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God and the doctor we alike adore
But only when in danger, not before;
The danger o'er, both are alike requited,
God is forgotten, and the Doctor slighted.

John Owen, ob. 1622.
PREFACE

To write a social history of the Roman Empire which does justice to its variety is an almost impossible task and the brilliant essay of Rostovtseff has found few continuators. Historians have preferred to concentrate upon three approaches which must be combined in a general survey but which in a particular treatment can receive different emphases.

A.H.M. Jones in his 'Later Roman Empire' attempted a chronologically restricted account: Meiggs and Levick have preferred to concentrate upon a particular city or area throughout the period of Roman rule: Kunkel set out to demonstrate the vicissitudes of one particular social group, the Roman lawyers. Each of these approaches, if followed to the exclusion of the others, leads to a sterile antiquarianism, and in this thesis which aims to delineate the medical profession in the Roman Empire, I have endeavoured to combine them as far as possible. The social position of a doctor can only be fully understood within his area and within a chronological context.

Works on ancient medicine have in the past concentrated more upon the theories of the sects than upon the medical practitioner. The old article of Salomon Reinach with its copious documentation is thus of greater value than Allbutt's 'Greek Medicine in Rome', which describes many of the ideas and medical opinions of the Roman doctors without attempting to relate them to their social context.

More recently, Below has studied the doctor's legal position, and Edelstein and Temkin have suggested many new interpretations of old problems. Nevertheless, since the history of medicine, especially in this country, has long been the preserve of the
interested amateur, many authors who lack a sound historical training have preferred unprovable speculation to the evidence of the texts and have uncritically mixed fact and fantasy in a way that makes detailed refutation lengthy and tedious. Thus few references will be found in the footnotes to the abundant secondary literature on medical history recorded in the bibliography.

A survey as detailed as that of Kunkel is ruled out by the nature of the evidence: the inscriptions, mainly collected in the catalogues of Oehler and Gummerus, are numerous, and I have preferred to rely upon a selection to illustrate a point rather than present a complete list. The literary evidence is also too abundant to permit an examination of the background and career of every doctor, and the length of time covered by this thesis is itself a handicap to such an inquiry. Many developments begun in the first century only reach their final form in the fifth or sixth centuries, and apparent uniformity is only attained in the Later Empire. A detailed discussion of all the problems is thus impossible and I have chosen to discuss only those that seem most relevant to my theme; social attitudes towards doctors, their relations with their patients, their wealth and social status, their families and their civic offices.

Chapter 4 is substantially a new assessment of the epigraphic evidence derived from a survey of all inscriptions and reliefs of doctors in the Roman Empire, and I have added further notes on Galen and his contemporaries to give greater precision to the conclusions already reached by Ilberg. My discussion of the archiatri, which will be found in Chapters 2 and 7 is also new and corrects some of the results of Pohl's dissertation, which is more cited than read. The Later Empire and its
medicine are almost unknown and save for the works of Temkin, Kühlewein and Sigerist summarised in Chapter 10, little has been done. Frings' dissertation is weakest on the social background and ends with John Chrysostom, leaving the late fifth and sixth centuries to be examined further by me in Chapter 8. No satisfactory account of early medical education has previously been written, and thus much of Chapter 9 is claimed as original work, especially the section on 'medical schools'.

A thesis such as this which incorporates inscriptive material owes much to the kindness and help of museum directors and their staffs, and to the interest of other scholars who have placed at my disposal unpublished material or who have assisted my epigraphic wanderings by advice and discussion. Among them I should especially like to thank the Rev. E.A. Bader, Prof. G. Barbieri, Mrs D.K. Bowen, Mr. J.A. Crook, Prof. L. Gasperini, Prof. C. Habicht, Mr. M.K. Hopkins, Dr. A.W. James, Mr. T.B. Mitford, Prof. M. Napoli, Prof. G. Pugliese Carratelli, Dr. J.K.S. St. Joseph, Miss J.M. Reynolds, Mr. B. Warmington and Mr. A.G. Woodhead. My thanks also go to Mrs. B. Horrell who laboured valiantly to type a difficult and obscure manuscript. I was also able to enjoy the facilities of the British Schools of Archaeology at Athens, Ankara and Rome and of the Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica in Rome. I wish also to thank the Department of Education and Science and the University of Cambridge for grants to carry out this work, and my own college for innumerable benefits. Above all my gratitude must go to my supervisor, Prof. A.H.M. Jones whose kindness, learning and salutary criticism have contributed greatly to the merits of this thesis.

This dissertation is the result of my own individual work and no part has been carried out in collaboration with anyone else.

V. Nutton.
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CHAPTER ONE

The medical profession in the West; (i) until the death of Nero.

The origins of medicine in Rome and the West are only slightly more obscure than its republican developments and the elder Pliny's tendentious chapters summarising what were traditionally considered the most important changes are almost the only source for its early history. Amid much polemic one point is clear: that while the Romans practised domestic medicine and families preserved and transmitted knowledge of healing drugs and potions, sophisticated practice and technique entered only with the Greeks. The first such medical practitioner is said to be Archagathus, a surgeon who, arriving in Rome from the Peloponnese in 219 B.C., was granted citizenship and a taberna at public expense. Although he was at first popular, his savage methods brought him into disrepute as a mere butcher, and his art and all other doctors became objects of loathing. But even this testimony reveals other physicians active in Rome and the importance of his visit probably lies in his eminence in the contemporary Greek world. Pliny implies and Cato confirms the existence of native Italian medicine, practised within a family, assisted by some more experienced druggist, which continued throughout the second century B.C. and probably later. Little can be said about its technique or its diffusion, and here we encounter the first difficulty. Is the almost complete silence of the authorities upon Romans practising medicine to be taken as an indication of their low status, or is it just coincidence that only doctors of Greek and S. Italian origin are mentioned as the friends and companions of senators and the wealthy? Both Pliny and Cato suggest an influx of Greek medical techniques in the
second century which superseded native methods without entirely destroying them and it may be true that when these novelties found favour, their exponents would be Greeks. Even if this assumption is not granted, the problem is immediately twofold; on the one hand, we must attempt to discover the existence of Roman and Western doctors, on the other hand, the apparent domination of medical practice by Greeks involves the question of the status of doctors with that of the influence and status of Greeks in the Roman Empire.

The first part can be quickly dealt with. Literary and archaeological sources show Etruscan medicine as a curious blend of accurate observation and superstition, and the Etruscan doctors recorded upon inscriptions do not appear to be of great wealth. Cicero in his Pro Cluentio introduces a travelling pharmacist with an accessible store of potions and poisons, and these humble drugsellers reappear in the works of Scribonius Largus where some of their recondite remedies are described. While important doctors argue over a case, others less skilled and far removed from the practice of medicine cure the patient by a drug and their numbers are supposed to be large. Himself trained by some of the best doctors and surgeons of the day, Celsus of Centuripae, Paccius Antiochus, and Tryphon the elder, and with important connections with Crete and the imperial household, Largus can effect to despise and condemn those druggists whose knowledge is limited and who do not scruple to provide a deadly poison to all and sundry, or an efficacious but dangerous drug. Even the elder Pliny knows little of Roman practitioners except their obscurity, and in the period before 100 A.D. only 16 out of 170 doctors recorded on inscriptions can be assumed to be non-Greeks. On the other hand it must not be forgotten
that there were some Romans who privately studied medicine or pharmacy such as Antonius Castor, whom Pliny records as a centenarian, his faculties unimpaired, tending his small botanical garden. A search for Roman practitioners of medicine thus reveals their humble and obscure position, and the Greek doctor who is more obvious is an easier object of study.

We can make an immediate distinction between the group of slaves and freedmen and that of the freeborn Greeks who came to Italy and attached themselves to a patron. The former at least in the republican period presents little difficulty as far as concerns its legal status; it was low, and it can be supposed that its social status was similarly low. In this the culture pattern of Roman medicine differs from Greek. Although some Greeks may have been captured in war, they could in no way be numerous, and Kudlien ascribes the increase in servi medici to the Roman concentration upon domestic medicine. This would be assisted by the proliferation of the large slave 'familiae' under the late Republic and early Empire, especially the imperial familiae where slaves were organised in decuriae which included such specialists as medici chirurgi, medici ocularii and obstetrices.

