this alone it is difficult to decide whether Galen was then aged thirty-three, as is the normal meaning of the Greek, or thirty-four; that is, born in September 129 or in September 128. The latter is excluded by the remark, 19. 16, that he returned to Pergamum πεπληρωμένων μοι τῶν ἐκ γενετῆς ἐτῶν ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα, that is, between September 165 and 166. But since there is little reason to believe that Galen left Rome much before summer 166, it is unlikely that after a leisurely journey through Greece, including a stay in Athens, he could reach Pergamum before his thirty-eighth birthday. Besides, September 128 as his date of birth can in no way be reconciled with the second piece of evidence, which comes from Galen's *Commentary upon Hippocrates* 'On joints'. The Greek is as follows:² μετὰ τὸ τριακοστόν καὶ δεύτερον ἔτος ἐν Ῥώμῃ διέτριψα πόλει τοσούτων ἀνθρώπων πλήθος ἐχούσῃ ὡς ἐπαινέσαι Πολέμωνα τὸν ῥήτορα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπιτομὴν αὐτὴν εἰπόντα. This can be interpreted to mean either that he came to Rome at the age of thirty-two or that he had lived there since he was thirty-one, both of which conflict with 19. 15 and rule out September 128. Walsh, relying upon this testimony, argued strongly that Galen was born in September 130 and that 19. 15 must be rejected as a late approximation of the aging Galen, but his conclusions depend upon a possible mistranslation and upon a certain miscalculation of the time spent by Galen at Pergamum as doctor to the gladiators.³ Even so, if Galen was born in 130, he could not have completed his service with the gladiators before September 162, when we know that he was already in Rome. September 129 remains the only acceptable date, but how can this be reconciled with the other evidence? It is indeed possible to argue that Galen arrived in Rome shortly before or shortly after his thirty-third birthday and, when setting down his recollections some thirty years later, was uncertain of the exact date, but 'after my thirty-second year' is a cumbrous way of describing an event that must have taken place at the very end of his thirty-third. To emend δεύτερον to τρίτον, which

J. Walsh, 'The date of Galen's birth', *Annals of the history of Medicine*, n.s. i (1929), 378-82 (= Walsh). Ilberg's objections to the choice of month are misconceived, *NJ* 283 f. and *A.G.M.* xxiii (1930), 289.

¹ 128; J. Klebs, *PIR*¹ p. 374, n. 701. 129; Ilberg, *NJ* 277, whose argument was accepted by J. Mewaldt, *RE* vii (1912), 578-91 (= Mewaldt), and, with a revised argument, in 'Wann ist Galenos geboren?', *A.G.M.* xxiii (1930), 289-92 (= Ilberg, *AGM*), followed by A. Stein, *PIR*² G. 24 (= Stein) and by Bowersock, op. cit. (p. 158 n. 2), 60, 130; Greenhill, 208; Walsh, 380-2; G. Sarton, *Galen of Pergamum* (Lawrence, Kan., 1954), 15 (= Sarton); Siegel, 4. 131; A. J. Brock, *Galen on the Natural Faculties* (Loeb ed., London, 1916), 16; D. Guthrie, *History of Medicine* (London, 1945), 74; S. W. Jackson, *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* v (1969), 365. I have not thought it necessary to argue against the

various Arabic traditions that Galen was born in the time of Christ or in the tenth year of Trajan (Barhebraeus, *Chronographia* 52, Budge).

² The words καὶ δεύτερον were omitted (by oversight?) in the editions of Chartier and Kühn, although they survive in the accompanying Latin version. Ilberg, *NJ* 268, who appears not to have known the reading of the manuscripts and early editions, proposed instead to read τὸ τρίτον καὶ τριάκοντον. This passage is presumably why Mewaldt says (col. 579) 'also gegen das J. 161 oder wenig später zum erstenmal nach Rom kam', and the reason for the hypothesis of a brief visit in 161/2 rejected by Greenhill, 208.

³ For his error, see below, p. 163. A year's gap between his departure from Rome in Aug. 166 and his arrival in Pergamum in Sept. 167, as Walsh suggests, is excessive if Galen's opinions at 14. 622 and 624 have any force.

logically removes this passage from all discussion of the date, is attractive, but it may be easiest to assume with Ilberg that Galen is confusing his departure from Pergamum, or at least from his post with the gladiators, with his arrival in Rome, two events separated by almost a year.¹

A basic chronology can now be drawn up:

Birth	August/September 129	(Sept. 1, <i>exempli gratia</i>)
18 A. 347	Arrives in Rome aged 32	August 162
19. 15	or 33	September/October 162
19. 15 + 14. 614	In first winter aged 33	162/163
14. 624	Debate with Alexander	early/mid 163
19. 15	Stays for three more years	until at least January 166
	and leaves before Verus' return	August 166
19. 16	Reaches Pergamum aged 37	between September 166 and 167

