

Caroline Petit, Simon Swain, and Klaus-Dietrich Fischer, eds., *Pseudo-Galenica. The Formation of the Galenic Corpus from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. London: University of London Press, 2021. 224 pp. ISBN: 9781908590572.

In recent decades, there has been a significantly increased interest in the work of Galen of Pergamum, resulting in many new editions, translations, and interpretations. The early 19th century Kühn edition, however, though it is gradually being superseded, is still the standard edition for many Galenic works. As is well-known, this edition is not without problems, and among other things, it includes a number of Pseudo-Galenic works, while it does not contain some of the authentic works we now have.

The volume here under review adds to our knowledge of the Galenic corpus by offering an in-depth discussion of some of those doubtful and spurious works, their history and transmission, as well as their value as sources for the history of science and philosophy. In the words of the editors, this book is meant to “help all the readers interested in Galen and ‘Galenism’ from antiquity to the present to navigate the muddy waters of the corpus more confidently” (p. ix). In some places, the editors perhaps somewhat exaggerate the current situation, when they state that readers of Galen may be misled and deceived because of the poor state of Kühn’s edition, referring to the inauthentic works included. After all, there are some easily accessible and handy overviews detailing all extant Galenic and Pseudo-Galenic works, including various editions and translations, also distinguishing those thought to be of doubtful authenticity or spurious from those considered authentic, such as Kollesch and Nickel’s *Bibliographia Galeniana* (1994), the appendices in Hankinson’s *Cambridge Companion to Galen* (2008), and Singer’s *Galen: Psychological Writings* (2013). Thus, it is not the case that even beginning students of Galen must enter the Kühnian swamp without further guidance.

Nonetheless, the importance of the work done in this book is obvious. First, there is a growing appreciation of Galen’s immense influence on medieval and early modern science and philosophy, and some of the many Pseudo-Galenic texts that were in circulation were very influential in those time-periods. Thus, it is unwise to neglect such works—and they have been relatively neglected—in our studies of the history of science between antiquity and modernity, just because we have learned that they were not in fact written by Galen himself. Second, besides their value in offering an interesting general survey of Pseudo-Galenic texts and their history and influence, many chapters in this book also make important progress in the exegesis and textual analysis of specific Pseudo-Galenic texts.

NUNCIUS

Published with license by Koninklijke Brill NV | DOI:10.1163/18253911-bja10051

© ROBERT VINKESTEIJN, 2023 | ISSN: 0394-7394 (print) 1825-3911 (online)
 Downloaded from Brill.com04/18/2023 12:11:07PM
 via Universiteit Utrecht

The volume started with a conference at the Warburg Institute in 2015, and consists of a brief introduction, and twelve chapters each concerned with specific Pseudo-Galenic works, time-periods, or language traditions. The chapter by Véronique Boudon-Millot stands out, as she argues, convincingly in my opinion, that the *De Theriaca ad Pisonem* was not written by Galen and that it must have entered the Galenic corpus somewhere between the 3rd and 6th century AD. Doubts were cast on this text throughout history, but it was widely used and quoted throughout the medieval tradition. Its authenticity has been the subject of debate in modern scholarship as well, but this well-researched and clearly presented chapter by Boudon-Millot may perhaps settle the question.

Several other chapters analyse the history of texts that have been agreed to be Pseudo-Galenic for some time in modern scholarship, and that date back to antiquity. Vivian Nutton provides a chapter on three Pseudo-Galenic texts on pharmaceuticals that seem to have been written in Galen's own lifetime and can tell us something about medical practice and writing in 2nd and 3rd century AD Rome. Marie Cronier traces and evaluates the transmission of the Pseudo-Galenic *Definitiones Medicae*, building on previous work by Kollesch. Caroline Petit analyses the history of four Pseudo-Galenic works from volume XIX of Kühn's edition, reconstructing their possible origins and transmission, and showing how they ended up in Kühn's edition because of Kühn's uncritical attitude towards Chartier's edition, which was characterized by a very inclusive approach. Laurence Totelin discusses the three books of *Euporista*—collections of remedies that were easy to procure, written with a practical focus—that were ascribed to Galen under the title *De remediis parabilibus*, concluding that the last two are almost certainly Pseudo-Galenic, while the first may go back to authentic Galenic work. This chapter also provides a short but useful overview of the genre of the *Euporista* as such. Petros Bouras-Vallianatos discusses the history of three Pseudo-Galenic texts on urine and the pulse in late Byzantine. His chapter provides an interesting perspective on the practical use of these texts (which seemed to have mattered more, to its Byzantine readers, than questions of authenticity) and on the way various texts from various authors were combined. He also discusses possible sources in an analysis that nicely brings out the complicated status of such texts, and provides a basic edition of the texts. Mauro Zonta deals with the textual history Galen's *Περὶ ἀλυσίας*, for which we were completely dependent on Arabic and Hebrew translations until recently, and shows the importance of Medieval Hebrew quotations in the 13th century Spanish Jewish philosopher Falaquera for the textual reconstruction of this work. Siam Bhayro's chapter is not focused on one particular text, rather it provides an illuminating discussion of changing attitudes towards the question of authenticity, and changing conceptions of the very

conditions for what counts as authentic, in the Syriac and Arabic translation movements on the basis of Sergius' and Hunayn's dealings with Galenic and Pseudo-Galenic texts.

There are also a few chapters concerned with the Latin editions of Galen from the 15th century. Stefania Fortuna provides a brief history of the Latin editions of the Galenic corpus made in the 15th and 16th centuries, including an overview of the Pseudo-Galenic texts contained in them. Allen Shotwell analyses early 16th century lecture notes on anatomy of the Bologna-based philosopher and physician Alessandro Achillini, showing how the then available Latin editions of Galen's work, including Pseudo-Galenic texts such as the *De anatomia vivorum*, influenced anatomical study in early 16th century Bologna. Christina Savino presents the story of Galen's commentary on the Hippocratic *Epidemics* book II, which was entirely lost in Greek, but of which a Renaissance forgery ended up in Kühn's edition. She shows how it is likely that the Greek text in Kühn is a translation of a Latin falsification, made by the 16th century physician and humanist Giovanni Battista Rasario, who based himself on Galenic and Hippocratic works, as well as on later compilers such as Oribasius and Paul of Aegina. Finally, Outi Merisalo discusses the history of the Pseudo-Galenic *De spermate*, which appeared in the 12th century and became part of Chartier's edition in the 17th century.

Most of the chapters of this book are especially valuable to a highly specialized audience of scholars concerned with the textual tradition of specific Galenic and Pseudo-Galenic works, and as far as I can tell, many chapters provide very useful work in this regard. As a scholar of Galen's work who has not been specifically concerned with most of the Pseudo-Galenic texts under discussion, I find that this book, with its analysis of a variety of cases, also provides a useful introduction to the complex textual history of the vast (Pseudo-)Galenic corpus.

Robert Vinkesteijn

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany;

Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

r.w.vinkesteijn@uu.nl