All slaves and almost all freedmen of this period bear Greek cognomina, and a Greek origin may with probability be assumed. They would be taught medicine either within the familia or, as in other crafts, by being sent to an outside master, like Thessalus whose course of instruction, lasting only six weeks, gained him many disciples. Furthermore, in an expanding and changing population or a metropolis such as Rome, there was a lack of doctors capable of public practice, for if we may trust Pliny, Roman medicine was primarily, if not exclusively, domestic, and surgery and more advanced techniques were the possession of Greeks.
No contemporary legal text mentions a freeborn Roman doctor, but it is impossible to obtain a secure conclusion from the scanty material, especially as the legal problems which arose would be more concerned with unfree doctors, the limits of whose responsibility were doubtfully defined. But slaves and freedmen are not persons of the greatest wealth, and their importance, if any, depends upon that of their patron or master; free peregrine Greeks are much more interesting and much more important both in the history of medicine and in society. Rome had had relations with the Greeks of S. Italy for centuries and had dominated Greece since 195, yet evidence of Greek physicians in Rome does not become extensive until the time of Augustus. The cult of Asclepius was brought to Rome in 291 and existed earlier in Latium, while doctors such as Heracleides of Tarentum and Lucius of Naples flourished in the South. The reputation of the doctors of Velia, whose organisation looked back to Parmenides, brought Aemilius Paulus to be treated there, and later Cicero and Brutus. These contacts developed only slowly, and Menecrates of Tralles, who gained citizenship, probably by grant, and was adopted by Q. Manneius of Atinum, is an isolated instance of a republican Greek doctor recorded on an inscription. The example of Archagathus in coming to Rome was followed by Asclepiades of Prusa, whose visit to Rome in 91 B.C. can be fairly claimed as a turning point. His theories, extended by Themison and Thessalus, formed the basis for future medical investigations, and his success gave him a wondrous reputation and the friendship of senators such as the elder Crassus. Such personal acquaintances may have contributed to the spread of Greek medicine and Cicero provides one example of the tolerant attitudes of some senators. Asclapo the doctor was first summoned to attend Tiro.
when he fell ill at Patrae, and although Cicero originally hesitated, Tiro's approval caused him to send a payment to Asclapo to encourage him in his task, Ad Fam. XVI.4. He was successful, ib.9, and was thus recommended by Cicero to his friend Sulpicius as a useful companion in Achaea in 46, a man of kindness, learning and fidelity, Ad Fam. XIII.20. Cicero's familiar relationship with his doctor - the death of Alexion causes him immense grief, Ad Att. XV.1,2 and 3 - was shared by others of his circle. Brutus, requesting Cicero's aid in freeing Glycon, Pansa's doctor, from gaol where he lay under suspicion of murdering his patron, or at least of culpable negligence, refers to him, Ad Brutum I.6, as: "a modest and frugal man whom not even his own advantage could drive to crime."

Jones has suggested that a doctor often served on the governor's staff and would be taken out from Rome. Thus Asclapo attended Cicero and Sulpicius, and Artemidorus of Perge, a doctor associate of Verres in 80 - 79, obtained citizenship through the governor of Cilicia, C. Cornelius Dolabella. He may be recorded in an important sentence from the Verrines: comites illi tui delecti manus erant tuae: praefecti, scribae, accensi, medici, haruspices, praecones. The inclusion of doctors in this list suggests that to have one's own doctor on the staff was not uncommon, but although a doctor could be placed on the payroll, his appointment, like that of the accensus was the personal choice of the governor.

The first legal enactment concerning doctors is said by Suetonius to have been a grant of citizenship by Julius Caesar to all doctors practising in Rome, possibly on the model of Greek grants of citizenship, to encourage them to remain and others to follow. The presence of Greek doctors is already clear, and the inducements offered to them to migrate to
Rome from the unsettled conditions of the East existed even before the creation of the 'imperial peace' under Augustus, when the arts of peace flourished. Teachers, philosophers and rhetoricians flocked to Rome, and doctors who formed part of the same Greek intellectual milieu, accompanied them. The personal policy of the triumvirs towards the East may have induced practitioners of medicine and learning to visit Rome. Antony had a personal doctor Olympus, and associated with a friend of Plutarch's grandfather, a medical student at Alexandria. M. Artorius Asclepiades of Smyrna attended Augustus at the battle of Philippi where his dream saved Augustus' life and he received honours from Athens and Smyrna before his death about 27 B.C. Even more famous may have been the freedman, Antonius Musa. In 23 B.C. he cured Augustus of a dire disease using cold baths, possibly at Velia, and was rewarded with much money, a gold ring, the mark of an ingenuus, and immunity for himself and his fellow practitioners for ever. Suetonius records that he also received a statue and Della Corte mentions a Pompeian wall inscription which uses his name as a date. His drastic methods failed to cure Marcellus, Dio 53, 30.4, and he disappeared from the court.

This interest on the part of the emperor must have had some effect especially among the Roman upper classes. As Bowersock notes, there had been cultivated Easterners at Rome in the clientela of generals, and the influx of Greek rhetoricians and philosophers such as Areius and Asclepiades may have been due as much to the common desire among the upper classes for Greek culture as to a conscious policy of Augustus to unite East and West. Yet while the unbroken conspiracy of Greek and Roman aristocrats developed through the republic and principate, we have less information about the lower
classes. The attitudes of a wealthier, educated and more eloquent class may not be those of their inferiors, and a prosopographical study of upper class relationships such as Bowersock provides may not help to elucidate those of the common people. Not every Greek man of letters was an Arelius, not every doctor an Artorius.

With the establishment of the principate and the consequent centralisation of power, closeness to the emperor becomes important in any consideration of the status of doctors and other immigrant literati. A slave doctor in the imperial familia can be regarded as a humble creature, but what is to be said of an imperial freedman or a free born Greek who is in direct attendance upon the emperor? These are they whose power and influence is potentially great and whose social esteem may not at first correspond; no doctor becomes a senator, yet regular and intimate service to the emperor placed him in a position of greater responsibility and importance than the average senator. Thus almost from the first the imperial doctors enjoyed wealth, and they progressed from being freedmen or peregrini who received an individual grant of citizenship to Roman citizens from Greek families that had long possessed citizenship. But it is possible to argue that this slight improvement in the status of the imperial doctors did not affect the humbler Greek practitioners, although the status dissonance between, on the one hand, an influential position and wealth within the imperial household, and, on the other, Greek nationality and the practice of a low status profession is resolved in favour of the imperial doctor and may have had some repercussions on the status of those who aspired to such posts or upon those who desired to imitate the emperor.

A brief notice of some of the imperial doctors, Greeks or of Greek
descent and training, reveals their pretensions to literary ability and culture and the public benefits conferred upon their home cities of which they were distinguished members. The earliest known, T. Claudius Melito, doctor to Germanicus, has been plausibly identified with the author of a pharmacological work mentioned by Galen, XIII 843, and another, T. Claudius Menecrates, was one of the sources of the medical writings of Damocrates, Nero's doctor. His epitaph records 156 writings and the foundation of a medical sect, which earned him honours from notable cities and a heroon from his friends. Like Melito, he was probably a peregrinus who received citizenship from the emperor, and thus may be the Menecrates honoured by his fellow citizens at Sosandra in Lydia as α[ε]ριάν ὑπία Φρονίμων ταῦτα. He was rich enough to fill many offices in the city and Cagnat tentatively identified him with Claudius' doctor, now returned home. Keil pointed out that no mention is made of his imperial service and that all his offices are civic and local, an objection which can be met by assuming that much has been lost at the head of the stone or that the citizens were primarily interested in his benefactions to them. The length of time required to hold all the offices is a more serious objection, although one might suppose that he lived to an advanced age. However, as the words Ti. Claudius are restored by Keil, this Menecrates may be in no way connected with the imperial doctor cf. CIG 2714.

Further south in Asia Minor we find another doctor to Claudius and Nero, T. Claudius Tyrannus, an imperial freedman who returned to the city of Magnesia on the Maeander, where he treated his patients διαυγήφατος and in a manner befitting one who was "approved by the divine judgement of the emperor". He gained immunity from civic taxation and liturgies and
tax exemption for the manufacturing establishments rather than surgeries, which he established at the village of Kaduie in the city's territory, having an active part in the death of Claudius, though in cases of need. I have left to the last the most famous doctor of Claudius who is known to us both from the monumental and epigraphic records of his benevolence and from the literary sources. This is Caius Stertinius the Xenophon, born of a wealthy and respected family of Cos around 10 B.C., who survived until midway through the reign of Nero. A descendant of the two healing gods, Asclepius and Heracles, he not surprisingly took up medicine. In 23, when C. Stertinius Maximus was consul, a Coan embassy came to Rome in which Xenophon probably participated, thereby gaining a grant of citizenship through the consul. He appears to have remained in Rome, for Pliny states that he was already in the imperial service at the accession of Claudius, whom he accompanied to Britain as praefectus fabrum and from whom he received the appropriate decorations. His administrative competence is suggested by his appointment. His brother's wealth was considerable and they expended much in public benefactions, rebuilding much of Naples and possibly the medical school at Velia. It is a little difficult to date his gifts to Cos, but it is likely that the shrine and library at the Asclepieum and the series of votive inscriptions date from around. At Rome he lived on the Caelian
by the **Porticus Claudia**, drawing his water supply from the **Aqua Claudia**\(^66\), and an inscription (**ILS 1841**) records the death of one of his slaves. He is said to have played an active part in the death of **Claudius**\(^67\), though in cases of sudden death suspicion fell naturally upon the personal doctor\(^68\), and from this Allbutt p.58 was moved to denounce him as "... the greedy, boastful and adulterous scoundrel."\(^69\) He remained for some time as doctor to **Nero** before returning to **Cos** where he held numerous civic and religious offices\(^70\); at his death leaving his heir the greater part of three million HS\(^71\). "... for the rebuilding of his city's walls and left at his death ten million HS."