II

However much Galen might insist that his advance in society was the reward of his own unaided efforts, he was not allowed by his opponents to forget that paternal wealth had set him on his way and that family contacts with intellectuals like Eudemus and possibly also with senators had given him opportunities that were not always available to others.² His father, the wealthy architect Aelius Nicon, was a typical member of the cultured world of Asia Minor, interested in philosophy and literature, a purist in language, a dabbler in agriculture and a practitioner of verse; in short, a man well qualified to enter the refined coterie of scholars, senators, and local worthies who frequented the Asclepieion of Pergamum.³ The historian Claudius Charax, the orator Aelius Aristides, the sophist Polemo, and the consul Cuspius Rufinus were all visitors to or long-term residents at the shrine, where they watched dramatic performances, read their library-books, and, to be sure, discussed their complaints at inordinate length.⁴ Nicon intended his wealth, derived from land as well as from his architectural practice, to assist his son almost from the cradle to become a philosopher or politician.⁵ He engaged literate nurses and tutors, and later personally attended with his son the public lectures of the

¹ Ilberg, who selected the correct date, used a circular argument. At *AGM* 290 n. 1 he used the consular date (163) of Severus to demonstrate Galen's arrival in 162, forgetting that at *NJ* 277 he had used Galen's arrival-date to place Severus' consulate in 163. While the latter conclusion may indeed be right, the traditional dating of Severus' career has been strongly challenged by H. G. Pflaum, 'Les gendres de Marc Aurèle', *J.S.* 1961, 29 f.

² 10. 561, where it is feebly denied by Galen.

³ A collection of references is given at *PIR*² A. 226, to which add *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* xiv (1944), 112 f. H. Diller, *RE* xvii (1936), 507 f., doubts the identification of the architect Nicon with Galen's father, but see the (not

always accurate) arguments of H. Schöne, *Schedae philologicae Hermanno Usener oblatae* (Bonn, 1891), 90-3 and W. Dörpfeld, *A.M.* xxvii (1902), 29 f.

⁴ C. Habicht, *Allertümer von Pergamon* viii. 3 (1969), n. 141; Galen, *CMG Suppl.* I. 33; Habicht, n. 33 and pp. 16 f.; Rufinus, *ibid.* 9 ff. I am unable to accept his reasons for dating the circular temple to the reign of Hadrian rather than Antoninus Pius for *κατασκευάζοντος*, Galen 2. 224, should represent an imperfect, not an aorist, and thus date the building to c. 150. On the activities pursued at the Asclepieion, Habicht, pp. 16 ff., and on the excavations there, O. Ziegenaus and G. de Luca, *Allertümer von Pergamon* xi. 1 (1968) with later reports in *A.A.* 1970. 2, 176-201.

⁵ 6. 755, 14. 17, and 16. 324.

city's leading philosophers.¹ His hopes were checked by the intervention of Asclepius himself, who revealed to him that his son was destined for the profession of medicine.² Henceforward he spared no expense to secure outstanding medical teachers and, at an age when some doctors were already in practice, the sixteen-year-old Galen was only just beginning his detailed medical studies.³ At Pergamum he listened to Aeschrius, Stratoniceus, and Satyrus, and it was possibly also at this time that he became a *θεραπευτής* at the shrine of the god.⁴ His father's death in 148/9 not only provided him with enough wealth to enter the curial class but also freed him from any family ties that compelled him to remain in Pergamum.⁵ Like many young doctors before him he moved to a centre famous for its medical teaching; to Smyrna, to Corinth, and finally to Alexandria, 'the foundation of medicine to all men'.⁶ Yet it is unlikely that Galen was forgotten in his absence, for he took good care to retain his Pergamene connections with men who were undoubtedly themselves rich.⁷ Thus it is not surprising that shortly after his return from Alexandria in 157 he was appointed to the post of doctor to the gladiators by the high priest of Asia, one of the wealthiest and most influential men in the whole province.⁸

There are three problems concerning his tenure of this office: the date at which he was appointed, the length of the appointment, and the reason for its closure. Since at 13. 599 Galen says that he was just twenty-eight when he took the job, the year can be securely fixed at 157. But the divergent interpretations placed upon his statements at 13. 600 demand close scrutiny of the Greek before a sound conclusion can be attained.

ὁ μετὰ τὸν ἐγχειρίσαντά μοι τότε τὴν θεραπείαν δεύτερος ἀρχιερεὺς ὁμοίως καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσε τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν μονομάχων μετὰ μῆνας ἑπτὰ μέσους. ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος περὶ τὴν φθινοπωρινὴν ἡμερίαν, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ ἡρὸς ἡρχιερεύσατο. πάλιν δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ σωθέντων ἀπάντων ὁ τρίτος καὶ ὁ τέταρτος καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ὡσαύτως ἐνεχείρισάν μοι τὴν θεραπείαν τῶν μονομάχων.

Since the first high priest who employed him took office at the autumnal equinox, it was not difficult to conjecture that Galen also took up his duties around that time. But this conclusion was strongly challenged by Ilberg.⁹ 'Galen hatte sein 28. Jahr vollendet, als der gerade amtierende Oberpriester,

¹ 5. 41 f., 8. 587. Some of the evidence is discussed by K. Deichgräber, *S.D.A.W.* 1956. 3. 32 ff.

