



Xenophontos, S. (2018) Galen's Exhortation to the study of medicine: an educational work for prospective medical students. In: Bouras-Vallianatos, P. and Xenophontos, S. (eds.) Greek Medical Literature and its Readers: From Hippocrates to Islam and Byzantium. Series: Publications of the Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London. Routledge: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY, pp. 67-93. ISBN 9781472487919.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/132019/>

Deposited on: 2 March 2018

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow\_  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

# Galen's *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine*: An Educational Work for Prospective Medical Students\*

Sophia Xenophontos

## Introduction

Galen's (AD 129-ca. 216) *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine*, classified among his works related to the Empiricist medical school, is one of his less well-known treatises. It is a peculiar piece both in the topics it tackles and in its style and form of argumentation more generally. In the first part (chapters 1-14), the author discusses the importance of engagement with the arts, preparing the ground for a more specialised exaltation of the greatest of them, medicine. That is explored in the second part, which does not survive.

The dual subject of the work might partly explain its controversial title, which continues to perplex scholars to this day. Should it be called *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine*, as Galen himself appears to have called it in his auto-bibliographical work *My Own Books*?<sup>1</sup> It is given this same title by St Jerome in the fourth century<sup>2</sup> and by Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq (d. ca. 870) in his Arabic translation of the title.<sup>3</sup> Or should it be called *Exhortation to the Study of the Arts* in accordance with the quite reliable Aldine version (dated to 1525), our earliest surviving testimony of the work in the absence of any Greek manuscript?<sup>4</sup> Whatever the answer to that might be, the existence of two alternative titles found in the various stages of the transmission of the text shows with some degree of certainty that during the revival of the treatise in later times its two sections must have been received as distinct thematic units,<sup>5</sup> presumably serving the purposes of different readerships. There is no similar evidence, however, to suggest that the work circulated in two different segments in Galen's time. Therefore it would be fair to say that it was in all likelihood published as a single entity back then and intended for a specific audience,<sup>6</sup> as will be discussed

---

\* I would like to thank Michael Trapp, Katarzyna Jazdzewska, and the anonymous reviewer for their insightful suggestions, and the audiences at King's College London (2014), University of St Andrews (2015) and Johannes Gutenberg-Universität in Mainz (2017) for comments on oral versions of this chapter.

<sup>1</sup> Galen, *Lib. Prop.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1830) XIX.38.14-15 = ed. Müller (1891) II.115.13 = ed. Boudon-Millot (2007) 163.15: εἰς τὸ Μηνοδότου Σεβήρων προτρεπτικὸς ἐπὶ ἰατρικῆν.

<sup>2</sup> St Jerome, *Adv. Jov.* 2.11, ed. Migne (1883) XXIII.300.41-2: *Exhortatione medicinae*.

<sup>3</sup> Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, *Epistle*, 119, ed. and tr. Lamoreaux (2016) 112: "Exhortation to the Learning of Medicine". See also Lamoreaux (2016: 112, n. on §119), who mentions that one manuscript reads: "Exhortation to the Teaching of Medicine".

<sup>4</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, ed. Aldina (1525) 1r: Γαληνοῦ παραφράστου τοῦ Μηνοδότου προτρεπτικὸς λόγος ἐπὶ τὰς τέχνας. On the textual tradition of the work with specific remarks on the Aldine readings, see Wenkebach (1933). Specifically on the essay's title, see Barigazzi (1979: 157-63); cf. Schöne (1920: 148-56).

<sup>5</sup> It is notable in this respect that there is an Arabic manuscript of the 12th c. which preserves a summary of the first section of the essay alone.

<sup>6</sup> Some scholars have assumed that Galen's essay *The Capacities of the Soul Depend on the Mixtures of the Body* was the second section of the *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine*, but Bazou (2011: 33-6) is right to suggest that, despite having a related theme, the two works were otherwise independent essays. Singer (1997: 407) proposes that the final sentence of the *Exhortation* might be pointing to *Thrasylbulus*. I believe that the missing part of the *Exhortation* did not contain a different treatise but the second section of the same treatise; this interpretation is mainly based on the expression that Galen

below. Furthermore, although we are not in a position to reconstruct to any extent the lost part on medicine, some scholars are right to suggest that it must have contained traditional material about the importance of the medical art, which Galen would have employed in other instances within his corpus, for instance in his small tract *The Best Physician is also a Philosopher*.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, Galen's encouragement of participation in the arts, which reflects his interest in philosophical education *per se*, points to a less familiar aspect of his thought and one that can help us penetrate below the surface appearance of an alleged technical treatise.

In the larger project from which this chapter derives I aim to give prominence to Galen's role as a moralist of the Roman Imperial period by examining how and to what degree this aspect of his intellectual profile was shaped by his philosophical and medical background, social status, cultural affiliations, and occasionally idiosyncratic spirit. The main thesis I am putting forward is that Galen's moral agenda is an essential part of his philosophical discourse, and that his identity as a therapist of the emotions corresponds to his role as a practising physician on a number of intriguing levels. Galen's moral programme on emotional well-being and self-management has been passed over or at best treated cursorily,<sup>8</sup> thus I am aiming to elucidate the variations of his ethical mindset in an attempt to demonstrate that Galenic moralism is in close dialogue with the practical ethics of the post-Hellenistic period, not in any passive fashion but through distinctive transformations.

In this chapter, I wish to focus specifically on the moralising techniques that permeate Galen's *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine* and explore how these inform the construction of his moral authority. I want to look, in addition, at the ways in which he tailors his ethical advice in order to respond to the needs of his intended audience comprising, I suggest, adolescents who are about to start their intermediate education and are urged to engage with professional studies, starting with philosophy and progressing on to medicine. I aim to throw some interpretative light on this neglected work by also discussing its rhetorical force vis-à-vis its literary *comparanda* (earlier and later)<sup>9</sup> and especially by arguing that Galen writes under the influence of Plutarch (AD ca. 45–ca. 120), a key moralist of the early Roman Imperial period.

The surviving essay can be divided into two sections; chapters 1-8 juxtapose the permanent benefits of acquiring skills in the arts with the unpredictable changes of fortune, while chapters 9-14 describe at some length the risks associated with intense physical exercise.

---

uses in finishing the section, which indicates a change of topic that will be dealt with in a separate part that follows on, *Protr.* 14, ed. Kühn (1821) I.39.10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 117.18: τοῦτο δ' αὐτὸ δεικτέον ἐφεξῆς. There is a close parallel in Galen's *On the Capacities of Foodstuffs*, 3, ed. Kühn (1825) VI.644.2 = ed. Wilkins (2013) 163.13-14, which ends with ῥητέον ἐφεξῆς as an expression that alerts the reader to a new section within the same work. This is a common practice in other medical authors as well, for instance Oribasios, *Coll. Med.*, 7.1.7, ed. Raeder (1928) I.195.10 or Aetios of Amida, *Tetr.*, 16.60, ed. Zervos (1901) 83.1-2.

<sup>7</sup> Boudon (2000: 6). Apart from Boudon, some of the most important editions are Marquardt (1884), Kaibel (1894; repr. 1963), Wenkebach (1935), Barigazzi (1991).

<sup>8</sup> Much scholarly emphasis has been on the humoral aetiology behind mental disorders (e.g. hysteria, mania, melancholy etc). The focus in this project will be on moral passions and not mental disturbances, which are not "diseases of the soul" in the same way that passions are. Furthermore, Jouanna (2012) has discussed Galen's medical ethics in relation to Hippocratic medical ethics; however, there is still no comprehensive account of Galen's medical deontology in its own right or its connection with practical philosophy. The desideratum was noted by Kudlien as early as 1970, but it has never been fully addressed since then; see Kudlien (1970b).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Szarmach (1990-2).

## Chapters 1-8: Arts vs Fortune

In the *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine* (henceforth in its abbreviated form *Exhortation*) Galen engages with the ethical subgenre of the protreptic, which conventionally aims to encourage (προτρέπειν) the study of philosophy and the attainment of virtue.<sup>10</sup> That is the tone, for instance, in Plato's *Phaedo* and *Euthydemus*, in Aristotle's fragmentary *Protreptic*, Isocrates' *Antidosis*, or the much later *Protreptic* by Iamblichus (AD ca. 245–ca. 325),<sup>11</sup> although the origins of the genre may go as far back as the writings of the fifth-century sophists.<sup>12</sup> Associated also with the exhortative performances of professional orators in law courts (e.g. those of Gorgias or Lysias), the protreptic preserved its character of persuading an audience not so much through rational arguments as through emotional appeals. As such it becomes a philosophical genre with rhetorical force, or more broadly a combination of rhetoric and popular philosophy, as Burgess claims.<sup>13</sup> In many instances, I will explicitly show the function of what I call Galen's "moralising rhetoric", which makes use of epideictic elements by putting them to work in the interests of his readers' self-reform.<sup>14</sup>

The *Exhortation* starts with Galen expressing scepticism as to whether the so-called irrational animals are indeed entirely devoid of reason.<sup>15</sup> Such agnostic statements often have a rhetorical purpose rather than being intended as a philosophical stimulus for further reflection; for, they are immediately countered by a remark reflecting Galen's certain knowledge so as to win the reader over.<sup>16</sup> Thus in this instance he goes on to assert that, although some animals possess at least some degree of reason, they certainly do not have the capacity to learn whichever art they wish in the way man does.<sup>17</sup>

The sharp distinction between rational humans and irrational animals was posited in orthodox Stoicism by Chrysippus (ca. 280–207 BC),<sup>18</sup> who surmised that animals cannot be bearers of any reason, but Galen seems to take here a more flexible stance by accepting at least some sort of animal intelligence. This aligns him with the Stoic Posidonius of Apamea (ca. 135–ca. 51 BC), who, as Galen himself tells us in

---

<sup>10</sup> For the genre of the protreptic in antiquity, see e.g. Hartlich (1889), Burgess (1902: 228-34), Slings (1995), and Slings (1999: 59-164). Cf. Schneeweiss (2005: 14-15, 18-19) and Schenkeveld (1997: 204-13). Specifically for Galen's protreptic, see Hartlich (1889: 316-26). For the caveats regarding the generic classification of philosophic protreptic, see the study by Jordan (1986).

<sup>11</sup> For Iamblichus' *Protrepticus*, see for instance Flashar (1965).

<sup>12</sup> The protreptic is very close to the genre of the *paraenesis* and, apart from isolated cases (for instance Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 1.1), classical philosophers did not on the whole distinguish between the two genres, very often merging them instead. See Malherbe (1986: 121-7). Regarding the modern differentiation of the two genres, Stowers (1986: 92) uses "protreptic in reference to hortatory literature that calls the audience to a new and different way of life, and *paraenesis* for advice and exhortation to continue in a certain way of life. The terms, however, were used this way only sometimes and not consistently in antiquity".

<sup>13</sup> Burgess (1902: 228-9).