**Stertinius Xenophon** is important, not just because of his medical ability but because he is one of the earliest examples of a Greek entering the imperial equestrian service. His contemporary, **T. Claudius Balbillus**, an astrologer from **Ephesus**, also served as *praefectus fabrum* on **Claudius**' British expedition, and progressed through the office of *ad responsa Graeca* to the prefecture of **Egypt** in 55 - 59\(^72\). The private servants of the imperial family could also attain high position; **Sextus Afranius Burrus** rose from being the procurator of an imperial estate to become pretorian prefect.\(^73\) **Xenophon** combines the two; a Greek, he attended the imperial household as a physician before entering the imperial equestrian service, and there is reason to suppose that even in his administrative posts he continued in his medical duties. **He** and **Balbillus** mark a change also in the composition of the heads of the *officia*, where formerly imperial freedmen had charge, now freeborn Greeks began to intervene, and supersede them, a long process indeed but which had its origin in the time of **Claudius**\(^74\).

As an imperial doctor, *Xenophon* marks a change. Here is a Roman citizen, and moreover of equestrian census, entering the imperial service as
a physician, possibly even under Tiberius, and he thus differs from those who were either freedmen or peregrini who obtained citizenship from the emperor. His wealth also deserves comment as illustrating the fortunes available to a successful practitioner among the wealthy. Pliny states that before his time the annual income of an imperial physician was 250,000 HS, but that when he pointed out to Claudius that his city practice brought him in 600,000 the annual retainer was increased to 500,000. Charmis of Massilia charged 20,000 for one cure, and Crinas of Massilia gave ten million HS for the rebuilding of his city's walls and left at his death ten million sesterces, more than Arruntius whose estate only amounted to 3,000,000. The surgeon Alcon, fined 100,000 HS by Claudius and exiled to Gaul, later returned to Rome to recover that amount within a few years.

Thus it can easily be seen that there was opportunity of enrichment for certain Greek doctors, whose wealth could easily surpass that of equestrians and possibly even senators. The top equestrian posts carried salaries of 200,000 HS a year, and Pflaum remarks with justice that 500,000 HS a year is not consonant with position within the imperial administration, in which the post ad responsa Graeca, although important, probably ranked as centenarial only.

Compared with Xenophon, the other famous doctors of the time are mere shadows. Clerc's attempt to connect Arruntius with doctors at Massilia is pleasing speculation at best, and although Cassius is praised by Celsus and noted by Scribonius as a friend of Tiberius, the others mentioned by Pliny, the Calpetanii and Rubrii, are unknown. Doctors from Massilia, probably peregrini, had great vogue during the reign of Nero. This Greek settlement in the West employed Greek sophists in the time of Strabo, and
there were doctors, some paid by individuals, others by the city, including Demosthenes Philalethes, a migrant from Men Karou. Crinas, who became famous under Nero, amassed such wealth through his astrological medicine that his magnificent benefactions to his city hardly affected his prosperity.

His position as leader of the Roman doctors was annexed by Charmis, a fellow townsman, who, opposed to all others, recommended a cold bath cure which soon became the fashion. The imperial doctors were still Greeks: Andromachus the elder, author of a poem on theriac and possibly the first Roman archiatros, and Damocrates. Servilius Damocrates, a pharmacological versifier, had as his patron M. Servilius Nonianus, cos. 35, whose daughter he cured. Although Alexander of Tralles calls him 'Athenian', an inscription from Blaundus in Lydia, AE 1923.32, reveals a member of the imperial household honoured by the city, and from the remains of the name, Cichorius suggested that this was the Neronian doctor, born there, who later obtained Athenian citizenship.

Most important for the history of medicine is Thessalus of Tralles, the son of a weaver, who developed the ideas of Asclepiades in founding the Methodist sect. His techniques were idiosyncratic and it is difficult to uncover the truth from the mass of prejudice that surrounds him. Galen refers to him contemptuously as a woolworker, brought up among women, a false son of Asclepius who neglected geometry, astronomy and dialectic, all parts of the education of a true student. Thus cobblers, carpenters, dyers and smiths now trample the works of medicine, while the merest child can explain the follies of their master, X.20, who deserves a high place among the sophists, who, if all else failed, would hurriedly send their patients to recuperate in Libya. He established a
successful practice in Rome, and claimed to surpass his predecessors, inscribing on his tomb on the Appian Way, Thessalus Ἀρείακος. He was abusive in his writings, even when addressing Nero, to whom he dedicated some letters, although he probably did not become court doctor.

Thus, it can be seen that, from the republican period until the reign of Nero, the doctors of Greek origin and training could obtain wealth by serving in the West, in contrast with the freeborn Roman doctor, who languishes in obscurity and is one of the humblest of persons. But wealth does not mean status, and it is clear from the writings of such as Pliny, that the Greek doctor was despised, although not quite rejected. An inspection of the literary sources' attitudes towards doctors reveals vast differences, from the outright opposition of Pliny to the fairmindedness of Seneca, who may be taken as an example of a cultured man's attitude to a physician. This however need not relate to the attitudes of the lower, less literate and less eloquent classes, but may serve to elucidate a further problem. Although a doctor must gain experience, travel does not mean status.

Seneca, a sufferer from seasickness, asthma, and old age, entertains a high regard for the doctor, from whom one buys an article beyond price; life and good health, and he lays down for the doctor moral prescriptions similar to those adopted by Quintilian for his perfect orator. The doctor passes from being a servant to a friend and endears himself to his patient, not by his mercenary art, but by his loving kindness. An intimate personal relationship, Ep.22.1, and constant personal attention are important. "A correspondence with the doctor will not permit him to choose the right time for food or a bath, he must feel the pulse." He tells of his own physician in glowing and condescending terms: "He spent more
than the average doctor on me, for my sake he took precautions, not for his art's reputation; not content with displaying remedies, he even applied them; he sat beside those in distress; he was present at critical junctures; no duty burdened him, none sickened him; he heard my groans with sympathy; amid a crowd of patients my health was his first concern; he attended others only when my health permitted; I was bound to him not as to a doctor but by ties of friendship". As there is no suggestion in this passage of opera or a similar legal compulsion to attend, it seems clear that the doctor mentioned is either a free man or the freedman of another, and, though slave doctors were employed, De Ben. III 19, this doctor, though an inferior, does not appear to be one.

Seneca was interested in the medical debates of his time, and had picked up ideas about treatment and disease, though it is going too far to call him a practitioner. He calls medicine an art that has its decrees as well as precepts, Ep. 95.9, and thus there are the sects of Hippocrates, Asclepiades and Themison. Although a doctor must gain experience, travel does not make a doctor, Ep. 104.9, and Ep. 40.5 implies that a travelling doctor cannot effect a cure. Seneca laments the increase in cooks and dieticians because of the complex growth of medicine, which now campaigns in many ways. In the past, in a simple and healthy society, a few practised herbal medicine to staunch bleeding and to heal wounds, but, with increased luxury, a multitude of diseases have entered society, and even women, by copying male habits, succumb to male diseases. "To secure health, men strain to lift heavy weights at centres such as Baiae and allow themselves to be pummelled by a bath attendant, though such activities are unsuited to a man of taste who has thus to receive orders from a slave. Rather one should
enter into consultation with one who cares as much for the preservation of
health as for the defeat of disease\textsuperscript{115}, and by attending to his precepts,
one will be helped towards a cure", Ep. 94,24,36. Just how original Seneca
was in his views on the proper relationship between doctor and patient is
uncertain, but he appears to continue the Ciceronian tradition of courtesy.
It is however necessary to remember that the doctors who treated him were
probably better trained than the average physician, and that even Seneca
rejected the view that a long illness should be borne until the end, praising
Tullius Marcellinus, who when seized by a protracted disease requiring much
attention, chose to commit a decent suicide\textsuperscript{116}.