² 10. 609, 16. 223, and 19. 59. On the importance of dreams in deciding a career, Millar, *op. cit.* (p. 159 n. 3), 179 f. and G. Strohmaier, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt* ii (Berlin, 1965), 375.

³ P. Giessen 43 and *A.E.* 1968. 159 show doctors who died at the age of seventeen.

⁴ 12. 356; 5. 119; 2. 217 and 224; possibly also Aescianus, 17 A. 575 and 19. 16 (with I. Müller, *Scripta Minora Galeni* ii, p. lxiv). On his duties as *θεραπευτής*, 19. 19 with Habicht, *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 114 n. 79.

⁵ 6. 756; 5. 44. 45. 47, and 51.

⁶ Smyrna, 2. 217 and 19. 16, cf. C. J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna* (Oxford, 1938), 232

and L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), 146-8 and *Hellenica* xi-xii (Paris, 1960), 233; Corinth, 2. 217 (but it is uncertain whether he actually attended lectures there or simply found Numisianus already away at Alexandria, 15. 236); Alexandria, 2. 218, 12. 177, 15. 135, 15. 236, cf. *Expositio totius mundi* 37 and *IGRR* iii 374.

⁷ See especially 5. 47-9.

⁸ 13. 599 f. and 18 B. 567. On the identification of the high priest of Asia with the Asiarch, see J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1965), 44-9, and on their social status, A. Stein, 'Zur soziale Stellung der provincialen Oberpriester', *Epitymbion H. Svoboda dargebracht* (Reichenberg, 1927), 300-11.

⁹ Ilberg, *NJ* 283 f.

dem die Abhaltung der jeden Sommer in Pergamon stattfindenden Festspiele oblag, ihn zum alleinigen Gladiatorenarzt ernannte. Es war in Sommer 157, bald vor Ende des bis Herbstanfang laufenden Amtsjahres . . . Der folgende Oberpriester (dessen Amtsantritt sich verzögert hatte) erneuerte deshalb nach sieben Monaten (April 158), als die neuen Spiele bevorstanden, den Auftrag.' But 18 B. 567, upon which Ilberg based his argument, indicates merely that Galen treated gladiators for cuts and wounds at the summer games, which is not disputed, and says nothing about the date at which he assumed office. Nor is it clear why a doctor to the gladiators should be appointed immediately before the games, because he would be required also to attend them in training, when injuries could easily occur, and supervise their general health. As we know from the contemporary *senatusconsultum de gladiatoribus*, they were too valuable to be lightly squandered or to be left to become ill through neglect.¹ Indeed, it is easier to believe that Galen's successful preservation of the health of all the gladiators was helped by his taking office in September, for, when the second Asiarch was appointed in April/May 158, Galen would have had little chance to reveal his incompetence and it would then have only been fair to permit him to continue at least until the summer games. That there were games at this season is undeniable, although their identity may be disputed,² but Galen's attendance in 157, if he was already back home, was unofficial. As 13. 600 indicates, he did not enter upon his post until after the autumnal equinox in that year.

Galen suffered only two deaths during his service with five Asiarchs compared with the sixty of his predecessor, which may be ascribed to his careful treatment of wounds, especially of the thigh.³ Walsh, noting a seven-month interval between the first and second high priest, calculated that this service lasted thirty-five months in all, from September 159 until August 162.⁴ Although his suggestion for the years is unacceptable because he both takes 130 as the year of Galen's birth and confuses his twenty-ninth year with the year following his twenty-ninth birthday (i.e. the thirtieth), if his calculations are adapted to my chronology, they give a period of service from 157 until 160. The two-year gap between Pergamum and Rome would be filled first with some study-tours, then with practice in Pergamum, and finally with a leisurely voyage to Rome, a large gap indeed, but not an impossible one when the multitude of undated events in Galen's life is considered. But there are graver objections. The Greek and Galen's exact seasonal description indicate a first term of seven months, which fits uneasily into the twelve-month calendar that we know was used in Asia.⁵ It is no coincidence that the high priest entered office at the autumnal equinox; for, ever since the decision of the

¹ *F.I.R.A.* i. 49: see also L. Robert, *Les Gladiateurs dans l'orient grec* (Paris, 1940), 25 f., 117, 256 f., and 283-5.

² If the gladiatorial show at Pergamum was an annual event, as 18 B. 567 implies, it should be identified with a local festival, not with the annual games of the *Κοινὸν Ἀσίας*. As Moretti has shown, *R.F.I.C.* xxxii (1954), 276 ff., the latter were held twice per annum at two of the eight centres entitled to hold them. Since at Smyrna, which ranked equally with Ephesus and Pergamum, these

games were held only once in four years, a similar cycle can be assumed for Pergamum. Thus although the local and provincial games might coincide once in four years, an annual festival at Pergamum is likely to have been local.

³ M. Meyerhof, *A.G.M.* xxii (1929), 77.

⁴ Walsh, 378. Siegel, 12, gives his age at appointment as twenty-seven, but rightly dates it to 157.