<sup>14</sup> On Galen and his contemporary readers in general, see Johnson (2010: 74-97).

<sup>15</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.1.5-6 = ed. Boudon (2000) 84.1-2. This was a traditional Stoic *topos* with particular amplification in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* 13.6-9 and *Memorabilia* 1.4.9-14. For Galen's scepticism, see De Lacy (1991: 283-306).

<sup>16</sup> The same technique can be found in *Ind.*, 27, eds. Kotzia-Sotiroudis (2010) 79.321-325 = 71, eds. Boudon-Millot, Jouanna, Pietrobelli (2010) 21.17-22.2.

<sup>17</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.2-3 = ed. Boudon (2000) 84.8-13.

<sup>18</sup> See for instance, Plutarch, *De esu*, 2.6.

*On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*, attributed emotions to animals such as pleasure (ἡδονή) and anger (θυμός).<sup>19</sup> Moreover, Galen's eagerness to acknowledge the limited existence of animal rationality rather than dismiss it altogether shows how close he is to Plutarch's influential thesis that all animals, to a lesser or greater extent, are carriers of reason. Plutarch was central to the debate over the mental capacities of animals in that he devoted three separate treatises to explore the issue systematically, viz. *On the Cleverness of Animals*, *Whether Beasts are Rational* (also known as *Gryllus*), *On the Eating of Flesh*, as well as independent discussions within other works of his *Moralia*, for example in *On the Love of Offspring* and *Table Talk*, all of which, as Newmyer has persuasively contended, attest to his substantial contribution to this philosophical question.<sup>20</sup> Especially Galen's reference to the intellectual abilities of land animals (rather than of marine ones) and in the same context the employment of illustrative examples that involve specifically spiders and bees<sup>21</sup> are elements found in Plutarch's animal-related accounts,<sup>22</sup> which make a strong case for Galen's dependence on the latter.<sup>23</sup> This is a broader proposal I will be making throughout, which is on a first level supported by the fact that Galen seems well aware of the work of Plutarch, quoting from it several times across his writings either explicitly or in less direct ways.<sup>24</sup> On another level, Galen's engagement with the Plutarchan intertext may be further corroborated by the interesting turn we find in the first chapter of the *Exhortation*, emphasising man's ability to learn and perform every art, a skill that as a rule, according to Galen, all other animals lack. This emphasis seems a meaningful inversion of Plutarch's *On the Cleverness of Animals* 966E-F, which refers to spiders' webs being admired and imitated by man in weaving. Galen focuses more on man's limitless ability to imitate and learn, which transcends animals' inborn and very limited set of skills.<sup>25</sup> This twist serves as the springboard for the ensuing narrative, in which Galen seeks to establish the uniqueness of man by explaining his potential for practising the arts as the product of reasoned choice (*prohairesis*)<sup>26</sup> rather than of inherited nature (*physis*).<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Galen, *PHP*, 4.7, ed. Kühn (1823) V.424.7-12 = ed. De Lacy (1978) I.288.14-18 and Galen, *PHP*, 5.6, ed. Kühn (1823) V.476.6-477.9 = ed. De Lacy (1978) I.332.29-334.15.

<sup>20</sup> Newmyer (2005). The issue goes back to the early Peripatos, e.g. Aristotle's *EN*, I.13, 1102a26–1103a3. Cf. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, II.3, 414b28 ff. See also Books 8 and 9 of the Aristotelian *History of Animals*. Fortenbaugh (2011) discusses the Peripatetics' place in the ancient discussion on animal intelligence with special reference to Theophrastus and Strato of Lampsacus.

<sup>21</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.2.9-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.3.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Plutarch, *De soll. an.*, 970B-C, where it is stated that terrestrial and earth-born animals seem cleverer than sea creatures. On the other hand, references to bees may be found in 967B, 976D, 980B, 981B, 982F, and references to spiders in 966E, 974A-B.

<sup>23</sup> The animal examples involving bees, ants, spiders, and swallows are shared among other authors as well, for example Cicero, Philo, Pliny the Elder, and Aelian. Dickerman (1911) suggested that they all draw on a common source (presumably Alcmaeon of Croton, fifth c. BC). Even in that case, one cannot exclude the possibility of Galen having read and directly quoted Plutarch instead of an earlier source, which might have been both less easily available for him to consult and less well-preserved. In Xenophontos (2016b) I argue for Galen's dependence on Plutarch in more detail. Cf. Xenophontos (2016a) regarding Plutarch's notions on ethical education and moralising.

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Galen, *Opt. Doct.*, ed. Kühn (1821) I.41.4 = ed. Barigazzi (1991) 92.12; Galen, *PHP*, 3.2, ed. Kühn (1823) V.5.300 = ed. De Lacy (1978) I.182.24-5.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also Plutarch's *Whether Beasts are Rational* 991D-F, where animals are said to be naturally attuned to learning. I thank Katarzyna Jazdzewska for bringing this point to my attention.

<sup>26</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.2.7 = ed. Boudon (2000) 84.14: προαίρεσις.

<sup>27</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.2.6 = ed. Boudon (2000) 84.14: φύσει.

The reference to *prohairesis* (translatable as “volition” or “reasoned/moral choice”) is important because of its association with the Platonic and Aristotelian educational model, where it constitutes the decisive aspect of virtue and character.<sup>28</sup> In fact, the distinction between humans and animals in this prefatory context is predicated on the assumption that education (*paideia*), as a matter of exercise and habituation, is an exclusively human asset. That justifies why Galen goes on to stress the significance of training for human education,<sup>29</sup> and to praise the constant labour that helps man acquire the most outstanding of divine gifts, philosophy.<sup>30</sup> Galen therefore vindicates the necessity for the study of the arts that he preaches in his essay, assuring his readers that his literary text conforms to their intellectual status.

The elements of irrationality, nature, and labour taken together bring to mind Seneca’s (c.4 BC–AD 65) *Letter* 90. This describes in nostalgic terms the golden age of mankind, in order to stress that the business of philosophy has always been the pursuit of moral virtue by living in harmony with nature, rather than achieving technological progress and material sufficiency. This *Letter*, which is also taken to be an exhortation,<sup>31</sup> makes use of refutation devices to undermine Posidonius’ claim that humans had discovered the arts through philosophical training.<sup>32</sup> The emphasis that Galen puts on the notion of training further attests to his affiliation to Posidonius, which in turn makes it highly probable that he might have been influenced by the latter’s lost *Protreptic*.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, by defining the notion of *physis* as inherited traits rather than a mode of living in harmony with nature, and by coupling it with the idea of philosophical practice, Galen situates himself in the Platonic-Aristotelian tradition, and shows how experimental he is in his philosophical allegiances. Our author appears thus far as an intellectually diverse thinker who favours doctrinal interpenetration rather than sectarian devotion.

Although some of the notions that Galen expresses up to this point are commonplace in the genre of the protreptic, especially the animal imagery and the role of *physis*, it is remarkable that he transposes them from theoretical or technical frameworks into a setting of practical ethics, giving them an intimate role to his reader’s moral reform. In Galen’s text the protreptic elements open up direct channels of communication between the experienced advisor (i.e. author/narrator) and the less experienced recipient, whom Galen expects to start becoming alert and discriminating. For example, he frequently employs distancing and assimilation strategies, i.e. clever techniques which depict despicable or alternatively imitable groups of people whom the reader is advised to either imitate or avoid; in this way Galen prompts his audience to make the proper moral choices that are characteristic

---

<sup>28</sup> See, for instance, Chamberlain (1984).

<sup>29</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.2.8 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.1-2: ὁ δ’ ἄνθρωπος οὔτε τινὸς τῶν παρ’ ἐκείνοις ἀμελέτητος (“but it is not just that man is practised in all their arts”); Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.2.10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.4: οὐκ ἀνάσκητός ἐστι (“demonstrating considerable skill”). When citing the original text I follow Boudon’s edition, unless otherwise stated. Translations of the *Exhortation* come from Singer (1997) with modifications, as his translation is based on the edition by Marquardt (1884) and the one by Barigazzi (1991).

<sup>30</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 1, ed. Kühn (1821) I.3.1-2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.11-12.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Nikolaidis (2002: 22-3), who warns that *Letter* 90 should not be taken as a protreptic in the strict sense despite the features it shares with traditional protreptics.

<sup>32</sup> Seneca, *Ep.*, 90.7; cf. 90.11-12, 90.17-18. See one of the latest studies by van Nuffelen and van Hoof (2013). According to Proclus, together with persuasion, dissuasion, “midwifery”, praise and blame, refutation is one of the ways of bringing man to self-knowledge (e.g. *Alc. I*, 8.13-14).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Rainfurt (1904: 56) and Boudon (2000: 15-6).

of their philosophical background and which differentiate them from animals, as we shall soon see in more detail.<sup>34</sup> Thus the employment of animal imagery in this context of the *Exhortation* clearly serves a hortatory purpose,<sup>35</sup> in contrast to its function in three ethical/psychological texts by Galen: *Character Traits*,<sup>36</sup> *On the Affections and Errors of the Soul*,<sup>37</sup> and *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*<sup>38</sup> treat animals as representations of the uncontrollable impulses of the irrational faculty of the soul that need to be subjected to management by the rational part through obedience and habitual discipline. As such, they bear witness to their Platonic counterparts in the *Republic* 588c-d or *Phaedrus* 253c-254a and are inserted into Galen's argumentation in order to gloss the philosophical doctrine of the division and function of the soul, rather than to instruct ethically through an intimate, hands-on, and reader-friendly manner. These three texts are surely targeted at readers who are more advanced in terms of philosophical background compared to the readers of the *Exhortation*, and whose needs are less to receive helpful advice on how to lead the good life than to help them conceptualise philosophical terms and theories on the soul.

We have started encountering cases in which the same elements (in this instance the animal imagery) recur in both technical passages of moral psychology and popular philosophical passages, but which at the same time seem to serve rather diverse purposes depending on each passage's context, intended meaning, and intellectual and/or moral level of its recipient. Such retexturing of similar material figures not just across Galen's own ethical and psychological essays, but also in relation to his technical works on how to maintain good health (as we shall see in section IV), and interestingly in comparison to other ancient protreptics. For instance, Iamblichus' *Protreptic* also suggests that reason renders humans divine and distinguishes them from all other creatures,<sup>39</sup> but he does this in order to preach through systematic argumentation the value of philosophy in general, and not to present the reader with a moral problematic by advancing rhetorical strategies for his enticement, as it happens in Galen's *Exhortation*.

Galen's text goes on, in chapter 2, to further stress the divide between irrationality and rationality, which is introduced by a set of strong rhetorical questions expressed in the sociative "we":

---

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the notion of "active reading" in Meeusen (Chapter 5) in this volume.

<sup>35</sup> In this connection, von Staden (2003: 18-19) refers to Galen's use of *alogos* as a term of ridicule and abuse.