The fact that laymen such as Seneca or Antonius Castor could take
such a detailed interest in medical theory is of importance when we seek to
place Cornelius Celsus in the context of other medical savants of the early
empire. His 'On Medicine', appears from its citations to have been written
under Tiberius, and Cichorius ascribed it to around 25 - 6\textsuperscript{117}, when it may
have formed part of an encyclopedia of Artes\textsuperscript{118}. Krenkel\textsuperscript{119} notes that the
name A. Cornelius Celsus only occurs in one manuscript and that he is usually
called Celsus or Cornelius Celsus, and, following a suggestion of Cichorius\textsuperscript{120},
he supposes that Celsus was a native of Provence\textsuperscript{121} who moved to Rome where
he may be identified with A. Cornelius Celsus of CIL VI 36285. This is
plausible speculation, but arguments from 'nobility of thought' and
'integrity'\textsuperscript{122} are little more than special pleading and cannot be used to
elucidate the identity of Celsus. Wellmann\textsuperscript{123} thought that he was a straight
translator, although he was unable to suggest a suitable Greek source, and,
as a man of wide interests who wrote, like Varro, for a general public,
Celsus wrote in Latin rather than Greek, although that was the language of
advanced medical textbooks. He must have had some wealth to have studied medicine and the other ars that he describes, and some have deduced from his mention of valetudinarium that he was a landowner who treated slaves and rustics in his estate hospital. Whether he practised is uncertain, as the boundary between a practitioner and an educated layman was fluid, as we have seen, and it was possible for a layman to write a general survey of medicine for general instruction, containing a historical introduction and a description of the views of the various contemporary sects. Thus, Celsus, if we believe him to be a man of education, although not necessarily a practising doctor, is another example of the increased interest in Greek medicine during the early first century A.D., and such supporters may have secured a greater acceptance of the Greek physicians among the upper classes. To generalise from the fragmentary evidence for the status of medical practitioners is dangerous, yet certain groups are clear. The practitioners of Roman or Etruscan medicine, the wandering herbalists and travelling surgeons, do not appear to be of great social significance, although their importance in providing some form of medical aid must not be underestimated, and their status is low. Then there are the slave and freedmen doctors, some attached to the great famíliae, others practising outside them, trained in Greek techniques; their legal status is low and their social status depends almost entirely upon their relationship to their patron and upon his status. An imperial freedman was obviously more important than the freeman doctor of an Umbrian merchant. It is probable that slaves and freedmen formed the majority of doctors practising in Rome in the first century A.D., although this may be due to the bias of the epigraphical sources, and the rise in the social position of the doctor in
the West may be traced through the disappearance of slaves and freedmen.

Yet this blunt formulation omits the free προτριγνε Greek doctors whose acceptance into society is entangled with the problem of the acceptability of Greeks in the Roman Empire. Senators from the time of Cicero had supported Greek doctors, and philosophical and moralising theoreticians such as Seneca had propagated the notion of friendship towards a doctor, but the position of a Greek doctor within Roman society is uncertain. He can amass wealth, but his social position and offices are unimportant, and although he is granted privileges they do not imply high status, rather the reverse.

With a few exceptions, such as the doctors of the imperial court, the doctor was not of great status, and although Greek techniques in medicine seem to have expelled Roman medicine from upper class households, its practitioners may not have been similarly accepted. These generalisations on the status of doctors appear plausible, yet there are significant exceptions and the variety of techniques, practitioners and statuses within the medical profession makes an all-embracing generalisation doubtful, if not impossible, while the very nature of the evidence makes it unlikely that a sure conclusion will be reached upon the attitudes towards doctors of the unlettered and unlearned mass of the populus Romanus. Nevertheless, a piecemeal selection of groups and a discussion of their fortunes can lead to a clearer understanding of changes in the status of the medical profession.
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CHAPTER TWO

The medical profession in the West: (ii) from Pliny to Galen.

Any attempt to break down history into periods is bound to create its own difficulties, and where such hazy intangibles as 'public opinion' and 'status' are discussed, arbitrary dividing lines, although useful, produce too sharp a break. Thus, although the period covered is defined by the outpourings of distinguished authors at each end, many of the ideas discussed relate both forwards and back, and I shall endeavour to chart some of the opinions and legislation relating to doctors and to insert them in a context before introducing Galen, the greatest single source for the history of the medical profession in Roman society.

The vociferous opposition of the Elder Pliny to Greek medicine has influenced succeeding writers on Roman medicine, and although his arguments may be dismissed as the idiosyncratic grumbles of an old curmudgeon, it is still necessary to examine them and to see how much truth resides there. His resentment is primarily directed against the Greeks practising medicine among the Roman upper classes, and he follows the elder Cato in his denunciations. "Postea fraudes hominum et ingeniorum capturae officinas invenere istas in quibus sua suae hominis venalis promittit vita". "We obey foreigners and they master their masters", while, among the illiterate and inexperienced there is no respect for a doctor ignorant of Greek, and they have more confidence in prescriptions the less they understand them. He does not attack medicine in itself, praising herbalists like Castor, but only those who prefer sitting at a lecture to regular tramps over fields and
wastes seeking herbs. He complains about the lack of supervision of doctors and the credulity of Roman patients in blindly entrusting themselves to anyone who calls himself a doctor, praising the reluctance of his ancestors to allow profit at the expense of their lives. "Now we are blown along by crafty Greeks and clearly the best speaker among them commands our life and death." Yet Pliny is not entirely wrong in some of his allegations. "There is no law to punish capital ignorance, no example of retribution. They learn from our dangers and experiment by our deaths, and a doctor can escape scot free from murder." The responsibility of a doctor for his patient's death is always difficult to determine, and the evidence of the legal sources appears to show that, although the death or injury of a slave compelled compensation, the death of a free man brought no effective legal consequences. The epitaph, "died of a surfeit of doctors" may be a witticism, not a genuine inscription, and Pliny's imputations of adultery with their imperial mistresses to Eudemus and Vettius Valens, despite a disclaimer that these are personal faults and not those of the medical art, suggest precisely that. Similar implications can be drawn from his discussion of the excessive fees of Roman doctors. His comments on the medical profession are satirical and witty, containing some truth, but it is uncertain how far these derogatory opinions were shared and what effect they had. The imperial private physicians continued to be Greeks, either receiving citizenship from the emperor such as Ser. Sulpicius Hecataeus from Cnidos, or else coming from important local families of Roman citizens in the provinces. L. Arruntius Sempronius Asclepiades, a doctor to Domitian, may have been a wealthy Massiliot, and T. Statilius Criton, doctor to
Trajan, came from a leading family at Heraclea in Caria. Trained at Ephesus, whence he came to Rome under the Flavians, he may be mentioned by Martial XI 60.6, and he wrote works on pharmacy and cosmetics based upon the knowledgeable works of Cleopatra\textsuperscript{15}. His Getica was a record of his service with Trajan in a Dacian campaign\textsuperscript{16}, and he became an imperial procurator. He returned to Asia and Heraclea where he lived on, the holder of numerous priesthoods and honoured for his services by the doctors of Ephesus\textsuperscript{17}. A relative, possibly great nephew, Statilius Attalus held the post of imperial physician to Antoninus and Marcus Aurelius\textsuperscript{18}. Another doctor, Calpurnius Asclepiades from Prusa, records that he obtained citizenship from Trajan for himself, his parents and four brothers, and then served as one of the assessors of Roman magistrates in charge of the voting tablets\textsuperscript{19}.

The personal relationship of a doctor to the emperor assured the continuance of their high status, and they are welcomed by some rich Romans – Apollinaris, Titus' doctor, stayed at the home of the wealthiest citizen of Herculaneum\textsuperscript{20} – but a secure definition of their social position is difficult and scattered information can not lead to a satisfactory conclusion. Despite their wealth and importance, no doctor becomes a senator, although their sons might enter to be despised by diehards, themselves of recent origin\textsuperscript{21}. The most that could be expected was to be a procurator, like Criton or L. Gellius Maximus, a member of a wealthy family from Pisidian Antioch and an imperial physician\textsuperscript{22}.

As most of the doctors known to us in the West are Greeks – and by doctor I mean those who call themselves such – the problem is one of the rise of Greeks in society in general. Nero may have introduced Greeks into the Senate\textsuperscript{23}, but the first Greek consul is not until 92\textsuperscript{24}, and marriages of
Greek senators into the families of Western nobility are conspicuously rare. The *Graeculus esuriens* of Juvenal may be a figure of fun, but the prejudices of Roman senators took long to break down. Despite the attempt of Vitellius to introduce equites as the heads of the imperial *officia*, the freedmen Greeks still retained control into the time of Trajan and Hadrian, and Greeks are introduced into the administration more and more.