⁵ Sarton, 20, sticks hard to the seven-month term, which he dates from 158 to 161.

provincial council of Asia in 9 B.C. that the new year was to commence on September 23, the birthday of Augustus, all the officials of the province for the coming year assumed their duties on that day.¹ Far from being a random date, as most Galenic scholars have assumed, the autumnal equinox marked the opening of the provincial year, and it is thus the second high priest's appointment at the end of April that requires explanation. Since there is no mention in our sources, either literary or epigraphic, of suffect high priests, it may be assumed that a high priest held office for a whole year unless prevented by extraordinary circumstances.² Such, I suggest, occurred in 158, possibly the death in office of the Asiarch, which would account for there being two priests in the same year. His successor, chosen ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ ἡρος, organized the summer games before he too was replaced by a third Asiarch in the autumn, whose term, like that of his two successors, was a whole year. It is to explain why he served five high priests in four years that Galen gives the exact chronological details of the first two terms, for it would be generally assumed that the normal term lasted one year, and thus nothing is said about the length of tenure of the last three high priests. His period of service can thus be dated from autumn 157 to autumn 161, which allows ample time for Galen to study, to travel, and to make his way to Rome by September 162.

Although Galen gives no reason for leaving this post to come to Rome, this has not deterred scholars from advancing hypotheses based upon the flimsiest of evidence, his prediction at 14. 622 that he intended to return to Pergamum from Rome as soon as the *stasis* in his own country ended. Although, as Bowersock rightly notes,³ it was inevitable that a man of superior education, wealth, and, especially, ambition would make his way to the capital, and although there is no necessary connection between the *stasis* and his departure—for *stasis* could easily have broken out while he was in Rome—almost all his biographers have regarded it as the chief cause of his abandonment of his post with the gladiators. They may well be right, and in that case the *stasis* must be identified. Ilberg provides a typical answer. 'Sobald der Krieg im Osten zu Ende sei (der armenisch-parthische von 161–165 ist gemeint), wolle er nach der Heimat zurückkehren.'⁴ One fact alone stands in favour of this identification: the ending of the Parthian War coincided with Galen's return to Pergamum. But there are two strong objections to Ilberg's view, one historical, the other linguistic. Although the defeat of Severianus caused such consternation at Rome that a competent general had to be brought all the way from Britain to command a legion and one of the emperors took the field in person,⁵ there is no evidence to suggest a panic among the provincials or a flight of intellectuals to Rome. Life in the Asian cities appears to continue as usual, for the Parthians did not penetrate into Asia Minor beyond Cappadocia, and the loss of a legion far away on the other side of the Anatolian plateau may not

¹ The letter of Paullus Fabius Maximus and the subsequent decisions of the council of Asia have been re-edited by U. Laffi, 'Calendario della provincia d'Asia', *Studi classici ed orientali* xvi (1967), 1–98. The relevant sections are iv. 19–24, vi 40 f., 50–5 together with the discussions on pp. 3–7, and 71 ff. As a further argument against a hypothetical seven-month term, it should be observed that, if Laffi is right in dating

the change in the provincial year to 9 B.C., the high priest of 157 took office, not in September, but in April or November.

² The evidence is assembled by D. M. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), 1601–7, but the list that he gives is badly in need of revision.

³ Bowersock, *op. cit.* (p. 158 n. 2), 62.

⁴ Ilberg, *NJ* 288.

⁵ Birley, *op. cit.* (p. 159 n. 2), 160–6.

have impinged directly upon the lives of those who lived along the Aegean coast. The linguistic argument is stronger. *Στάσις*, Galen's word, is never used to mean an external war and is applied by the ancient historians, most notably Thucydides, only to internal conflict.¹ It is difficult to believe that Galen, who had compiled a lexicon of the Attic historians and who prided himself on the precision of his vocabulary (while disdaining the hyper-Atticists) changed the accepted meaning of the word so radically.² The struggle with the Parthians is a *πόλεμος*:³ there is no reason also to call it a *stasis*. Sarton attempted a compromise. 'It is possible that he would have continued in that office but a new war between the Pergamenians and their neighbours the Galatians put a stop to the games.'⁴ There is, alas, nothing at all to support this idea of an internal conflict within Asia Minor which persisted for some years unchecked by the watchful Roman administration. The best solution, if indeed *stasis* is required as the cause of Galen's departure, was long ago suggested by Greenhill who described it as 'some popular commotions'.⁵ The letters of Pliny and the orations of Dio of Prusa from an earlier period, and the contemporary speeches of Aelius Aristides and other sophists with their emphasis on the blessings of concord reveal the social ferment of the cities of Asia Minor.⁶ Riots, strikes, political conflicts, and academic feuds could all be involved in a protest against an individual or a particular group. Galen, whose wealth was devoted to cultural and philanthropic rather than to more popular and ostentatious ends, may have fallen out with the new high priest, or his friends may have lost political influence, or he may even have suffered some of the abuse and political disparagement shown to Dio.⁷ A social or political crisis within Pergamum with its extremes of wealth and poverty⁸ could easily be dignified with the name of *stasis* and Galen, as a member of the losing side, could regard his exile as imposed in part by it. But it is important not to forget that Galen, who elsewhere does not spare his righteous anger at any discomfiture by his enemies, never in his surviving writings ascribes his departure from Pergamum to the envy and hatred of his opponents, to the enmity and machinations of those eager to usurp his position. It may well be that he decided of his own volition to leave at the end of his fourth year in office with the agreement of the Asiarch and that it was only in his absence that *stasis* broke out of which he was one of the victims.⁹ But the glimpses he offers of the political structure of his home town are tantalizingly brief: it would be unwise to erect a vast edifice of hypothesis upon so fragile a foundation.