<sup>36</sup> Galen, *Mor.*, ed. Kraus (1939) 28; cf. ed. Kraus (1939) 42; English translation by Mattock (1972) and Davies in Singer (2014).

<sup>37</sup> Galen, *Aff. Dig.*, 1.6, ed. Kühn (1823) V.27.6-28.3 = ed. De Boer (1937) 19.8-20.

<sup>38</sup> Galen, *PHP*, 2.3-12, ed. Kühn (1823) V.515.1-518.2 = De Lacy (1978) I.368.12-370.23.

<sup>39</sup> Iamblichus, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Pistelli (1888) 48.9-21: "Nothing therefore either divine or blessed subsists in man except the element of intellect and insight, which alone is worthy of any attention or study: for this alone of us is immortal and divine. And, moreover, the fact that we are able to participate in this intellectual power, though our life is naturally miserable and grievous, and yet is tempered with so much that is sensuously agreeable, demonstrates that in relation to other things on the earth man seems to be a God. For our intellect is a God, and our mortal life is a participant of a certain deity, as either Hermetimus or Anaxagoras said. Wherefore we must either philosophize – or, bidding farewell to physical life, go from this place, because all other things are full of trifles and rubbish", transl. Johnson (1988).

is it not vile (αἰσχρόν), then, to neglect (ἀμελεῖν) the one part of us which we share with the gods, while busyng ourselves (ἐσπουδακέναι)<sup>40</sup> with some other matter? To disregard (καταφρονοῦντα) the acquisition of Art, and entrust ourselves (ἑαυτὸν ἐπιτρέποντα) to Fate?<sup>41</sup>

The passage above, apart from suggesting that humans are capable of union with the divine, thus building on the assimilation strategy, also conveys the two categories of ethical evaluation, praise and blame, depending on the moral decisions we make as rational agents. The accumulation of terms denoting condemnation and public contempt awakens the reader's sense of social honour, and Galen's persuasion technique becomes more forceful once he inserts a word picture of *Tyche* and of Hermes together with their supporters. The literary *ekphrasis* of *Tyche* situates our author within a long philosophical tradition, which dealt with the mutability of fortune in an effort to prove the necessity of emotional resilience achieved through philosophical training. Similar descriptions occur as far back as the *Tabula* of Cebes, a little known work of the first century AD,<sup>42</sup> in Plutarch's *On the Fortune of the Romans* (317C-318D) which presents a similar confrontation between Fortune and Virtue,<sup>43</sup> in Dio of Prusa's *Orations* LXIII-LXV (three self-contained discussions on fate), and in Favorinus' treatise *On Fortune*, with which Galen enters into dialogue, presumably as a result of the *ad hominem* attack he had made on Favorinus.<sup>44</sup>

In relation to his predecessors however, Galen dwells on the issue of fate by developing individual twists. An astonishing example of that is the way he incorporates in his essay *Avoiding Distress* the destructive fate that burnt to ashes a significant part of his library and medical instruments during the great fire of AD 192. I have shown elsewhere how the instability of human affairs in that context had a direct impact on the psychological state of the reader, in that it enlivened retrospectively the feeling of distress as a way of eventually healing it.<sup>45</sup> In the *Exhortation* however, the dangers of fate do not seem to have any psycho-therapeutic function; they are rather meant to guide readers by means of a delightful imagery, which in turn might hint at Galen's concern to make his narrative attractive to people still to be acquainted with the ups and downs of life, without disturbing them in any way.

The assumption of a young readership is reinforced by the similes we find in the description of Fortuna (Gr. *Tyche*) in particular, which help readers visualise its form and associated qualities. The ancients, Galen tells us, depicted *Tyche* as a woman with a rudder in her hands, a spherical support for her feet and with no eyes.<sup>46</sup> Trusting her is like committing the same sort of mistake as handing the rudder of a

---

<sup>40</sup> ἐσπουδακέναι with Barigazzi (1991) following Kaibel (1894); Boudon (2000) prints ἐσπευκέναι in line with the Aldine edition.

<sup>41</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 2, ed. Kühn (1821) I.3.5-8 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.16-19.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. Cebes, *Tabula* 7.1-3, 9.4, 18.1-3. The standard edition is that of Prächter (1893); more recent editions in Pesce (1982) and Fitzgerald and White (1983). The *Tabula* should be read alongside the excellent discussion of Trapp (1997), where additional references can be found.

<sup>43</sup> Interestingly, the part of the treatise that directly contrasts Fortune and Virtue is the opening, 316C ff.

<sup>44</sup> Succinctly in Boudon-Millot (2007: 12-14). Favorinus was a contemporary of Galen, whom the latter lambasted in his ethical work *Against Favorinus' Attack on Socrates* as well as his *The Best Method of Teaching*.

<sup>45</sup> Xenophontos (2014).

<sup>46</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 2, ed. Kühn (1821) I.3.9-13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.20-86.5.

ship in danger of capsizing to a blind helmsman.<sup>47</sup> The image of the helmsman, which Galen adduces twice more in this text,<sup>48</sup> is of Platonic origin (with important Presocratic antecedents), and was often employed in ethical tracts of popular philosophy, especially Plutarch's own.<sup>49</sup>

The two groups of followers, those who trust to luck and those who rely on rationality, are illustrated by historical and mythical examples as well as more general allegorical figures each time, making the text even more easily digestible. So the adherents of Fate are idle and ignorant and comprise not only Cyrus, Priam, and Dionysius but also a whole band of demagogues, courtesans, betrayers of friends and even murderers.<sup>50</sup> Conversely, Hermes' chorus consists of noble and knowledgeable men of mild conduct, including geometers, mathematicians, philosophers, doctors and scholars alongside architects, grammarians and ultimately such great men as Socrates, Homer, Hippocrates, and Plato.<sup>51</sup> Once set on this dual course, Galen exploits his protreptic moralism and makes brief encouraging or discouraging remarks to direct the reader more explicitly. In both cases he uses the second-person-singular form of address, and claims that careful examination of the band of Fortune will lead to loathing,<sup>52</sup> whereas moral contemplation of Hermes' chorus will excite both emulation and adoration.<sup>53</sup>

The reader is subtly prompted to identify with the followers of Hermes by the author's explanation that this god does not judge people on the basis of political reputation, nobility and wealth, but on whether they lead a good life.<sup>54</sup> Good living or "εὖ ζῆν" is the target of ethical philosophy itself, and interestingly the identification of Hermes with a whole branch of philosophy is entirely consistent with the way Galen uses Hermes in his *Character Traits* as a figure who leads human beings to assimilation with the divine after teaching them how to despise above all worldly pleasures.<sup>55</sup> The affinities between the two works attest to a network of cross-references suitably adjusted to the twists and turns in the argument of each text. In addition to Hermes, the insertion of the anecdote about Aristippus, a proverbial figure of self-sufficiency in ethical literature (especially in moral diatribes), lends legitimacy to Galen's ethical production. Aristippus is deployed both in Galen's *Avoiding Distress* and in Plutarch's *On the Tranquillity of the Soul*, although in the *Exhortation* Galen provides us with three interrelated stories about him and seems to draw from Posidonius' *Protreptic*.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 2, ed. Kühn (1821) I.3.14-17 = ed. Boudon (2000) 85.5-8.

<sup>48</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Kühn (1821) I.16.14-16 = ed. Boudon (2000) 97.6-8; Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.23.8-9 = ed. Boudon (2000) 102.20.

<sup>49</sup> See, for instance, Plutarch's *De virt. mor.* 452B, *De tranq. an.* 475E-F, *Quaest. conv.* 663D, *An. seni* 787D, *Praec. ger. reip.* 801C-D.

<sup>50</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 4, ed. Kühn (1821) I.5.13-6.8 = ed. Boudon (2000) 87.19-88.11.

<sup>51</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 5, ed. Kühn (1821) I.6.15-8.6 = ed. Boudon (2000) 88.19-89.21. The assimilation strategy seems to be a common practice employed by Galen. E.g. in his *Recognising the Best Physician*, he claims that it befits heroes and rich men to learn medicine, 9, ed. Iskandar (1988) 111.1-2.

<sup>52</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 4, ed. Kühn (1821) I.6.10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 88.13-14: ...μισήσεις ὄλως τὸν χορὸν.

<sup>53</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 5, ed. Kühn (1821) I.8.1-3 = ed. Boudon (2000) 89.16-18: Τοῦτον...τὸν χορὸν...οὐ μόνον ζηλώσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσκυνήσεις.

<sup>54</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 5, ed. Kühn (1821) I.7.15-16 = ed. Boudon (2000) 89.12-13: τοὺς καλῶς μὲν βιοῦντας; cf. Galen, *Protr.*, 3, ed. Kühn (1821) I.5.2-4 = ed. Boudon (2000) 87.7-9.

<sup>55</sup> Galen, *Mor.*, ed. Kraus (1939) 40-41.

<sup>56</sup> Boudon-Millot (2007: 15-16).

Despite the fact that the paradigm of Aristippus was designed to show that material wealth was trivial and unimportant to human life,<sup>57</sup> many people who found themselves destitute committed suicide, as Galen emphasises.<sup>58</sup> The presentation of contradictory attitudes towards the loss of possessions points up the extent to which Galen differed from Callistus the grammarian, whom he cites in *Avoiding Distress* to highlight that he died of depression caused by the loss of his property. Galen, on the other hand, regardless of his own losses in the same disaster, continued cheerfully his normal activities.<sup>59</sup> Galen disapproves of people who neglect their spiritual condition and who are more preoccupied with worldly blessings; he considers them equal to the most worthless slave,<sup>60</sup> once again challenging his reader's sense of honour.<sup>61</sup>

In addition to this, Galen's moralism starts to share the acerbic features of Cynic philosophy not only in that it appropriates the opinions of Antisthenes and Diogenes, but above all in that he himself is walking in their footsteps when he sourly attacks rich and uneducated people for falling victim to the self-interest of flatterers:

so perhaps the comparison of such men (sc. flatterers) to wells is not unreasonable; when a well, which once provided them with water, dries up, people lift up their clothes and urinate in it (ἀνασυράμενοι προσουροῦσι).<sup>62</sup>

In similar vein, Galen castigates people who boast of their noble descent, unaware of the fact that their nobility is like the coinage of a state, which has currency with its inhabitants but is counterfeit to everyone else.<sup>63</sup> Galen's reference to Antisthenes is thought-provoking, since by making a link to the Cynic philosopher who also happened to be the originator of the philosophical protreptic,<sup>64</sup> Galen might be staking a claim to being his emulator and a perhaps reformer of the genre he introduced.