The Greek doctor must be placed in this context, and similar considerations should apply also to other Greek literati such as rhetors and architects. Yet these professions are at a disadvantage compared with the doctor: most people fell ill, but not all wished to learn Greek or to construct a palace, and the direct personal relationship between doctor and patient may be missing between architect and client. Sheer numerical superiority alone cannot explain the greater frequency of inscriptions of doctors compared with other professional groups, and the retention of doctors when philosophers were being harried and expelled suggests that practical utility made them desirable.

Imperial favour may also have contributed to the success of the medical profession. Vespasian, who took part in a medical debate at the Museum at Alexandria, gave privileges to doctors and masseurs, freedom from billeting and civic taxes, protection from *iniuria*, the right of association and the inviolability of shrines, temples and sacred precincts used as meeting places. The persons referred to by this edict are worthy of note. The *iatro* are rarely mentioned. Seneca, Ep. 15.2, regarded them as very inferior doctors, Trimalchio, Sat. 28.3, has three in his gymnasium, and one may be found at Pompeii. They are included in no other legal document, and Herzog p.992, suggested their inclusion was due to
the personal interest of the emperor. Teachers, receive similar privileges by this edict, and they form part of the same intellectual milieu as the learned doctor. They had received citizenship from Caesar if they resided in Rome, and some medical works, especially lexicographical and philological studies in Hippocrates, came close to academic learning. Doctors and teachers had long been associated in the Alexandrian Museum, and possibly at Ephesus and elsewhere, and it is not surprising to find them cited together.

This is the first edict to give privileges to doctors in general, as opposed to grants to individuals or to a group resident in one place. The succeeding edict of Trajan withdrew these benefits from those who, "desirous of gain rather than the benefit of humanity", taught medicine to slaves and thus released a flood of semi-trained servile practitioners. We have no other evidence for a sudden increase in the number of slave doctors, and Forbes' suggestion that the edict succeeded is possibly too simple an explanation of the numerical decline of slaves and freedmen on inscriptions. There are no longer the great columbaria of familiae, and the wealth obtainable, the extension of Roman citizenship to the Greeks, and legal privileges all helped to render the profession more attractive to a free man. Even so slaves continue to practise; the lawyer Julian says that doctors trained slaves to profit from them, and there are several references to

The second century saw the last flowering of the Greek city and the spread of Greek culture and attitudes to the West. The sophistic movement, fostered by Hadrian, brought scholars, orators and philosophers to Rome, and produced representatives from the Western provinces such as
Favorinus. As more Greeks entered the senate and the equestrian service, so the doctor, who was often found associated with high provincial society in the East, became a friend and counsellor of Roman senators. Marcellus of Side came to Rome as a friend of Herodes Atticus and wrote on fish and on medicines derived from them. Not that this indicates that he was necessarily a doctor, but other evidence attends. Suidas M. 265, calls him the author of 42 books of παθητικά, including one on werewolves, and his literary output is confirmed by Anth. Pal. VII 158. A period of general prosperity, especially for the wealthier classes, permitted the study of literature, philosophy, rhetoric and medicine, the arts of peace and, especially in the East where the study of medicine was regarded as part of a general education, a man of intelligence and culture was expected to discuss medical terminology or the causes of diseases with fair competence.

Aulus Gellius can be taken as an example of this cultured interest. He considers it disgraceful, not only for a doctor, but also for a liberally educated man to be ignorant of health, and he dipped into those medical texts which he thought informative, enabling him to discuss the correct meaning of ηἱμπρασία, φλίψι and ορθύρυχος. A similar reason for including medicine in the general education is given by Athenaeus of Attaleia, the founder of the Pneumatist sect, who states that it is useful, even necessary, for all from the age of fourteen to study medicine and hear its word. "How the soul rejoices and is uplifted by association with the noblest philosophers and doctors and those who are the leaders of knowledge by frequent communion with them!"

Gellius may have read the Hippocratic commentaries of Sabinus and his friends, Calvisius Taurus and Favorinus, discussed medical
technicalities with ease. When Gellius and Taurus, XII.5.3, visited a sick friend at Lebadea, Taurus, summoning the doctors, discoursed on the cure of the patient, and he censured a doctor in attendance at the villa of Herodes Atticus for loose terminology. Favorinus, author of a famous speech on 'Quartan Fever', participated in a medical discussion at Rome and could quote the works of Erasistratus. The emperor Hadrian too may have been educated in medicine and, Galen XV.21, expressed an interest in Artemidorus' edition of Hippocrates. When dealing with a case of bastardy, he pronounced his decision after a careful scrutiny of the opinions of the ancient doctors and philosophers.

Again, if Plutarch is considered a representative of Greek learning and culture, his tract 'On the preservation of Health' becomes an important document. In opposition to the harsh words of a doctor, Glaucus, who believes that the limits of medicine and philosophy can be defined as accurately as boundaries in Phrygia and Mysia, Zeuxippus and Moschion stress the interrelation of the two disciplines, and Moschion was annoyed at philosophers who displayed no interest in medicine, Moralia 122 A,B. At Moralia 152D and 731A other doctors participate in symposia and display their medical learning and philosophical knowledge. This literary tradition which goes back at least to Plato's Symposium is continued by Athenaeus who describes a dinner at the house of P. Livius Larensis attended by Galen, Daphnis of Ephesus, a doctor and an academic philosopher, and Rufinus of Nicaea and other literati.

But what did this mean to the average doctor in the West? Our evidence, apart from inscriptions, is limited to sources which are either Greek or concerned with things Greek and hence little can be said about the
intellectual attainments and abilities of doctors in the West. Certainly Alexander the Phrygian, martyred at Lyons, is not of great social standing \(^53\), and Pliny's masseur, Harpocras, was a member of the lowest class, the slave of an Egyptian woman, and not even an Alexandrian but a native of Memphis, until Trajan at Pliny's request granted him citizenship \(^54\).

The numbers of doctors epigraphically recorded increase from 154 to 201; the percentage of slave and freedmen doctors drops from 68 to 40\%, and that of non-Greeks rises from 10 to 25\% \(^55\). The increase in gross numbers reflects the preponderance generally of second century inscriptions and widespread prosperity rather than the particular merits of the medical profession, and the doctor in the West cannot be regarded as one of the leaders of the community \(^56\). Legal privileges increased and doctors were regularly associated with other literati, orators, grammarians and philosophers. Our knowledge of these sophists is derived mainly from ancient biographies, which are lacking for doctors, and while the rewards for the successful sophist were high, the failures are almost unknown to us \(^57\). Thus although the level of wealth and social esteem of those sophists and philosophers recorded by Philostratus or evinced by inscriptions is higher than that of doctors, the more frequent inscriptions to doctors may show that these were in fact more numerous and covered a greater range of statuses.

The legal position and privileges of doctors continued to improve. Hadrian \(^58\) granted immunity from billeting and munera civilia to doctors, grammarians, orators and philosophers, which was confirmed by Antoninus Pius \(^59\). Orators, grammarians and doctors were immune from the duties of gymnasiarch, agoranomos, priest, from billeting or providing corn or oil, from military service and acting as judge or ambassador, and from compulsory
service within the province. These liturgies apply to persons of wealth and reveal the standing of doctors, especially in the East. Such widespread immunities granted to a rich group of literati may have damaged the precarious finances of the Asian cities, and the provision of salaries to many doctors and teachers may have stretched them further. The inscriptive evidence suggests that only in Rome and Asia were there large numbers of doctors and the situation that brought about the reform of Antoninus Pius was probably peculiar to Asia.

In a letter to the council of Asia, although Modestinus says that it applied throughout the Empire, Antoninus limited the intellectuals who were to enjoy immunity. A small city could have five doctors, three sophists and three grammarians, the head of a conventus, seven, four and four, and the metropoleis ten, five and five. Under no circumstances was this number to be exceeded, although no objection is raised to a smaller number of doctors being selected. Election is to be made by the city council, which is to keep watch on physicians to prevent them abusing their position and neglecting their duties.