III

The itinerant physician was a familiar sight on the roads of the Roman Empire. Whether from obedience to the Hippocratic precept that the ideal

¹ The references in Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. are sufficient proof.

² 8. 581-9, 19. 48, W. Herbst, *Galenus de studiis Atticissantium testimonia* (Leipzig, 1911).

³ 14. 647.

⁴ Sarton, 20. Siegel, 13, is equally inventive. 'Whether he left Pergamon because he was frightened by a border war against the rebellious Parthians or whether the gladiators and slaves were induced into military service

and the infirmary was requisitioned is not certain.'

⁵ Greenhill, 208.

⁶ E. L. Bowie, *Past and Present* xlv (1970), 18; Galen also wrote a tract *On concord* (19. 46).

⁷ Dio, *Or.* 38-51; Pliny, *Ep.* 10. 58, 81 f.

⁸ Especially Galen 5. 49 ff.

⁹ Such a dispute might easily arise over the question of tax immunity, *J.R.S.* lxi (1971), 52-6.

doctor should experience a diversity of countries and climates or from the more practical necessity of earning a living, the doctor in the ancient world often moved from one city to another, either on a definite circuit or as the fancy took him.¹ This was especially true of Greek doctors who had flocked to Rome in search of fame and fortune even before the time of Archagathus the Spartan.² Indeed for some their travels provided not only employment but also education and qualifications that were thought worthy to be displayed upon their tombstones after their death. One doctor had travelled the world from the streams of Ocean to the limits of Europe, Asia, and Africa; another had visited many cities of men and known their disposition; a doctor from Bithynia had traversed land and sea in his profession; and Dorotheus of Alexandria consoles himself for his burial at rocky Tithorea after a lifetime's wandering in many lands with the thought that even the divine poet Homer found burial only on the minute island of Ios.³ Inscriptions and literary evidence demonstrate the flow of Greek doctors to Rome and the West. A Phrygian was martyred at Lyons; a pretentious Greek erected an altar to Asclepius and Panacea at Chester; an Egyptian was buried at Milan; Patron, a Lycian who came to Rome on an embassy, remained there as a doctor; and others migrated thither from Smyrna, Tralles, Ephesus, Thyateira, and Nicomedia.⁴ They might travel alone or as the companion of a wealthy patron,⁵ bearing letters of commendation and eloquent testimonials to their merits from grateful cities or merely the assets of a ready tongue and abundant luck.⁶ To many sufferers they came as a welcome relief, to others as suspicious outsiders. Dio of Prusa recommends his audience to accept them *faute de mieux* and Seneca curtly remarks that 'peregrinatio non facit medicum'.⁷ Galen, who included Greece, Cyprus, Palestine, Egypt, and Italy among the lands that he had seen, is a typical example of such a travelling doctor, at least during the third and fourth decades of his life, and his descriptions of what he saw and did, of his friends and teachers, and of the particular reasons for each visit are important contributions to the history of travel in the Roman Empire. My intention here is not to examine each voyage in detail but to try and date some of them as accurately as possible in order to fill out the bare framework of Galen's life.

I begin with the vexed question of the number of visits paid by Galen to Rome and the routes followed on each occasion. Stein presents the accepted view of the journeys associated with Galen's first stay. 'Anno 162 primum migravit Romam pedestri itinere per Thraciam et Macedoniam, item postea, cum ex Italia per Corcyram in Macedoniam Philippus ad Alexandriam Troadis appulsus reverteretur'.⁸ This is a combination of the accounts of his flight

¹ Hippocrates, *Airs, Waters, and Places*, 70-2 (ed. Jones); L. Edelstein, *Ancient Medicine* (Baltimore, 1967), 87-90; cf. also *Dig.* 27. 1. 6. 1 οἱ περιδεῦνται καλούμενοι.

² Dion. Halic. 1. 10. The visit of Archagathus, Pliny, *N.H.* 29. 12, traditionally dated to 219 B.C., was important, not because Archagathus was the first Greek doctor to come to Rome, but because he was already eminent in the world of Hellenistic medicine.

³ L. Robert, *Hellenica* ii (Paris, 1946), 103-6.

⁴ Eusebius, *H.E.* 5. 1. 49; *J.R.S.* lix (1969), 235; *Bulletin épigraphique* 1951 n. 249; *IG* xiv.

1934; 967; 1755; 2104; *Hellenica* ix (Paris, 1950), 26; *IG* xiv. 2019.