Besides traits of the Stoic-Cynic diatribe combined with those of the protreptic, Galen's account features characteristics of mainstream educational works and echoes in particular Plutarch's *On Reading the Poets*.<sup>65</sup> It is striking, for instance, that Galen quotes both from Euripides' *The Phoenician Women* (404-5) and Homer's *Iliad* (4.405), the most important school texts in that period,<sup>66</sup> which are also present in Plutarch's essay, and that he amends poetical lines to make them suit the moral message of his argumentation. This is the so-called emendation (*epanorthosis*), a key pedagogical technique, which Plutarch applies in instructing young readers how they should interpret poetry in the morally upright way and benefit from it as a preliminary

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Galen, *Opt. Med.*, ed. Kühn (1821) I.58.2-4 = ed. Boudon-Millot (2007) 288.14-17.

<sup>58</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 6, ed. Kühn (1821) I.9.6-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 91.1-5.

<sup>59</sup> Galen, *Ind.*, 3, eds. Kotzia-Sotiroudis (2010) 67.29-32 = 7, eds. Boudon-Millot, Jouanna, Pietrobelli (2010) 4.6-10; Galen, *Ind.*, 2, eds. Kotzia-Sotiroudis (2010) 66.12 = 3, eds. Boudon-Millot, Jouanna, Pietrobelli (2010) 3.1-2.

<sup>60</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 6, ed. Kühn (1821) I.10.8 = ed. Boudon (2000) 91.22.

<sup>61</sup> See "αἰσχρόν" (despicable), "ἠτιμάκασιν" (they disgraced), "ἀποβλήτοις τῶν οἰκετῶν εἰόκασιν" (they are equivalent to the reject servants), all in *Protr.*, 6, ed. Kühn (1821) I.9-11 = ed. Boudon (2000) 91, and also in the passage cited above. Similarly in his introduction to *Opt. Med. Cogn.*, 1, ed. Iskandar (1988) 42.5-9 and *Opt. Med. Cogn.*, 9, ed. Iskandar (1988) 111.5-12; and his *San. Tu.*, 5.1, ed. Kühn (1823) VI.311.9-312.9 = ed. Koch (1923) 137.26-138.5.

<sup>62</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 6, ed. Kühn (1821) I.11.3-7 = ed. Boudon (2000) 92.14-17.

<sup>63</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 7, ed. Kühn (1821) I.11.7-11 = ed. Boudon (2000) 93.1-7.

<sup>64</sup> Burgess (1902: 234), Hartlich (1889: 225-6), Gorgemanns (2001: 469-70).

<sup>65</sup> On Galen's attitude to Greek poetic tradition in his *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*, see De Lacy (1966). Cf. Rosen (2013).

<sup>66</sup> Criamore (1996), Morgan (1998: 50-89).

stage to philosophy. The recurring use of imperative forms of *akouein*, a didactic directive that is interpreted to mean not simply hearing but also critically considering what is being listened to, is a common trope in didactic communications, also present in Plutarch's essay.<sup>67</sup> In discussing the importance of eugenics, Galen argues that noble ancestors instigate a desire to emulate their example,<sup>68</sup> interacting both verbally and conceptually, for example, with the near-contemporary *On the Education of Children*, an essay now considered pseudo-Plutarchan, though once thought to be authentic.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, Galen's emphasis on the emulation of noble exemplars and the severe criticism that he applies to any moral misconduct contribute to his self-depiction as a supervisor of morals, whose role in overseeing and correcting the ethical failings of philosophical novices is crucial especially in his *On the Affections and Errors of the Soul*.<sup>70</sup> Finally, Galen's protreptic towards engagement with the arts resembles the introduction to Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory* (1.9-10), a basic educational manual of the Roman Imperial period, which also begins with a protreptic concerning the study of the liberal arts. In the light of the above, we can see that Galen's *Exhortation* has a didactic nature and purpose, and was intended to have an appeal as an educational text in the passing from secondary education to advanced studies.

In encouraging sensible people to practice the arts, Galen refers to Themistocles in particular as an example of a man who became a significant figure despite his lowly birth on his mother's side.<sup>71</sup> The dictum attributed to Themistocles survives in Plutarch's *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* 187B and in Stobaeus' *Florilegium* (4, 29, 15) where it is attributed to Iphicrates instead. This misattribution may suggest Plutarch's influence on Galen (see *Life of Themistocles*, 1.1-4), given that Galen seems to have consulted two other moral works by the same author in this context, as noted above, and presumably also the *Life of Solon* 22.1 for his *Exhortation* 8.<sup>72</sup> Stobaeus (4, 29, 21-2) informs us that there was a work by Plutarch entitled *Against Nobility* (*Κατὰ εὐγενείας*) in which the dictum of Themistocles may have occurred, although this remains pure speculation, and it is safer to assume that Galen might have drawn on the *Life of Themistocles* instead.

---

<sup>67</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.23.14 = ed. Boudon (2000) 103.6: ἄκουσον; Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.24.9 = ed. Boudon (2000) 103.18: ἄκουε πάλιν; Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.24.13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.4: ἀκούειν ἐθέλεις; Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.24.10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.5: ἄκουε πάλιν; Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.25.6 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.15: ἀκούση. Cf. Schenkeveld (1992).

<sup>68</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 7, ed. Kühn (1821) I.12-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 93.15-16: πρὸς οἰκεῖον παράδειγμα τὸν ζῆλον ἡμῖν γίνεσθαι.

<sup>69</sup> In Xenophontos (2016b) I discuss the similarities between the two works, suggesting a *terminus ante quem* for the *On the Education of Children* in the light of Galen's *Exhortation*. It is true that the same thought appears in other moral(ising) texts too, e.g. in Cicero, *For Lucius Murena* 66: "you said that you had a domestic example to imitate" (domesticum te habere dixisti exemplum ad imitandum), but it is more reasonable to assume that Galen was more familiar with near-contemporary Greek sources rather than earlier, Latin ones. The issue of Galen's knowledge of Latin is still not sufficiently explored; see, for example, Herbst (1911: 137-8).

<sup>70</sup> Galen, *Aff. Dig.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1823) V.52.18-53.9 = ed. De Boer (1937) 35.9-16, transl. Singer (2014): "Those, however, who are in the grip of moderate affections, and are thus able to recognize a little of the truth of the above statements, if, as I have previously said, they appoint a monitor or tutor, who, by constant reminders, by criticism, by exhortation and encouragement to hold back from the stronger affections, and by providing himself as an example of all those statements and exhortations, will be able, by the use of words, to make their souls free and noble".

<sup>71</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 7, ed. Kühn (1821) I.14-15 = ed. Boudon (2000) 94.20-2.

<sup>72</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Kühn (1821) I.15.9-16.2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 96.3-14.

At any rate, the dictum of Themistocles, over and above discounting the role of noble birth as a factor in ethical propriety, also reinforces the antithesis pride vs. shame that is omnipresent in Galen's text from the beginning. Galen goes on to link this concept with a key topic in the cultural discourse of the period, namely ethnic identity. By referring to the case of the Scythian Anacharsis, who was admired for his wisdom despite his barbarian birth, Galen teaches that moral behaviour, an acquired state, raises men above nobility and ethnicity, inherited qualities that are totally beyond their control. That seems to be a recurrent issue in his *Exhortation*, treated also in the anecdotes of Aristippus previously discussed.<sup>73</sup> The Stoics believed that anything that is not "up to us" should not affect our individual happiness (this is their theory of the morally "indifferents"),<sup>74</sup> but Galen here revises the idea, claiming that what is not up to us should not play a role in any moral evaluation of us:

Once mocked as a barbarian and Scythian, Anacharsis said: "my fatherland disgraces me, but you disgrace your fatherland", a very fine response to a worthless person who regarded country as the only source of honour.<sup>75</sup>

Before closing the first part of the essay, Galen raises the issue of beauty and how this can hinder young people from caring for their psychic condition. He employs moral exempla from Solon, Euripides and Sappho, who all agreed that physical beauty did not guarantee happiness but rather threatened it. Additionally, Galen stresses that youth offers only temporary pleasures, and therefore he urges his young readers to develop special regard for the end of their life and appreciate old age.<sup>76</sup> Once more Galen assesses the impact of pre-philosophical/worldly externals, depending on whether they contribute to one's inner well-being or social adulation: e.g. the acquisition of money (χρηματισμός) from bodily charm is disgusting (αἰσχρός) and universally despised (διὰ παντός ἐπονείδιστος), but the money that comes from the art is free (ἐλευθέριος), respectable (ἔνδοξος), and reliable (βέβαιος).<sup>77</sup> That helps Galen exhort young men to look in the mirror and try to make their beautiful outward appearance fit their inner, moral one.<sup>78</sup> Here Galen is assuming the Socratic persona, as the same counsel is pronounced by Socrates himself notably in Plutarch's *Precepts of Marriage* 141D.<sup>79</sup> By neglecting their souls, human agents are worthy of being spat upon, as the exemplum of the Cynic Diogenes suggests.<sup>80</sup> Galen filters this through his own protreptic voice:

---

<sup>73</sup> Especially Galen, *Protr.*, 5, ed. Kühn (1821) I.8.9-13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 90.4-8.

<sup>74</sup> Epictetus, *Disc.* III, 24, 67-69.

<sup>75</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 7, ed. Kühn (1821) I.14.1-5 = ed. Boudon (2000) 95.1-5. Cf. Galen's *Protr.*, 6, ed. Kühn (1821) I.11.9-11 = ed. Boudon (2010) 92.19-21.

<sup>76</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Kühn (1821) I.15.9-17.12 = ed. Boudon (2000) 96.3-97.22.

<sup>77</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Kühn (1821) I.17.14-17 = ed. Boudon (2000) 98.2-5.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Galen, *Mor.*, ed. Kraus (1939) 43, where illness and ugliness of the body correspond to illness and ugliness of the soul.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Diogenes Laertius 7.19 and Stobaeus 2.31.98. The recipients of the advice are in both cases young men. For how Galen is influenced by "Socratism" in the *Exhortation*, see Rosen (2008: 157-9).

<sup>80</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Kühn (1821) I.18.15-19.13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 99.1-16 with multiple occurrences of ἔπτυσεν, προσέπτυσε, ἀποπτύειν.

So, young man (ὦ μειράκιον), do not allow yourself to become worthy of being spat at (προσπύεσθαι), even if you think that everything else about you is splendid.<sup>81</sup>

It is important to discuss Galen's authority in the context of his exhortation. His address to young men is informed by a provocatively extravagant, almost paternal, tone: "Come then, my children, you who now hear my words: dedicate yourselves at once to the arts",<sup>82</sup> which eventually becomes so insistent as to allow but little freedom of choice to the young men. This address provides the audience with a sense of security that Galen's advice will not only protect them against charlatans but to a large extent direct them towards the practice of those arts that are beneficial to life.<sup>83</sup> Both the appellations Galen uses above ("μειράκια" and "παῖδες") and the strong enticement towards progression to the liberal arts point to the fact that this work is addressed to adolescents around 14 years old, who are about to finish or have just finished their primary education and will now embark upon general, secondary education (*enkyklios paideia*)<sup>84</sup> – a preliminary to any activity in life – with a view to take up higher studies that will help them secure a noble profession in life, such as medicine. Therefore by taking care of their moral prosperity, Galen depicts himself as a physician of their soul.