What was the result of this edict on the practitioners of medicine? One consequence was the separation of doctors into those with and those without immunity, marked by a change of nomenclature for civic doctors, the acquisition of the title of archiatros. The latter word requires some comment and discussion of its origin and meaning. The earliest reference may come from Pseudo-Aristeas 182, dated around 200 B.C., all of whose manuscripts have , describing an official of the Ptolemaic household paraphrased by Josephus, Ant XII.94 as ο ειν ῥων ξινων. Some editors, such as Thackeray, London 1900, have retained the manuscript reading, arguing that a doctor could perform other
functions, but most have accepted Letronne's emendation and read . The first occurrence is thus in an inscription erected in 129 - 117 to the doctor of Antiochus IX on Delos, whence comes another inscription, I Delos, 1573, of 102/1 to Papias of Amisus, friend, archiatros and secretary of Mithridates Eupator. Clearly the word means something like 'doctor to the king'; and at the same time in Egypt, there is a royal doctor and secretary, Tatas, and, from the first century B.C., a letter from Athenagoras, the archiatros, to the priests and officials at the labyrinth, SB 5216.

We have a century of silence before the word reappears in the early years of Nero, when Xenophon is called . On one inscription the word is engraved over the word but it would be unwise to deduce from this that the inscription is of Claudian date and then recut, especially as a similar mutilation does not occur on any other inscription to Xenophon of Claudian date. Andromachus is said by Erotian, p.29 ed. Klein, to be , but I am inclined to agree with Klein, p.XII, that the dedicatee is the son of Nero's doctor, who held a similar post under Trajan. The elder Andromachus is called archiatros by Galen, XIV 2, though one may discount this as evidence for its use under Nero. A similar anachronistic example which has been used to show that the word was in general use, even for doctors outside the imperial household, is that of Themison of Laodicea, who lived in the early first century and who is said by the scoliast on Juvenal X 221 to have been 'archiater'. This statement, which is unlikely to be earlier than the fourth century and is probably later, when archiater was a common description for any respected doctor, can hardly be taken seriously.
Nor can one say that even in the early second century the word was in common use for an imperial physician, as can be seen by the variety of titles employed. Menecrates, though Stein, PIR² C.937, called him archiater, is only ἰατρὸς Ἐσβάτου 71, and Servius Sulpicius Hecataeus, a doctor to Galba from Cnidus, is recorded as ἰατρὸς καὶ φίλος τοῦ Ἐσβάτου 72. A Syrian from Laodicea who attended Hadrian calls himself ἰατρὸς τοῦ Ἐσβάτου 73, while Hermogenes in his dedication at Chester is simply ἰατρός 74. Although the title archiatros becomes more widespread in the second century, it is unwise to attribute it to any imperial doctor to whom it is not given by a reputable source. Galen for example does not call himself by this title, although it is found in at least two medieval manuscript titles 75. The formalisation of archiatros, in the sense of 'court doctor', cannot be found before the late third century, and it is tempting to ascribe all non-imperial uses of the word to the period after Antoninus' edict. The dating of the earliest non-imperial use is obscure and the evidence frequently fails when a firm date is required 76. Nevertheless I consider it probable that in the sense of civic doctor it does not occur before this edict. Even after this date, the Latin form, archiater, is rare and, outside the technical medical literature, little is heard until the fourth century. The late second century grammarian, Herodian, I.229, discusses the position of its accent, a sign of its unfamiliarity, and the doctor Aretaeus uses it of a doctor of importance and ability who may not induce death, though it bring relief to the suffering, VI.5.1.

Geographically too the use of this word was restricted. Out of 889 inscriptions of doctors, only 74 refer to archiatri, and no examples
occur in the inscriptions of Spain, Gaul Britain, Germany and the Danube provinces West of Moesia, and there is one fourth century reference in Africa, CIL VIII 25811. One inscription and twelve papyri record the word in Egypt, yet Caria, Lycia and Ionia provide thirty two examples. This may reflect merely the Greek preference for the word to describe a civic doctor, for these are found also in the West. An inscription from near Viterbo, ILS 2542, commemorates a doctor, who after serving with two alae moved to Ferentum where he was given a civic salary. Gummerus n.327, assumed that Frontinus Sciscola was a civic doctor at Corduba but the resolution of the abbreviation is dubious.

It is clear those doctors who were not included in the defined number, D.50.9.1, were eager to join, and that medicine became a desirable profession because of its immunities. Galen, V.751, declares that some practise because of the money that can be made, others because of the immunity granted by law, some for the honour and glory they could obtain, others out of humanity. City councils were empowered to provide salaries for the practitioners of the liberal arts and of medicine, although extravagance was discouraged. Ulpian lays down the considerations which are to affect the choice of a civic doctor, D.50.9.1: first there is moral probity, secondly practical ability, and for failure to comply with either, a doctor could be struck off the list at any time. The governor should not impose his candidate upon the city, although the doctor's remuneration comes under his jurisdiction. Specialists are included amongst those receiving immunity, but not exorcists, wizards and magicians, although they may have provided medical benefits. This stresses again the wide range of medical abilities and services available and the various statuses of practitioners,
and it should advise caution in any discussion of a uniform status of the medical profession.

While therefore there is a possibility that the status of the medical profession rose as a result of the immunities offered to its members and of the gradual acceptance into Western society of Greeks, this is still not sufficient to enable an all-embracing generalization to be made. While inscriptions show a gradual rise in status of those recorded, this may reflect to some extent the change in the type of evidence and the disappearance of the great columbaria. Although it may be true to say that the legal innovations in this period rendered the position of medici and archiatri superior to the other practitioners of medicine, this does not take us very far and tells us nothing about the quality of the change. Imperial doctors retain importance, certain approved practitioners become more numerous, but the evidence for other medici is not sufficiently sure to base a conclusion upon it for this period, and it is probably better to admit unsatisfactory doubt than to produce a definite and illusory result.
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CHAPTER THREE

Galen of Pergamum.

Galen of Pergamum is of all ancient writers probably the most informative about himself, his life and opinions, and the most unsatisfactorily studied. While medical historians have concentrated upon his theories, little has been done on his actual practice¹ and his relations with contemporary scholars and sophists². Galen is a part of the second sophistic movement, like Favorinus of Arles, and, had his linguistic, philosophical and rhetorical works survived, we should have a better appreciation of one who claimed to be a universal scholar.

He was born in 129³, the son of Nicon⁴, an architect, who owned several slaves, V.41, and a country estate some miles from Pergamum, VI.755, XIV.17, which Galen often visited⁵. His father intended to train him as a philosopher, XVI 324, employing a Greek teacher and a Greek pedagogue, VIII 587, so that he might be brought up to speak correctly, free from the corruptions of merchant slang. Nicon himself was a man of learning and ability, skilled in geometry, architecture, logic, arithmetic and grammar⁶, and Galen was clearly influenced by his father's zeal for learning⁷ and his participation in the cultural life of the city. There were there at the time the consul Cuspius Rufinus⁸ and several noted sophists and philosophers, taking cures at the Asclepieion⁹. Nicon had the money to provide the best teachers for his son, though this is feebly denied by Galen, X 561, who from the age of fourteen attended the lectures of some philosophers and fellow-citizens, V.41, XIX 59. When he was seventeen, his father, advised in a dream by Asclepius¹⁰,
sent him to study medicine under Satyros and Stratonicus, and then to Pelops at Smyrna. He also studied under the Stoic physician, Aeficianus, probably at Pergamum, before going to Corinth to seek the anatomist Numisianus. Finding him gone, he followed him to Egypt, where he also studied under Julian, another anatomist, before returning to Pergamum aged 28, where he was soon entrusted with the important duty of caring for the gladiators, XIII 599.

As Robert has shown, gladiatorial shows were not uncommon in the East, and were regularly to be found at the koinon of a province, where the games were given by the high priest. At Ephesus in the third century, Aur. Apolaustus, archiatros of the city, was responsible for setting up a statue to an asiarch on behalf of the and it is possible to see a connection between an official doctor to a city and the games there celebrated. Galen's success in the post was remarkable. He was appointed in the summer, and when the next high priest took over in the autumn, he was retained in the post, having suffered no fatalities among the gladiators. In all he held the post five times in succession before leaving for Rome, and claimed to have perfected a beneficial method of treatment. Costs of gladiators were steep and the high priest normally took over the troop from his predecessor; hence Galen's treatments of leg wounds and cuts on hands and feet earned him his reappointments. His predecessors had suffered sixty deaths, but by his careful treatment he reduced these to two during his five year term. When he was 32, he left Asia Minor for Rome, XVIII A 347, leaving behind a great reputation, even though he had not learned all the methods of the Asian doctors, X.455, and he may have visited many parts of the Aegean
on his way. His first stay in Rome was unsuccessful, 162 - 166, as he was compelled to leave Rome by the hostility of his fellow practitioners, who, he alleges, had some years previously secured the expulsion of Quintus, the master of Satyrus. His reason for his departure was partly this animosity and partly the ending of the stasis in his country, and he slipped away to Campania and then to Asia, just before the return of Verus from Parthia to take up the German war in 166. That at this time he had no thought of returning is indicated by his engagement of a crooked auctioneer from the Subura to sell up his property, XIV 648. I assume that this stasis is some local political rivalry at Pergamum against Galen and his family, which may have resulted in his dismissal rather than his retirement from the gladiatorial post, a common feature in contemporary Asian cities.