⁵ As well as St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, note Cicero, *Ad Fam.* 13. 20 and Galen 11. 357 and 5. 18 ff.

⁶ The extremes are represented by L. Cohn-Haft, *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece* (Northampton, Mass., 1956), 56-67, 76-85, and the story told by Phaedrus 1. 14.

⁷ Dio, *Or.* 8. 7 f. and 9. 4; Seneca, *Ep.* 104. 19 (cf. 40. 5, 'Quis medicus aegros in transitu curat?').

⁸ Stein, 5.

from Rome in 166, 14. 648 ff., and of his visits to Lemnos to secure a supply of the famed Lemnian earth, once coming from Pergamum, once coming from Rome via Philippi, the latter being placed in 166. But Greenhill, who was never inclined to rash conjecture, made a far different use of the second passage, 12. 171 ff.¹ 'How long Galen stayed in Rome [after 169] is not known, but it was probably for some years during which time he employed himself as before in lecturing, writing and practising. . . . Of the events of the rest of his life few particulars are known. On the way back to Pergamum he visited the island of Lemnos for the second time (having been disappointed on a former occasion), for the purpose of learning the mode of preparing a celebrated medicine called "Terra Lemnia".' Is the second visit to Lemnos to be placed in the 190s, as Greenhill argued, or in 166? And by what route did Galen travel to Rome on his first visit?

The source of the confusion is the Greek of 12. 171, which I give in full.

ὥσπερ οὖν εἰς Κύπρον ἔνεκα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ μετὰλλων εἷς τε τὴν Κοίλην Συρίαν, μόριον οὖσαν τῆς Παλαιστίνης, ἔνεκεν ἀσφάλτου καὶ τινων ἄλλων κατ' αὐτὴν ἀξίων ἱστορίας ἐπορεύθη, οὕτως καὶ εἰς Λήμνον οὐκ ὤκησα πλεῦσαι, θεασόμενος ὁπόσον μίγνυται τοῦ αἵματος τῇ γῇ, καὶ τό γε δεύτερον ἐξ Ἀσίας εἰς Ῥώμην ἀφικέσθαι πείξῃ πορευόμενος διὰ Θράκης τε καὶ Μακεδονίας. ἐπλευσα πρότερον ἀπὸ Τρωάδος Ἀλεξανδρείας εἰς Λήμνον, ἐπιτυχὼν εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην ἀναγομένου πλοίου.

The most natural interpretation of this passage is that it was on his second visit to Rome, travelling by road through Thrace and Macedonia, that he reached Lemnos, having begun by sailing there from Alexandria Troas. There is one objection to this version: if Galen sailed from Lemnos to Thessalonica, or even to Neapolis the port of Philippi, he would not cross Thrace, for its boundary marched with that of Philippi (12. 172). Yet this geographical dilemma may be removed if on his first visit he went overland through Thrace and Macedonia, probably crossing to the Chersonese or even by Byzantium, and on the second he took the road only from Thessalonica. The clause *τό γε . . . Μακεδονίας* then relates to both journeys, although the main clause specifies only the second, for which the first clause is not strictly correct. Those who follow Stein's interpretation are in greater difficulty. Galen was not so bad a stylist as to place the second part of a journey before the first in such a way as to compel a translation 'Although I made the second part of the journey by road, I began by sailing . . .', to which the geographical objection still applies. Even less acceptable is a version that keeps two separate voyages: 'Travelling overland on my second visit—I had earlier sailed from Alexandria Troas to Lemnos . . .', because the purpose of the comparison is not the different modes of transport used on the two journeys and because the break in the sense of the sentence is extremely clumsy. The first visit to Lemnos thus takes place on Galen's second journey from Asia to Rome, in 168 when he was summoned by the emperors to attend them, which means that a second visit on his return from Rome must be posited for a later and so far unknown date.²

¹ Greenhill, 208. His opinion was shared by A. J. Brock, *Greek Medicine* (London, 1929), 24, 177, and 191, and by M. Neuburger, *A history of medicine* (London, 1908), 248.

² L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, i (New York, 1923), 130,

has 'On the way to Rome, instead of journeying on foot through Thrace and Macedonia, he took ship from the Troad to Thessalonica.' On the Lemnian visit see also C. J. S. Thompson, 'Terra Sigillata', *Proceedings of the XVII Int. Congress of Medical*