Finally, he also works on the intellectual state of his young readers by subtly putting across the idea to them that the various forms of athletic activity differ from the arts. This he achieves by assuring them that Galen himself believes in their capacity for discernment,<sup>85</sup> and also by warning them that they need some additional instruction on the crucial issue of athletics.<sup>86</sup> The first section is rounded off in the form of ring composition with a recapitulatory passage treating man's relationship to gods and animals respectively. However repetitive this might seem to modern tastes, it illustrates the authoritative voice of the author, who communicates his ethical teachings assertively and in plain language, with blunt analogies and conditional clauses, meant to achieve universal applicability to the collective readership of young men:

---

<sup>81</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 8, ed. Kühn (1821) I.19.13-15 = ed. Boudon (2000) 99.16-18.

<sup>82</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.20.4-5 = ed. Boudon (2000) 100.1-2: Ἄγετε οὖν, ὦ παῖδες, ὅποσοι τῶν ἐμῶν ἀκηκοότες λόγων ἐπὶ τέχνης μάθησιν ὄρμησθε.

<sup>83</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.20.5-9 = ed. Boudon (2000) 100.2-6.

<sup>84</sup> *Enkyklios paideia* refers to a program of intermediate/secondary education (following the primary education that included reading and writing), which provided preparatory studies for the various branches of higher culture. After the second half of the first century BC, this program became more systematised, and included the seven liberal arts, normally grammar, rhetoric and dialectic (later known as *trivium*), and arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and harmonics (*quadrivium*), although with some degree of flexibility depending on the special interests of each author. Higher/professional learning traditionally included philosophy, rhetoric, medicine, architecture and other fields. See Clarke (1971: 1-2, 109-18) and Morgan (1998: 33-9).

<sup>85</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.20.9-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 100.6-8: "I am sure that you are quite well aware that none of these is an art".

<sup>86</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.20.13-14 = ed. Boudon (2000) 100.11-12: "The only thing that worries me is athletics". Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.21.1-4 = ed. Boudon (2000) 100.16-101.2: "There is a danger that it may deceive some young men into supposing it an art. We had best investigate it then; deception is always easy in anything of which one has made no previous investigation".

The human race, my children (ὧ παῖδες), has something in common with both the gods and the irrational beasts; with the former to the extent that it is possessed of reason, with the latter to the extent that it is mortal. It is better then to realise our kinship with the greater of these and to take care of education (ἐπιμελήσασθαι παιδείας), by which we may attain the greatest of goods, if we apply it successfully, and, if unsuccessfully, at least we will not suffer the shame of being inferior to beasts without reason.<sup>87</sup>

The exhortatory register in Galen differs from the mild didactic spirit of Plutarch, especially by comparison with the latter's two main educational essays, *On Reading the Poets* and *On Listening to Lectures*. Although on the whole all three works address the same concerns about the character development of young people about to embark on their philosophical studies, Plutarch is more philosophical than rhetorical and does not fail to discuss *inter alia* the philosophical significance of silence, the role of envy, or the power of self-exploration.<sup>88</sup> Galen's rhetorical exuberance, by contrast, directs the reader in a more robust manner, presumably in order to signal more compellingly the need for philosophical engagement. The difference in tone may also tell us something about the authors' public profiles as perceived by their respective contemporaries or even about the way they wished to be seen by them. By contrast to Plutarch, who was well-known for having taught philosophy all his life both in Greece and in Rome, Galen was primarily respected as a physician or at best – according to him – as a physician-cum-philosopher.<sup>89</sup> Could Galen's exuberant rhetoric (partly) hint at his ambitions to become a philosophical luminary in the area of practical ethics?

## Chapters 9–14: The Dangers of Athletics

I now turn to the second part of the essay to show that Galen here tends to insert even more manipulative material than merely the protreptic sort of advice we have seen in the previous section, and consequently that his tone turns out to be polemical rather than demonstrative. The author appears to follow the traditional division of the protreptic into one section that demonstrates the value of philosophy, education and the arts (ἐνδεικτικόν) and another that refutes inimical arguments against them (ἀπελεγτικόν).<sup>90</sup> Nevertheless, in this second part of the *Exhortation*, instead of

<sup>87</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.21.4-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 101.2-9.

<sup>88</sup> Plutarch's educational essays and Galen's *Exhortation* have many ideas in common: the contrast between usefulness and pleasure (*De aud. poet.* 14D-F), the mixture of philosophical material with mythical narrations so as to make them more attractive to young people (*De aud. poet.* 15F), amendment (*epanorthosis*) of poetical lines (*De aud. poet.* 20E-21D), praise and blame (*De aud. poet.* 27E-F), the role of eugenics (*De aud. poet.* 28D), differences between various groups of people and nations (*De aud. poet.* 28F-30E), the notion that the gods do not honour wealthy and powerful men but rather the just ones (*De aud. poet.* 30F), the imagery of horse and rider (*De aud. poet.* 31D) and the helmsman (*De aud. poet.* 33F), the condemnation of nobility, riches, beauty, and fame (*De aud. poet.* 32F, 33C-D, 34A, 34D-36A), what depends on luck (*De aud. poet.* 35C), antithesis between humans and wild animals (*De aud. poet.* 38D).

<sup>89</sup> According to Galen, the emperor referred to him as “the first among doctors and unique among philosophers”, *Praen.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1827) XIV.660 = ed. and tr. Nutton (1979) 128.27-8; elsewhere he claims that his teacher, the Peripatetic Eudemus, knew him for his philosophical achievements and considered medicine to be a sideline for him, *Praen.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1827) XIV.608.13-15 = ed. Nutton (1979) 76.27-9.

<sup>90</sup> Hartlich (1889: 302); cf. Calderini and Ginevra (1986: 75-80).

testing the validity of the accusations against the arts, Galen levels an attack against hypermasculinity and athletics, and rebukes the reader for succumbing to any such wrong choices. These new topics of discussion will have important implications for his overarching argument on the practicability and value of ethical philosophy, especially in that they help clarify his view on the attention that should be drawn to the care of the soul as opposed to the excessive care of the body.

On another level, it should be stated at the outset that Galen's discussion of extreme bodily exercise reflects and indeed critically responds to the importance of athletics as a cultural and philosophical field by the second century AD.<sup>91</sup> Some imperial philosophers tended to advocate the inclusion of gymnastics into the liberal curriculum (Maximus of Tyre is a good example)<sup>92</sup> emphasising its professed benefit for the soul, but in the *Exhortation* Galen seeks to favour medicine at the expense of gymnastics, considering the former an ideal guarantor of physical and mental health, a view that fitted his conceptualisation of medicine as a philosophising area of study and practice. Galen's attack on athletics has been correctly interpreted as an efficient way on his part to valorise medicine as an educational discipline and consolidate its place in the intellectual landscape of the High Roman Empire,<sup>93</sup> that may well be right, but, as I hope to show in this chapter and in my project more generally, Galen's rhetoric must surely have a social, moralising purpose too.

Dismissing the sociative "we" and assuming the second person indicative or imperative form of address, Galen embarks upon a rejection of athletics in so far as this interferes with the care of the soul. He holds that the most excellent men attract divine praise not for their physical competence but their artistic accomplishments.<sup>94</sup> Such was the case with Socrates, Lycurgus, and Archilochus who were all praised by Apollo. In corroboration of this statement Galen interjects a direct aside to eliminate any hesitation on the reader's part: "if you do not wish to listen to me, at least have some respect for the Pythian Apollo".<sup>95</sup> Galen's imposing voice taps into his reader's religious sensibilities, and a bit further on he goes on to question the readers' mental capacities too, by demanding they reflect on the various titles conferred upon athletes, a task that Galen sees as destined to fail: "Tell me, then, about the honorary addressing of the athletes. But you will not tell me, because you simply cannot tell me...".<sup>96</sup> Here Galen directly accuses the reader of succumbing to popular opinion and going along with the praise of the crowd,<sup>97</sup> an accusation that seems to be a *topos* in protreptics.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> König (2005: 254-300) analyses Galen's texts on physical training, including the *Exhortation*, to show how choosing athletics acts as a defining mirror image for medicine. On Galen's foregrounding of the self and his various levels of sophistication, see Barton (1994: 144-7). On athletics and the second sophistic, see van Nijf (2008: 203-24).

<sup>92</sup> Maximus of Tyre, *Diss.*, 37.3, ed. Trapp (1994). Cf. Philostratus' *On Gymnastics* 45, where athletic trainers are accused of corrupting the morals of athletes.

<sup>93</sup> Curtis (2014: 46-50). His 2014 chapter is a shorter version of pages 80-105 of his unpublished PhD thesis (2009).

<sup>94</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.21.13-22.3 = ed. Boudon (2000) 101.12-17.

<sup>95</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 9, ed. Kühn (1821) I.22.6-7 = ed. Boudon (2000) 101.21-22: εἰ δ' οὐκ ἐθέλεις ἐμοὶ πειθεσθαι, τὸν γε θεὸν αἰδέσθητι τὸν Πύθιον.

<sup>96</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.23.1-2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 102.12-13.

<sup>97</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.23.3-5 = ed. Boudon (2000) 102.14-17.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Iamblichus, *Protr.*, 6, ed. Pistelli (1888) 40: "Indeed it is a servile or brutal manner of living, but not of living well, for one to eagerly desire and follow the opinions of the multitude of mankind, but to be altogether unwilling to imitate the industry and toil of the same multitude by seeking real wealth, the things which are truly beautiful", transl. Johnson (1988).

In continuing his criticism, Galen asks how the reader can arrogantly set himself up as an arbiter of important matters, going against the judgment of men wiser than himself,<sup>99</sup> all of whom have condemned physical training. He elects to quote their opinions, accompanying them with various grammatical forms of the verb *akouein*. This serves Galen's philosophical aims, because, as we have seen, it carries the meaning of rationally processing what is being heard after dismissing superficial impressions. It is used in this way in educational contexts, where it is often translatable as "to consider", as in this case.

Plutarch's *On Reading the Poets* is again a good *comparandum* not just in respect of stressing the importance of *akouein* in the educational training of young men, but also in that it dwells on issues relating to literary criticism, treating specifically the correlation between poetry and philosophy. In contrast to Plato's rejection of poetry on the grounds that it inculcated immorality in young readers, Plutarch adopted the study of poetry in his educational agenda, treating it as a preliminary stage to philosophy.<sup>100</sup> Galen not only seems aware of the tension between poetry and philosophy but also enters into debate with this tradition, comparing the two fields on the basis of their opposition to athletics. In fact, Galen's treatment is all the more anchored, given that he reveals the opinion of medicine too, which also condemns athletics, as the quotations from Hippocrates attest.<sup>101</sup>

The accumulated testimonies from various authorities that Galen uses to argue against athletics, although permissible in exhortatory and didactic settings, does not seem to meet his authorial aims, since he admits that he was compelled to resort to such rhetorical means in order to benefit those yielding to the vacuities of popular reputation.<sup>102</sup> In this instance, Galen renounces the identity of a rhetor and presents himself as a lover of truth,<sup>103</sup> a philosophical man with a social vocation as a mentor for his contemporaries. Such self-apologetics probably reveal a concern that he may appear more rhetorical than necessary, a common preoccupation of many moral philosophers and a fear he also expresses in his medical works. Yet Galen's rhetorical emphases in the *Exhortation* are not inept techniques, but effective aids in the philosophical training of the young students.