Galen, even when away from Rome, was not forgotten. His name was constantly mentioned among the doctors and philosophers, XIV 649, and, with such sponsors as Flavius Boethus and Claudius Severus, it is not surprising that in 168 he received a summons from the emperor to attend him at Aquileia and to participate in the German expedition. He had heard of the good reputation of M. Aurelius, but knew little of Lucius Verus, and he hastened to Aquileia, where, despite the departure of the emperors for Rome, he stayed amid the cold and the plague. Lucius Verus died on his way back to Rome and, after the funeral, Marcus Aurelius began planning a further German campaign. Galen, who by now had returned to Rome, when asked by the emperor to accompany him, begged to be excused, alleging the intervention of Asclepius in a dream. He was instead appointed doctor to Commodus, a not very exacting task, as the prince's daily wants were looked after by his servants and he was only summoned if Commodus fell ill. This period
was one of the most productive of Galen's life, as his relative leisure enabled him to write up his recollections of others' teaching and various medical and philosophical problems. His "On the use of Parts of the Body" was a great success among the Aristotelians, XIX 20f., but other practitioners accused him of faking his results. His standing was further increased by his appointment as maker of the emperor's drugs, after the death of Demetrius²⁷, when Aurelius was on the Danube, and the emperor on his return discussed the composition of his theriac antidote with him²⁸. He retained his position in the imperial household after the death of Marcus Aurelius, probably until the reign of Severus. The date of his death is uncertain; he treated the sophist and ab epistulis Graecis, Aelius Antipater²⁹, and Suidas states that he died aged 70. A later Arabic source records his death at the age of 87, but, as this source may have put his birth date as 108, this could be interpreted to leave 195/6 as his date of death, which is probable³⁰.

Such is the brief sketch of Galen's life, but it is necessary to examine his friends and patients to discover the preeminent position he held within Roman medical circles and his supporters in his feuds with other physicians. In the tract "On Prognosis, for Epigenes" he tells of the contacts he made on his first visit and of his relations with several distinguished patients. It is clear that he had a reputation as a philosopher first rather than a doctor, and his attendance upon his old teacher and fellow-countryman, the Peripatetic, Eudemus, was due to a long-standing friendship and to his study of philosophy, and possibly to his acquaintance with Epigenes, XIV 606 - 8, 613. Nor was Galen included among those doctors regularly summoned for consultations, although, XIV 609, he claims that he wished it thus. There was, as we have already seen, a
group of philosophers, scholars and sophists who took an informed interest in medical debate, and through his contacts with Eudemus and Epigenes, Galen was provided with an entry into it. Eudemus was a friend of two consuls, Sergius Paulus and Flavius Boethus, both Aristotelians. The latter was especially interested in anatomy, several times requesting volumes from Galen, which he may have taken with him on his tour of duty as governor of Palestine. Sergius Paulus was consul for the second time in 168, possibly also proconsul of Asia, and became praefectus urbis about 170.

Among this circle was the consul, Cn. Claudius Severus, son in law of the emperor, friend of Herodes Atticus, IG II/III 2 4780, and consul for the second time in 173. M. Vettulenus Sex. f. Civica Barbarus, son of the consul of 106, uncle of Lucius Verus, also requested instruction in anatomy from Galen before his departure for Syria in 164, Vita Marci 9.4, and it is not surprising that with such imperial connections Galen was mentioned to the emperor as a possible doctor even during his first stay in Rome, XIV 647-8.

The prefect of the city, C. Aufidius Victorinus, who received a work of Hippocrates "On Diet" from a doctor, knew Galen, and Bassus, to whom Galen dedicated his bibliographical works, was also a senator, possibly Vibius Bassus, proconsul of Asia and a relative of the Vedii of Ephesus. The identity of the Piso, to whom Galen dedicated a tract on Theriac, is doubtful, but Von Premerstein suggested that this man, immersed in the cares of public business, who took an active interest in the treatment of his son (who had been injured during the ludus Troiae, XIV 210, 212) was L. Calpurnius Piso, cos. 175.

Galen also secured many patients among the wealthy senatorial class, and he observed, if he did not treat, the consul Arrian, probably the
man who had been praefectus aerarii under Trajan and later consul. He cured the wives of various senators, described the ointment of a rich Roman lady, and addressed instructions on the health and care of an epileptic child to one Caecilianus. This man, for whom Galen secures the services of the fine doctor, Dionysius, who is just about to sail back to Athens, is almost certainly to be identified with C. Sabucius C.F.Quir.Maior Caecilianus, who was consul in 186 and proconsul of Achaea, rather than with L. Baebius Caecilianus, legate of Pannonia Inferior in 199. The identity of Iustus, whose wife was cured by Galen, is also problematical. Petersen assumed that he was the oculist of the same name, but the context seems to demand a man of wealth and standing, far superior to that of an oculist. "On prognosis for Epigenes" was written around 177, and it seems probable that we should seek a senator, active around that date or earlier, around 162–6. This would appear to rule out C. Pescennius Niger Iustus, who appears also never to have been called solely Iustus, and may also exclude Aemilius Iustus, legate of Thrace at the beginning of the reign of Commodus. There are at least two further possibilities: C. Curtius C.f.Pol.Iustus, legate under Antoninus of the leg.XX Val. Victrix, held the consulship before 152 and was governor of Moesia, but I prefer C. Modius Iustus, governor of Numidia in 171, who reached the consulship in 171. Little further can be said about the wealthy and respectable L. Martius, cured by Galen of melancholy and who considered that Galen spoke as the oracle: "from a golden tripod", though he may be a member of the family of P. Martius Verus, and one would like to know the name of the nobleman, who discussed the name of his disease with the doctors he had summoned.
Similar obscurity attends the rich Roman Plancius, who had a dislocated jaw, though conjecture might secure a connection with the family of Plancii from Perge. Thus we can see that Galen's patients include several senatorial families, and a further examination will show Galen in his activities in the imperial household.

On his first visit to Rome he treated the cubicularius Charilampes, XIV 624, whom Ilberg, N.J. 1905, 288, identified with Charias, mentioned in the correspondence of Fronto, 1.4.118, while Euphates, the rationalis XIV 4, who suggested Galen to M. Aurelius as successor to Demetrius, is probably the same as the Euphates of Meditations 10.31. When he had charge of the health of Commodus, Galen worked closely with the tutor, Pitholaus and came into close contact with the imperial family. When Sex. Quintilius Condianus fell ill, Galen immediately consulted Pitholaus and together they brought about his recovery. His excellent treatment of the recalcitrant Commodus, XIV 661, won over M. Aurelius, and even Anna Faustina was compelled to acknowledge his ability. She had some interest in medicine, complaining that she had not been informed of the illness, and she was accompanied by a Methodist doctor, to whom she introduced Galen as a most distinguished opponent. She then departed, hoping to have stirred up an argument, but she was apparently unsuccessful. Marcus Aurelius did not entrust himself to Galen's care at first with confidence. Soon after his return from Germany he fell ill, XIV 658–9, and it was only when the diagnosis of those doctors who had attended him on his campaigns proved false that Galen was called in, and he may not have attended the patient until two days had elapsed. As a result of his cure - he diagnosed overeating, not a fever - M. Aurelius described him to Pitholaus as a 'doctor and free man' and later as 'a doctor and
philosopher', words of high praise to Galen.