Support for Greenhill's view comes from a consideration of the routes taken by Galen between Rome and Pergamum. As I have argued above, his first visit was made overland along the direct road between Thrace, Macedonia, and the Adriatic, the Via Egnatia, which had been traversed some twenty years previously by the orator Aristeides.¹ This was the quickest land-route between Asia and Rome with a short sea-crossing from Dyrrachium to Brundisium, but there were other ways. When Galen left Rome hastily in 166, he went first to Campania and then to Brundisium in the hope of catching the first boat going East, whether bound for Dyrrachium or Greece proper.² As he tells us that the ship sailed for Cassiope, the north-east point of Corcyra, well to the south of the crossing to Dyrrachium, it is evident that his way home was not at first along the Via Egnatia. This time he travelled by way of Athens. On his journey he fell in with an irascible merchant from Gortyn whom he accompanied from Corinth to Athens, where a choice of routes awaited him.³ The quickest way home lay straight across the Aegean, landing at Miletus, Ephesus, or Smyrna, followed by a land-journey to Pergamum, once again in the steps of Aristeides.⁴ It would be a dedicated savant indeed who retraced his tracks to the north of Greece, Macedonia, Thasos, and Lemnos before crossing to Alexandria Troas and thence to Pergamum, and Galen makes no mention in *On prognosis* of any of the sights of such a grand tour of the Aegean.⁵ Besides, his statement at 12. 172 that he had traversed almost the whole of Macedonia before reaching Philippi on his second visit to Lemnos suits a journey along the Via Egnatia more than the road through Thessaly and Thessalonica.⁶

In the absence of any further evidence to the contrary it is best to assume that Galen's outward journey in 162 was made along the Via Egnatia, that his return in 166 was made via Athens and included a sea-crossing thence to Asia Minor, and that in an unknown year, possibly towards the end of the second century, Galen returned from Rome to Pergamum overland via Thessalonica and Philippi whence he took ship for Lemnos and Asia Minor. In 168 when he was summoned to Aquileia he crossed from Alexandria Troas to Lemnos and Thessalonica before taking the Via Egnatia once more to Italy or a more direct road through Moesia and Pannonia. This conclusion explains his comment at 12. 227 that he had refrained from publishing the ninth and

Sciences (1913), 433-44 and P. E. M. Berthelot, *J.S.* 1895, 382-7. The opinion of F. A. Rusch, 'Galen's *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis, VIII*' (Diss. Evanston, Ill. 1968), p. vii, that Galen returned to Pergamum to fetch his library (including the compilations of Rufus of Samaria), is unlikely, since there is not sufficient time between *On prognosis* (written in 177-8) and the mass of other treatises that depend upon Rufus' work from 180 onwards, Bardong, op. cit. (p. 158 n. 3), 624 and 639, for Galen to return to Pergamum and then again come to Rome, as well as write a great number of tracts, Bardong, *ibid.* A date in the 190s is more likely.

reckons the sea voyage at approximately one month.

³ 5. 18 f.

⁴ Aristeides 48. 66.

⁵ *Vita Abercii* 50 describes a journey from Rome to Phrygia via Brundisium, the Peloponnese, and then overland to Byzantium: the return journey, 54, is made by sea from Attaleia to Portus. Phrygia, however, is less accessible from the Aegean than Pergamum, and the details should not be pressed too closely.

⁶ I do not know on what evidence Siegel, 12, includes a visit to Thessaly: I suspect a mistranslation. It is as well to stress that if Galen sailed to Lemnos and Thessalonica on his first visit, he could not at the same time have walked through Thrace.

¹ Aristeides 48. 60 (ed. Keil).

² 14. 648. Behr, op. cit. (p. 159 n. 4), 24,

subsequent books *On the properties of simple drugs* for twenty years or more because he had not then seen some of the stones and metals described therein.¹ His failure to reach Hephaestias in 168 affords a sufficient justification for this delay and a reason why, when once he had reached Lemnos in the 190s, he should bring out the remaining parts of the work.

If the first visit to Lemnos is located in 168, then the visits to the Dead Sea and its neighbourhood, to Cyprus, and probably to Lycia can all be placed earlier on the evidence of 12. 171, but their position in the chronology of Galen's life still remains unsettled. On the one hand, Walsh places them in 167/8, on the other Ilberg prefers 161/2.² It must be admitted at once that some of these trips in search of minerals can hardly be dated with precision. His voyages along the coast of Lycia in a small boat to look for the bituminous mineral found by the river Gagates and for other remarkable stones, 12. 203, could have occurred either on his return from Alexandria or before his departure from Asia for Rome or even in 166/8. Ilberg's objection to putting a visit to the East in 167/8 rests primarily on his interpretation of the words *εἰχόμην τῶν συνήθων*, 19. 17, as excluding any but the customary duties and tasks of a physician.³ But since Galen, like the elder Pliny, advocates that a doctor should have his own stock of drugs and should know their properties without reliance upon the doubtful recipes of others, and since these journeys are not mentioned either in *On prognosis* or in *On his own books* (which would indicate that Galen considered them to be specially important), they can easily be included among the *συνήθη*.⁴ But a stronger argument is available against placing the trip to Palestine and the eastern shore of the Dead Sea in 166/8: although Galen notes that Flavius Boethus had preceded him in his departure from Rome in order to go to his governorship of Palestine, there is no indication at all that he and Galen met after that date.⁵ Galen sent books to him in 169, if Mewaldt's conclusions are correct,⁶ when he may still have been governing his native province or was but shortly retired from that post, but there is nothing to suggest that Galen went there at the invitation or under the protection of Boethus. The notion is attractive, but it lacks confirmation from the surviving evidence, and thus in view of the many things Galen says elsewhere about his friendship with Boethus, it would be unwise to assign the visit to Palestine to the years of his governorship. Since the mineralogical expedition seems to have been undertaken separately and not as part of Galen's return from Alexandria, it is possible to accept Ilberg's suggestion that it fell in late 161 or early 162.⁷ Although there is no definite connection in the Greek,

¹ The date of Galen's death according to the *Suda* was 199/200, when Galen was seventy, but new evidence from Arabic sources, deriving ultimately from Alexander of Aphrodisias, seems to indicate that Galen lived well into his eighties. As more work is done on the Arabic versions of Galen and as more and more signs of later re-working of treatises are discovered, the idea that *On the properties of simples* was one of his last works becomes less acceptable, especially if Galen lived for at least ten years beyond its completion.