In claiming that athletes are totally ignorant of the existence of their souls, constantly busying themselves with flesh and blood matters, Galen depicts them as extinguishing their capacity for rational contemplation and descending to the level of irrational animals.<sup>104</sup> Identifying athletes with pigs in particular<sup>105</sup> is a technique which helps Galen to correlate what he had previously described as the non-rational nature of athletes' souls with animal behaviour.<sup>106</sup> There is a similar passage in *Character Traits*,<sup>107</sup> which equates physical preoccupations with the life of a pig and spiritual concerns with an angelic existence. Interestingly abstaining from immoderate vices, such as over eating or drinking and sexual intercourse, also becomes a crucial

---

<sup>99</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.23.11-13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 103.2-5.

<sup>100</sup> Xenophontos (2010).

<sup>101</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.25.2-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.10-19.

<sup>102</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.25.9-16 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.18-105.4.

<sup>103</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.25.11 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.20.

<sup>104</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.26.17-27.9 = ed. Boudon (2000) 106.1-11.

<sup>105</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.28.14-29.2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 107.15-108.4.

<sup>106</sup> For the analogy's satirical and comic connotations, see Rosen (2010: 334-7).

<sup>107</sup> Galen, *Mor.*, ed. Kraus (1939) 37.

part of the profile of the philosophically minded physician in *The Best Physician is also a Philosopher*.<sup>108</sup>

Another aspect that seems crucial in Galen's exposition in respect to his construction of authority is the relationship he builds between himself and Hippocrates. The abundant Hippocratic quotations in the second section of the essay are not just back-up from an ancient thinker reinforcing Galen's argumentation; they are supporting Galen's voice and adding persuasiveness to his claims. That is reflected in the fact that Galen is careful not just to cite but above all to comment on and challenge some of the Hippocratic aphorisms, which ultimately leaves a very strong impression;<sup>109</sup> this is apparent in his use of pertinent vocabulary describing the physical symptoms of an athletic regime<sup>110</sup> and in the exposition of the mechanics of the body. It is interesting, however, that this part of the treatise does not get bogged down with any medical trifles not even any technical physiological terms, which might confound the inexperienced reader. In chapter 11 for example, Galen provides the reader with a straightforward clarification to explicate a Hippocratic aphorism that involves the distinction between state and condition of the body.<sup>111</sup> I think this is a good indicator of the fact that his audience do not yet have any medical background or familiarity with the Hippocratic corpus; otherwise such explications would have been redundant.

By referring to the athletes' somatic deformations, Galen subverts the notion of their beauty, arguing that their bodily strength is of no significant value other than helping them to perform agricultural activities.<sup>112</sup> The sarcastic tone continues in his assertion that the athletes' resistance to extreme weather equates them to new-born babies<sup>113</sup> and he mocks them for lying all day long in dust and washing in muck.<sup>114</sup> Such polemical comments are designed to undermine the self-esteem of athletes and in order to conclude that athletics are of no use in any practical context in human life, Galen employs a didactic myth in verse which preaches that athletic distinction is, in fact, not an accomplishment of humans but of animals.<sup>115</sup> Finally, he states that, unlike a lifelong dedication to the arts, he does not believe that athletics can be a way of earning a living<sup>116</sup> and he classifies it in the category of the less-respected banausic arts, whereas medicine comes under the high arts, i.e. the ones that can mitigate the

---

<sup>108</sup> Galen, *Opt. Med.*, ed. Kühn (1821) I.59.11-15 = ed. Boudon-Millot (2007) 290.2-7.

<sup>109</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.29.2-12 = ed. Boudon (2000) 108.5-14: "The old master, Hippocrates, apart from the lines already quoted, also says this: 'Great and sudden changes are dangerous: filling or emptying, heating or cooling, or moving the body in any other way'. For – he adds – 'all large quantities are inimical to Nature (*Aph.* 2.51)'...I would say, in fact, that athletics is the cultivation, not of health, but of disease...". On Galen as a commentator of Hippocrates, see Manetti and Roselli (1994), Flemming (2008).

<sup>110</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.31.2-7 = ed. Boudon (2000) 109.15-21.

<sup>111</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.29.13-30.2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 108.16-23. "By this he (sc. Hippocrates) does not just mean that athletic practice destroys what is natural; he even uses the word 'state', refusing in the name 'condition', which is always applied by the ancients to the truly healthy. A condition is a stable state which is not readily changes; that of athletes is a peak, and is dangerous and liable to change".

<sup>112</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.32.13-16 = ed. Boudon (2000) 111.8-14.

<sup>113</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.33.9-13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 112.3-7.

<sup>114</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.33.16-34.2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 112.11-15.

<sup>115</sup> Crusius (1884) suggested that these hexameters come from a lost work of Plutarch, number 127 in the Lamprias catalogue with title "Περὶ ζῶων ἀλόγων ποιητικός"; compare Gercke (1886) 470-2, who advances certain objections to Crusius' arguments; see also Bergk (1846: 117-8), who attributes the song to Xenophanes instead.

<sup>116</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 14, ed. Kühn (1821) I.38.9-12 = ed. Boudon (2000) 116.20-117.1.

bestiality of the soul.<sup>117</sup> This final remark in the surviving part of the essay shows the moralising dimensions that Galen credits to medicine. Thus, by urging the reader towards a well-defined cluster of habits, he corroborates his role as a physician of body and soul alike.

### **Ethics in the *Exhortation* and in Texts Focusing on the Mechanics of the Body**

The best constitution of the human body and its hygiene and physical exercise are vital issues in Galen's naturalistic thought which he discusses in a group of technical works.<sup>118</sup> In this section, I would like to explore briefly some cases of material common both to these works and the *Exhortation* in an attempt to illuminate Galen's moralising twists in the latter text and further stress how his ethical pronouncements require subtle transformations in order to resonate with his young audience and the requirements of his philosophical exposition.

The first example comes from the short essay *Good Condition*; here Galen examines the definition of "good condition" in cases where reference is made to an individual's nature, suggesting that one should add the name of the person, for instance "Dion's good condition" or "Milo's good condition".<sup>119</sup> Milo of Croton was a well-known wrestler of the sixth century BC (considered a follower of Pythagoras), whom Galen compares in this context to Heracles and Achilles, both representing positive cases of good condition in the unqualified sense. However, subsequently he twice adduces the authority of Hippocrates to warn against extreme bodily states: "Among people who take gymnastic exercise, the extremes of good condition are dangerous" and "The athletic state is not natural; better the healthy condition".<sup>120</sup> Both of these Hippocratic statements each occur twice in the *Exhortation*,<sup>121</sup> and Hercules too is used here as a positive model of physical resilience.<sup>122</sup> In the *Exhortation*, however, the figure of Milo is treated in the most negative fashion, as Galen devotes a remarkable amount of space to showing that Milo's physical achievements were a manifestation of incredible stupidity,<sup>123</sup> linked to the hero's servile sacrifice of his soul<sup>124</sup> (which Galen calls "worthless").<sup>125</sup> Moreover, Galen depicts Milo as devoid of rationality, making his approach to life appear useless in

---

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Galen, *Mor.*, ed. Kraus (1939) 44 for the sciences reforming the soul. The contradiction between the end and function of the so-called stochastic arts, including medicine, gave rise to heated debates in Galen's time; on how Galen and his contemporary and rival, Alexander of Aphrodisias (AD 2nd c.) explain this contradiction, see Ierodiakonou (1995).

<sup>118</sup> On Galen's attitude towards physical exercise, see the descriptive article of Barraud (1938). Also Schlange-Schöningh (2003: 127-33).

<sup>119</sup> Galen, *Bon. Hab.*, ed. Kühn (1822) IV.751.13-5 = ed. Helmreich (1901) 17.15-16 = ed. Bertini Malgarini (1992) 106.21-2.

<sup>120</sup> Galen, *Bon. Hab.*, ed. Kühn (1822) IV.752.4-14 = ed. Helmreich (1901) 17.22-18.10 = ed. Bertini Malgarini (1992) 106-108. Translations come from Singer (1997).

<sup>121</sup> From [Hippocrates], *Aph.*, 1.3.18, ed. Littré (1844) IV.458.13 = ed. Jones (1931) IV.99 at Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.27.13-14 = ed. Boudon (2000) 106.15-16 and *Protr.* 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.30.1-2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 108.22-3. From [Hippocrates], *De Alim.*, 34, ed. Littré (1861) IX.110.11-13 = ed. Heiberg (1927) 82.21-2 = ed. Joly (1972) 145.2-3 at Galen, *Protr.*, 10, ed. Kühn (1821) I.25.7-8 = ed. Boudon (2000) 104.15-16 and *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.29.12-13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 108.15-16.

<sup>122</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.33.9-13 = ed. Boudon (2000) 112.3-7.

<sup>123</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.34.5 = ed. Boudon (2000) 112.17-18: ὃ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης ἀνοίας.

<sup>124</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.34.3-35.11 = ed. Boudon (2000) 112.15-114.4.

<sup>125</sup> Galen, *Protr.*, 13, ed. Kühn (1821) I.34.9-10 = ed. Boudon (2000) 113.4.

comparison to Themistocles' wisdom.<sup>126</sup> Those reconfigurings reflect Galen's moralising input in his *Exhortation*, a text concerned with distancing its young readers from an excessive preoccupation with the body.

Galen's interest in depicting physical exercise through an ethical lens is also seen in his essay *The Exercise with the Small Ball*, where again the degree of moralising is restrained in relation to his *Exhortation*. This essay is addressed to Epigenes, a man of superlative physical condition – by Galen's own account –, to whom our author proposes the most superior kind of physical activity, i.e. exercise with the small ball. The precise nature of this sport is as yet unclear,<sup>127</sup> but what is interesting is that Galen embraces it because it does not just exercise the body, but above all delights the soul.<sup>128</sup> This is, in fact, a recurrent motif in this essay, emphasising the soul's superiority to the body<sup>129</sup> and stressing that this form of exercise assists both body and soul to achieve their respective excellences.<sup>130</sup> By contrast, Galen condemns wrestling on the grounds that it renders the intellect idle and sleepy, promoting body-building rather than the cultivation of virtue.<sup>131</sup> In this connection, Galen claims that if one engages with wrestling, one's chances of a brilliant generalship or political power are minimal and that it would be better to assign such public duties to pigs than to wrestlers.<sup>132</sup> The material here echoes a certain passage from the second part of the *Exhortation* where, as we have seen, Galen remonstrates with athletes for their body-building on the grounds that this extinguishes their rational capacities and makes pigs of them.<sup>133</sup>

Thus we can see that Galen reworks very similar material in the moral context of the *Exhortation* but in a manner that makes his argumentation more powerful, especially through the use of more direct condemnation devices. The retexturing patterns also show that Galen's principles of philosophical moderation in relation to the care of the body is an overarching feature of his moralising medicine, which controls all other types of bodily knowledge. That is quite clear, for instance, in his *On the Preservation of Health*, a work dedicated to health care, but not free from moral overtones. In a series of recommendations on physical health for adolescents, Galen once again strikes a balance between lack of exercise and extreme gymnastics and stresses how this balance has a direct bearing on a young man's character formation, with the right balance ensuring orderly behaviour (εὐκοσμία) and ready obedience (εὐπειθεία).<sup>134</sup>

### Intended Audience of the *Exhortation*

---

<sup>126</sup> The *chreia* of Milo seems to be a famous one, occurring, *inter alios*, also in Cicero's *On Old Age* 10.33, Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory* 1.10, Aelian's *Various History* 12.22 and 14.47b, and Lucian's *Charon* 8.

<sup>127</sup> Mendner (1959), Nickel (1976); for a description of the sport, see Wenkebach (1938: 275-9). See also Robinson (1955: 182-90) for other references to exercises with a ball such as Pollux or Athenaeus. On the popularity of ball games in the Imperial period, see Harris (1972: 75-111).

<sup>128</sup> Galen, *Parv. Pil.*, ed. Kühn (1823) V.899.10-900.1 = ed. Marquardt (1884) 93.10-12.

<sup>129</sup> Galen, *Parv. Pil.*, ed. Kühn (1823) V.900.10-12 = ed. Marquardt (1884) 94.5-8.

<sup>130</sup> Galen, *Parv. Pil.*, ed. Kühn (1823) V.906.14-907.1 = ed. Marquardt (1884) 97.7-11: Μάλιστα οὖν ἐπαινώ γυμνάσιον, ὃ καὶ σώματος ὑγίειαν ἐκπορίζει, καὶ μερῶν εὐαρμοστίαν, καὶ ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν παρὰ τοῦτοις...καὶ γὰρ εἰς πάντα ψυχὴν δυνατὸν ὠφελεῖν.

<sup>131</sup> Galen, *Parv. Pil.*, ed. Kühn (1823) V.905.10-13 = ed. Marquardt (1884) 98.8-12.

<sup>132</sup> Galen, *Parv. Pil.*, ed. Kühn (1823) V.905.14-17 = ed. Marquardt (1884) 98.13-16.

<sup>133</sup> Galen, *Protr.* 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.26.17-27.9 = ed. Boudon (2000) 106.1-11; Galen, *Protr.*, 11, ed. Kühn (1821) I.28.14-29.2 = ed. Boudon (2000) 107.15-108.4.

<sup>134</sup> Galen, *San. Tu.*, 1.12, ed. Kühn (1823) VI.60.8-18 = ed. Koch (1923) 28.22-31.

As we have seen, in the first section of the treatise Galen refers to passions or flaws that are especially predictable to young men such as deriving pride from family distinction, wealth, physical beauty, or falling victim to flatterers, sexual desire, and excessive exercise, all of which might hinder them from leading a philosophically-minded life. This section is populated with quotations from epic, lyric, and tragic poems with which young readers would have been well familiar from their literary studies. At the same time Galen makes extensive use of anecdotes and sayings about famous men from Greek history, mythology, and philosophy, which were important features of the general curriculum (*enkyklios paideia*), as shown. By using these, Galen attempts to encourage young men to fully appreciate the importance of education, urging them to embark upon the study of the arts as they move on to a more advanced stage in their learning. Philosophy is of course the next step they should take, but the end of the second section of the treatise makes it clear that Galen envisages the work to operate as an exhortation to the study of medicine in particular, which Galen considers the most conspicuous art of all, and which normally comes alongside philosophical studies or just after them.<sup>135</sup> Although it is surely delusive to say with confidence that this is the kind of audience that actually read the *Exhortation*, it is certainly true that in this work Galen constructs or conjures up images of a young audience, intending it to act as an educational manual of considerable moralising intensification for prospective medical students.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that Galen's *Exhortation to the Study of Medicine* is not a conventional epideictic piece, but one in which rhetoric to a large extent facilitates philosophical instruction. As I have tried to show, the work abounds in educational elements, which are consistent with its more developed moralising in relation to what we get in other works treating the mechanics of the body. We have also seen how Galen's authority imposes itself on what Galen expects to be an inexperienced, young audience in an attempt to initiate them into some of the tenets of philosophical training with a view to leading them to study medicine. This accounts for Galen's avoidance of theoretical and technical material, which is replaced by practical counsel instead. The function of Galen's protreptic is less to develop independent thought than to arouse desire, eliminate erroneous impressions and provide safe choices to young people moving from literary and rhetorical studies to a philosophical education, presumably with a view to becoming physicians later on.

The Socratic protreptic entails elenctic admonition, Aristotle's (fragmentary) protreptic elaborate arguments and a concluding peroration, Seneca's protreptic is an epistolary refutation of Posidonius, while that of Iamblichus is an anthology of protreptics in the form of exegesis. Galen's protreptic is of a different sort, not only in that it is an authoritative monologue verging on a traditional diatribe, but mostly because of its peculiar moralising rhetoric, which seems to cast a wide net, thus making it a public rather than an intimate piece. Its scope is also significant because of its close interplay with a good number of philosophical sources, not just the later

---

<sup>135</sup> Galen started his philosophical studies at the age of 14, Nutton (2004: 217). [Soranus], *Introduction*, ed. Rose (1870) II.244-5, recommends beginning medical education at the age of 15; see Drabkin (1944: 337), Carrier (2016: 34-6; 60-2). On medical education in antiquity, see Bannert (2015), Carrier (2016: 105-19); cf. Kudlien (1970a).

Stoic tradition, such as Posidonius and Seneca, but also with the Platonic and Aristotelian tradition, and most notably Plutarch; it is this richness and the diversity of Galen's treatment of moral issues that makes him stand out in ancient philosophical culture. The Lamprias catalogue, an ancient list of Plutarch's works, informs us that Plutarch himself produced two protreptics, *An Exhortation to Philosophy, Addressed to a Rich Young Man* (no. 207) and *An Exhortation to Philosophy, Addressed to Asclepiades of Pergamum* (no. 214), both of them lost. Attempting to prove that Galen's *Exhortation* drew on these two works must surely remain a matter of speculation, but, on the basis of the other close parallels shared between the two authors, I hope at least to have sparked interest in the possibility of Galen trying to enter the moral legacy that Plutarch inherited and enriched, and to enjoy (some of) the latter's popularity as a startling moralist of the Graeco-Roman period. Even if Galen's affiliation to Plutarch is not conscious or direct (which I think is), it does have something to tell us about the former's sustained work in the area of moral philosophy and its envisaged impact on his contemporary philosophical and intellectual landscape.

## Bibliography

### Texts and Translations Used

- Aldina. (ed.). 1525. *Γαληνοῦ Α΄. Galeni librorum pars prima*. Venice: Aldus.
- Amato, E. (ed.) and Y. Julien. (tr.). 2005. *Favorinos d'Arles, Oeuvres I. Introduction générale - Témoignages - Discours aux Corinthiens - Sur la Fortune*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Barigazzi, A. (ed.). 1991. *Galenus De optimo docendi genere, Exhortatio ad medicinam (Protrepticus)*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Bazou, A. (ed.). 2011. *Γαληνοῦ Ὅτι ταῖς τοῦ σώματος κράσεσιν αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις ἔπονται*. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Bertini Malgarini, A. (ed.). 1992. *Galeno. De optima corporis nostri constitutione e De bono habitu*; traduzione dal greco e commento. Rome: Mediamed.
- Boudon-Millot, V. (ed. and tr.). 2007. *Galien, Œuvres, Tome I. Introduction générale; sur l'ordre de ses propres livres; Sur ses propres livres; Que l'excellent médecin est aussi philosophe*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Boudon-Millot, V., Jouanna, J. and A. Pirotbelli. (eds. and trs.). 2010. *Galien, Tome IV: Ne pas se chagriner*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Boudon, V. (ed.). 2000. *Galien: Exhortation à la médecine; Art medical*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Calderini, G. and I. Ginevra. (eds). 1986. *Galeno, Nobiltà delle arti*. Naples: D'Auria.
- De Boer. W. (ed.). 1937. *Galenus De propriorum animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione; De animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione; De atra bile*. Leipzig and Berlin: in aedibus Teubneri.
- De Lacy, Ph. (ed. and tr.). 1978-84. *Galen On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*. 3 Vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Fitzgerald, J. T. and L. M. White. (eds.). 1983. *The Tabula of Cebes*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Heiberg. J. L. (ed). 1927. *Hippocratis, De alimento*. Leipzig and Berlin: in aedibus Teubneri.