² Walsh 379; Ilberg, *AGM* 291. Stein, 5, expresses no opinion on the date, while

Neuburger, *op. cit.* (p. 167 n. 1), 244 and 248, appears to place the same journey to Palestine both after his visit to Corinth and after his return from Rome.

³ Ilberg, *AGM* 291.

⁴ Pliny *N.H.* 26. 10. On the textual difficulties of the passage in Galen, see I. Müller, *Scripta Minora Galeni* ii. pp. lxxii ff.

⁵ 12. 171 and 203 (from which Siegel, 12, derives the erroneous idea that Galen visited Anatolia in search of minerals), 14. 6.

⁶ Mewaldt 584 f.

⁷ Ilberg, *AGM* 291. The fact that Galen obtained *λύκιον* and *ἀλόη* from a camel caravan while on his way home from Palestine,

the visit to Cyprus may be linked with that to Palestine and Syria, if only because they are in the same area.¹ All come before his first visit to Lemnos and it is implied in 12. 227 that the Cypriot mineral, cadmia, was brought first to Asia and then to Rome some thirty years before the ninth book of *On the properties of simple drugs* was written.² If the two journeys are associated together, then Galen stayed briefly in Asia after his return from Cyprus in 162 before he left to make his name in Rome. On the other hand, if they are kept separate, that to Cyprus, which falls easily into 166 or 167, precedes a period of residence at Pergamum during which Galen performed the normal tasks of a doctor.

Two arguments that have been used to produce a date can be swiftly dismissed since the proof they offer is at best inconclusive. The first derives from Galen's friendship with the *procurator metallorum* of Cyprus who gave him the minerals he desired even when there was a dearth of suitable material at the mine. Although it is tempting to see this as a further example of Galen's use of influential friends and acquaintances from Rome who were members of the imperial administration and to date this incident after 166, it is not impossible that his friendship with the procurator had been formed among the intellectual circles of Asia Minor. Most of the imperial officials in the Eastern provinces came from Eastern families, and to ascribe the ease with which Galen obtained his requests only to a connection formed in Rome is to overlook ties made within his native province. The argument from the procurator is inconclusive: that from the date of composition simply vague. 'About thirty years have passed since my visit' (12. 227) is not enough to date this treatise exactly to 192 or to 196/7, nor, since we have no other indication, can a date of composition be suggested that would permit a reverse conclusion to be drawn without involving a circular argument.

The choice between the dates thus depends upon whether Galen made two journeys to Cyprus and to Palestine or one. The Greek is inconclusive. The Palestine visit cannot have taken place after 166, that is, it must fall either in 157 or in 161/2: the reference to a stay in Asia after his visit to Soloi suggests 166/7 without excluding 157 or 161/2: the Lycian visit is more likely in 161/2 or 166/7 than in 157. All of them preceded Galen's first and unsuccessful trip to Lemnos in 168 (his second occurred not after 200, possibly before 192 on the evidence of 12. 227): none can be dated with total confidence and on the present evidence no definite solution can be attained.

IV

When Galen returned to Rome following Marcus Aurelius in 169, he entered upon a prolific period of composition when treatises on many varied subjects poured from his pen. They were to a large extent the fruit of his experiences of the previous forty years of his life, which had been spent in service with

12. 216, does not by itself mean that he had been given permission by the governor and that the governor was Boethus.

¹ All three areas, Lycia, Cyprus, and Syria, are mentioned together at 12. 216, and Syria and Cyprus together at 12. 171. Cyprus is mentioned by itself at 6. 507. At

15. 684 (= *C.M.G.* V. 9. 1. 229), Galen records the types of wine he has found in different regions: in the list, Cilicia, Phoenicia, Palestine, Scyros, and Crete. I suggest that *ΕΚΥΡΟΝ* should be emended to *ΚΥΠΡΟΝ*.

² That he visited Asia after Cyprus is confirmed by 12. 220.

gladiators and with senators, in bearing philosophically the outrages of fortune and embittered opponents, in collecting facts and specimens of drugs and medical cases, and in applying his careful powers of observation to the study of disease in different lands and circumstances. A revised dating of these events enables us to imagine further the determination and effort with which Galen pursued his studies and to see how he deserved the epithets lavished upon him by Marcus Aurelius, 'first among doctors and unique among philosophers', 14. 66o, if only from the range of his attainments, travels, and interests.

Selwyn College, Cambridge

VIVIAN NUTTON