- Helmreich, G. (ed.). 1901. *Galenus: De optima corporis constitutione. Idem de bono habitu*. Programm des Kgl. humanistischen Gymnasiums. Hof: F. Junge.
- Iskandar, A. Z. (ed. and tr.). 1988. *Galeni De optimo medico cognoscendo*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Joly, R. (ed.). 1972. *Hippocrate: Tome VI,2, De l'aliment*, Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Jones, W. H. S. (ed.). 1931. *Hippocrates: Aphorisms (vol. IV)*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kaibel, G. (ed.) 1894; repr. 1963. *Cl. Galeni Protrepatici quae supersunt*. Berlin: apud Weidmannos.
- Koch, K. (ed.). 1923. *Galeni De sanitate tuenda libri vi*. Leipzig et Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Kotzia, P. and P. Sotiroudis. (eds.). 2010. 'Γαληνοῦ Περί ἀλοπίας', *Ἑλληνικά* 60: 63-148.
- Kraus, P. (ed.). 1939. 'Kitâb al-Akhlâq li-Jâlînus', *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts of the Egyptian University* 5,1: 1-51.
- Kühn, K. G. (ed.). 1821-33. *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*. 20 vols in 22. Leipzig: Knobloch.
- Lamoreaux, J.C. (ed. and tr.). 2016. *Hunayn ibn Ishāq on His Galen Translations*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press.
- Littré, É. (ed.). 1839-61. *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate: traduction nouvelle avec le texte grec en regard, collationné sur les manuscrits et toutes les éditions; accompagnée d'une introduction, de commentaires médicaux, de variantes et de notes philologiques; suivie d'une table générale des matières*. 10 vols. Paris: J.-B. Baillière.
- Marquardt, I. (ed.). 1884. *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Scripta Minora*, recensuerunt I. Marquardt, I. Mueller, G. Helmreich, vol. I. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Migne, J.-P. (ed.). 1883. *Patrologiae cursus completus*. Series Latina, vol. XXIII. Paris: Garnier frères.
- Müller, I. (ed.). 1891. *Claudii Galeni Pergameni Scripta Minora*, recensuerunt I. Marquardt, I. Mueller, G. Helmreich, vol. II. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Nutton, V. (ed. and tr.). 1979. *Galeni De Praecognitione*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Pesce, D. (ed.). 1982. *La Tavola di Cebete*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice.
- Pistelli, H. (ed.). 1888. *Iamblichii Protrepiticus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Pohlenz, M., Hubert, C., et al. (eds.). 1929-78. *Plutarchi Moralia*. 7 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Prächter, K. (ed.). 1893. *Cebetis tabula*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Raeder, J. (ed.). 1928-33. *Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae*. 2 vols. in 4. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Rose, V. (ed.). 1870. *Anecdota Graeca et Graecolatina*, vol. II. Berlin: Ferd. Duemmler's.
- Slings, S. R. (ed. and tr.). 1999. *Plato: Clitophon*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Trapp, M. B. (ed.). 1994. *Maximus Tyrius Dissertationes*. Stuttgart-Leipzig: Teubner.
- von Arnim, J. (ed.). 1893-96. *Dionis Prusaensis quem vacant Chrysostomum quae extant omnia*. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Wenkebach, E. (ed.). 1935. 'Galens Protrepitikosfragment', *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin* 4: 88-121.
- Wilkins, J. (ed. and tr.). 2013. *Sur les facultés des aliments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Zervos, S. (ed.). 1901. *Gynaekologie des Aëtios*. Leipzig: A. Mangkos.

## References

- Bannert, H. 2015. 'Medical education', in M. Bloomer (ed.), *A companion to ancient education*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 413-29.
- Barigazzi, A. 1979. 'Sul titolo del Protreptico di Galeno', *Prometheus* 5: 157-63.
- Barraud, G. 1938. 'Galen et l'éducation physique', *Bulletin de la Société française d'histoire de la médecine* 32: 164-9.
- Barton, T. 1994. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bergk, T. 1846. 'On the age of Babrius', *Classical Museum* 4: 115-43.
- Burgess, T. C. 1902. 'Epideictic Literature', *Studies in Classical Philology* [Chicago] 3: 89-261.
- Carrier, R. 2016. *Science and education in the early Roman empire*. Durham, North Carolina: Pitchstone Publishing.
- Chamberlain, C. 1984. 'The meaning of *prohairesis* in Aristotele's Ethics', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 147-57.
- Clarke, M.L. 1971. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Criore, R. 1996. *Writing, teachers, and students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Crusius, O. 1884. 'Ein Lehrgedicht des Plutarch (Echtheit von Galen's Protrepticus, Versspuren, Galen und Plutarch, Plutarch und Phaedrus)', *Rheinisches Museum* 39: 581-606.
- Curtis, T. A. 2009. *Rhetorical strategies and generic conventions in the Galenic corpus*. University of Newcastle: Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Curtis, T. 2014. 'Genre and Galen's philosophical discourses', in P. Adamson, R. Hansberger, J. Wilberding (eds), *Philosophical themes in Galen*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 39-59.
- De Lacy, Ph. 1966. 'Galen and the Greek poets', *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7.3: 259-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. 'Galen's response to skepticism', *Illinois Classical Studies* 16: 283-306.
- Dickerman, S. O. 1911. 'Some stock illustrations of animal intelligence in Greek psychology', *Transaction and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 42: 123-130.
- Drabkin, I. E. 1944. 'On medical education in Greece and Rome', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 15: 333-51.
- Flashar, H. 1965. 'Plato und Aristoteles im Protreptikos des Jamblichos', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 47: 53-79.
- Fleming, R. 2008. 'Commentary', in J. R. Hankinson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Galen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 323-54.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 2011. 'Theophrastus and Strato on Animal Intelligence', in M.-L. Desclos and W. W. Fortenbaugh (eds.), *Strato of Lampsacus: Text, Translation, and Discussion*. New Brunswick, N.J.; London: Transaction Publishers, 399-412.
- Gercke, A. 1886. 'De Galeno et Plutarcho', *Rheinisches Museum* 41: 470-2.
- Gorgemanns, H. 2001. 'Protreptik', in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly Encyclopädie der Antike*, vol. X. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 468-71.
- Harris, H. A. 1972. *Sport in Greece and Rome*. London: Thames and Hudson.

- Hartlich, P. 1889. 'De exhortationum a Graecis Romanisque scriptarum historia et indole', *Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie* 11: 207-336.
- Herbst, W. 1911. *Galen de Atticissantium Studiis Testimonia*. (Diss. Marburg). Leipzig.
- Ierodiakonou, K. 1995. 'Alexander of Aphrodisias on Medicine as a Stochastic Art', in Ph. van der Eijk, H. F. J. Horstmanshoff and P. H. Schrijvers (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*, vol. II (Clio Medica 28). Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 473-85.
- Johnson, W. A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, M. D. 1986. 'Ancient philosophic protreptic and the problem of persuasive genres', *Rhetorica* 4: 309-33.
- Jouanna, J. 2012. 'Galen's reading of Hippocratic ethics', in J. Jouanna (ed.), *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*. Leiden: Brill, 259-85.
- König, J. 2005. *Athletics and literature in the Roman empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kudlien, F. 1970a. 'Medical education in Classical Antiquity', in C. D. O'Malley (ed.), *The History of Medical Education*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 3-37.
- Kudlien, F. 1970b. 'Medical ethics and popular ethics in Greece and Rome', *Clio Medica* 5: 91-121.
- Malherbe, A. J. 1986. *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman sourcebook*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Manetti, D. and A. Roselli. 1994. 'Galeno commentatore di Ippocrate', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 37.2: 1529-635.
- Mattock, J. 1972. 'A translation of the Arabic epitome of Galen's book *Peri êthôn*', in S.M. Stern, A. Hourani, V. Brown (eds), *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays Presented by his Friends and Pupils to Richard Walzer on his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford: Cassirer, 235-60.
- Mendner, S. 1959. 'Das Spiel Phaininda-Harpastum', *Gymnasium* 66: 517-24.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuville, S. and T. M. Johnson. 1988. *Exhortation to philosophy: including the letters of Iamblichus and Proclus' commentary on the Chaldean oracles / Iamblichus*; translated from the Greek by Thomas Moore Johnson. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Phanes Press.
- Newmyer, S. T. 2005. *Animals, right and reason in Plutarch and modern ethics*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Nickel, D. 1976. 'Ein Ballspiel im Urteil des Arztes. Bemerkungen zu Galens Schrift "Über die Übung mit dem kleinen Ball"', *Internationale Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Ethik der Naturwissenschaften, Technik und Medizin* 13.2: 77-81.
- Nikolaidis, A. 2002. *Σενέκα Επιστολή 90*. Athens: Stigmi.
- Nutton, V. 2004. *Ancient Medicine*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rainfurt, A. 1904. *Zur Quellenkritik von Galens Protreptikos*. Freiburg im Breisgau: PhD Thesis.
- Robinson, R. S. 1955. *Sources for the history of Greek athletics in English translation: with introductions, notes, bibliography and indices*. Cincinnati: Robinson.

- Rosen, R. M. 2008. 'Socratism in Galen's psychological works', in C. Brockmann (ed.), *Antike Medizin im Schnittpunkt von Geistes- und Naturwissenschaften (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 155-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. 'Galen, satire and the compulsion to instruct', in M. Horstmanshoff and C. van Tilburg (eds), *Hippocrates and Medical Education: Selected papers read at the XIIth International Hippocrates Colloquium Universiteit Leiden 24–26 August 2005*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 323-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. 'Galen on Poetic Testimony', in M. Asper (ed.), *Writing Science: Medical and Mathematical Authorship in Ancient Greece*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 177-89.
- Schenkeveld, D. 1992. 'Prose usages of akouein "to read"', *Classical Quarterly* 42: 129-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. 'Philosophical prose', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C- A.D. 400*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 195-264.
- Schlange-Schöningen, H. 2003. *Die römische Gesellschaft bei Galen. Biographie und Sozialgeschichte*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Schneeweiss, G. 2005. *Protrepikos: Hinführung zur Philosophie: Aristoteles; rekonstruiert, übersetzt und kommentiert von Gerhart Schneeweiss*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schöne, H. 1920. 'Verschiedenes', *Rheinisches Museum* 73: 137-60.
- Singer, P. 1997. *Galen: Selected works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). 2014. *Galen: Psychological Writings: Avoiding distress, Character Traits, The Diagnosis and Treatment of the Affections and Errors Peculiar to Each Person's Soul, The Capacities of the Soul depend on the Mixtures of the Body*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slings, S. R. 1995, 'Protrepic in ancient theories of philosophical literature', in J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: a collection of papers in honour of D.M. Schenkeveld*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 173-92.
- Stowers, S. K. 1986. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Szarmach, M. 1990-2. 'Der Protrepik von Galenos als rhetorische Werk', *Acta antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 33: 117-21.
- Trapp, M. 1997. 'On the Tablet of Cebes', in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle and After (B.I.C.S. Supplement 68)*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 159-80.
- van Nijf, O. 2008. 'Athletics and *paideia*: festival and physical education in the world of the second sophistic', in B. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: the world of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter: 203-24.
- van Nuffelen, P. and L. van Hoof. 2013. 'Posidonius and the Golden Age: A Note on Seneca, *Epistulae morales* 90', *Latomus* 72: 186-95.
- von Staden, H. 2003. 'Galen's daimon: reflections on "irrational" and "rational"', in N. Palmieri (ed.), *Rationnel et irrationnel dans la médecine ancienne et médiévale: aspects historiques, scientifiques et culturels*. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'université de Saint-Etienne, 15-43.
- Wenkebach, E. 1933. 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Galens Protrepikosfragment', *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 26.3: 205-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1938. 'Galenos von Pergamon: Allgemeine Ertüchtigung durch Ballspiel. Eine sporthygienische Schrift aus dem zweiten Jahrhundert n. Chr.', *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften* 31: 254-97.

- Xenophontos, S. 2010. 'The complementarity of Plutarch's *Πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιμάτων ἀκούειν* and *Περὶ τοῦ ἀκούειν*. Two educational 'sessions' (re)visited', *Rosetta* 8.5: 164-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. 'Psychotherapy and moralising rhetoric in Galen's newly discovered *Avoiding distress (Peri alypias)*', *Medical History* 58.4: 585-603.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016a. *Ethical education in Plutarch: moralising agents and contexts*. Berlin.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016b. 'Casting light on the connection between Pseudo-Plutarch's *On the education of children* and Galen's *Exhortation to the study of medicine*', *Latomus* 75: 71-7.