We can also place Galen in the context of the sophists, rhetoricians and philosophers of his day by examining his acquaintances and his patients. His first important case at Rome would appear to have been Eudemus the peripatetic, II 217, XCV 606f., who also taught him philosophy. Associated with him, as well as with the senators already mentioned, was Alexander of Damascus, an Aristotelian acquainted with the works of Plato, who shortly afterwards moved to Athens as public professor of peripatetic philosophy, II 218, XIV 627. To display the talents of the newly arrived Galen, Flavius Boethus arranged a debate between peripatetics and stoics, to which came many doctors and philosophers, XIV 626. Alexander led a ferocious attack on Galen's method of demonstration by dissection and began a discourse on the nature of sense perception, upon which Galen left, refusing to take issue with 'rustic Pyrrhos'. Alexander then came under attack from all those present, including Adrian the orator – he was not yet a sophist but a friend of Boethus52 – and Demetrius of Alexandria, a friend of Favorinus of Arles, who made daily expositions in his manner53. A second debate was arranged, including all the noted doctors and philosophers, and Galen proved the victor. When dealing with sophists and lecturers among his clientele we should not forget Pausanias the Syrian sophist who had lost the use of two fingers, I 343 = VIII 56f., or, as a later account has it, VIII 213, of both hands through falling from his chariot into the road53a. Diodorus the grammarian was another unusual case. During the day he used to fast, often bringing on a fit, until advised by Galen to take a little bread dipped in wine. Once he was engaged in the forum at midday, expounding a political theme, when he collapsed in a fit caused by a stomach complaint, VI 448, XI 242.
Galen also cured the orator, Diomedes, of a disease which none of the palace doctors could discover, and from such cures Galen's reputation among the leading men increased, XIV 625. He appears to have known the grammarian Callistos, CMG.V.10.22 486, who worried himself to death after losing all his books in the fire at the Temple of Peace, where Galen also lost many writings. This appears to have been the centre for Roman scholars, and possibly here Galen met the lawyer Nasutus, who died of grief at the sudden death of his mother 54. He was clearly known to the philosophers active at the time, and his philosophical writings were as influential as his medicine. He corresponded with Hermias, the tutor of Alexander of Aphrodisias 55, and late Alexandrian commentators on Aristotle accounted him with Plato and Aristotle. Even during his lifetime a sect of Christians led by Theodotus, a leatherworker of Byzantium, used philosophical arguments drawn from Galen to justify Christianity 55a. He treated the female philosopher Arria, who was a close friend of the emperor, XIV 218, and the philosopher Glauccon, to whom he dedicated a work on 'Therapeutic Method' was probably acquainted with him before his visit to Rome, to judge by the casualness of their first meeting, VIII 361 - 2. His diagnosis of the illness of Theagenes, the Cynic, is regarded as one of his greatest triumphs 56. This man used to give daily lectures at the Baths of Trajan, and employed as doctor a follower of Soranus, Attalus, probably Statilius Attalus of Heraclea Salbake, who used a plaster after the manner of Thessalus. Galen gave Attalus a lengthy lecture, which he only endured out of respect for Galen's learning, and failed to put into practice, continuing to publish daily bulletins on his patient's health until, suddenly, Theagenes died. Attalus, unsuspecting, came joyfully to see his
rerecovering patient, bringing with him some of Theagenes' friends. Inside the house, cynic philosophers were engaged in washing the body, and, as Theagenes had no wife or child, and his friends, being philosophers, forbore to weep, there was no sound to warn him. Attalus continued expounding the virtues of his cure almost into the room, when he discovered the truth and left in disgrace.

Was Galen unusual in his practice of medicine and philosophy, and how far is this insistence on the need for a doctor to understand the philosophical basis of medicine confined to Galen? Are we to see here an attempt by doctors to magnify their art by relating it to philosophy? Temkin, Isis, 1953, 213 - 225, has suggested a division into 'doctors' and 'leeches', corresponding to medicine as science and craft, and suggests, p.224, that there was an effort by certain practitioners to break away from the narrowness of leechcraft by joining a sect. "Greek medicine became split into sects, not over preferences for one or the other drug or one or the other surgical technique, but over different explanations of disease or the very need for such an explanation". Thus in attempts at medical system building there was a close relationship to philosophy, and Temkin, p.225, sees a vast number of doctors whose views and activities are to be placed somewhere between those of the leaders of medical thinking, represented in the literature, and the practitioner, bound by mere tradition, all affected in some way or other by the interest in the theoretical and philosophical basis of their art.

Although generally Temkin is correct, he has failed to consider sufficiently the desire of a doctor for social advancement, and the use of the relations between medicine and philosophy to achieve that end. Galen
always insists on close links between medicine and philosophy, and the simple
collection of doctors and philosophers is found frequently in his writings.\textsuperscript{58}
I have already described the important Aristotelian circle at Rome, and it is
hardly necessary to point out the importance of such a group for any
philosopher wishing to gain eminence and status. Philosophy, unlike
medicine, was not a profession, unless the philosopher was also a teacher, but
an object of study worthy of a gentleman's leisure. Cicero, who translated
much Hellenistic philosophy into Latin, is only one example of a senator who
turned to philosophy, and the Stoics in the first century formed a recognisable
group within the Senate.\textsuperscript{59} It is clear that a philosopher enjoyed a much
higher social standing than a doctor, speaking in general terms, and that the
closer medicine came to philosophy, the greater the status attached to it.
Galen can thus attempt to show medicine as part of philosophy, and hope to
gain additional benefits for himself and his followers.\textsuperscript{59a}
Hippocrates is for Galen the first of philosophers as well as the
first of doctors, XVI 31, and, as well as writing a treatise on the opinions
of Hippocrates and Plato, he can accuse his opponents of failing to
understand the philosophic basis of the thought of Hippocrates through their
ignorance of logical theory, XVIII A 245. Hence the ideal doctor must be a
philosopher like Hippocrates and practise \textsuperscript{\textit{ταύτα λογίζεσθαι ρέονταν}}. Nor
is Hippocrates the only philosopher doctor recorded by Galen. Among
Hellenistic philosophers, Chrysippus also wrote a work on 'Therapeutics'
VIII 138, and the philosophy of Epicurus is taken as the foundation of the
medical thought of Asclepiades, II 45, III 74, 571, while the Alexandrian
contemporary of Galen, Julian, claimed to follow Zeno, Plato and Aristotle
in his teaching, XVIII A 258, cf. I 457, 523. Empirical medicine obviously
owed much to the scepticism of Pyrrho and his school, XI 381, and Sextus, the contemporary head of the Empiric sect, also wrote philosophical tracts on Scepticism. Diogenes Laertius also took a philosophical interest in medicine, and clearly among the more literate practitioners, many studied the relationships between philosophy and medicine. Galen insists upon a knowledge of 'logical method' for every doctor, that he may learn quickly and not misunderstand, and that when faced with an unusual case he may bring to bear his powers of logic and reason. In his division of skills in the Protrepticus, Galen places the doctor in the highest circle, and ranks medicine first among the logical and noble arts. He admits that his work 'On the function of parts of the body' is more suited to a philosopher, desiring to obtain a knowledge of all nature, than to a doctor, but all men who respect themselves should undergo this initiation into mysteries which are visible to all. This particular enquiry, a great success with the Roman Aristotelians, XIX 20, is intended to strengthen the basis of medical thought against the denials of philosophers, IV 362-3. Galen's friends among the medical profession are styled and comprehend the theory of their actions as much as the practice, II 285, undeceived by the false doctrine of the sophists, XI 466-8. Just as the philosophers discourse upon the directive faculties, though with a different end in view.

Galen's attitude to individual sects is also of importance, for from his early training in logic he claims to be able to discover the truth by attending the best teachers in each sect and then applying logic to their arguments, VIII 143. Even when confronted by experts in a particular branch of medicine, he can defeat them by his logical method, III 837. In this he
differs from his contemporaries, who, failing to gain a clear comprehension of what each sect proclaimed, styled themselves physicians or philosophers, being unable to separate the true from the false, II 53. He did not hesitate to ask philosophers about the nature of the demiurge, although he found their replies unsatisfactory, and he requested them to share any findings they made with him, IV 695 - 6. He did not shrink from publicly debating with them and on his first visit to Rome, XI 194, he gave public readings of the works of Erasistratus to all the philosophers, though most doctors preferred to avoid debates on methodology, condemning them as useless and unlikely to provide any conclusion, I 243. Where he differs from his predecessors and turns medicine in a new path, is in his practical use and study of philosophy. Far from merely using it as a theoretical base for medical investigation, as Athenaeus, Asclepiades and Julian had done, Galen sets out as a practising philosopher, who utilises his medical discoveries to solve philosophical problems. His works on logic and epistemology are thus linked with his medical investigations in a manner different from the theoretical preconceptions of earlier doctors and philosophers, and it is significant that his immediate reputation was as a philosopher as much as, if not more than, a doctor. When discussing Galen as a philosopher or as a sophist, we can extrapolate not from theories which may not be borne out by actions, but from the actions themselves, which is impossible in an consideration of earlier doctors as philosophers.

Galen then made a strong bid to ally philosophy with medicine and to secure further honours and benefits for the medical profession by such an alliance. His frequent statements on the need for logic and philosophical knowledge on the part of the doctor, which find echoes in similar manifestos
as Vitruvius, I.1f., mark him out from most of the other doctors of his time, though it is only fair to say that almost all our information derives from Galen and hence may be biased. That he succeeded in the first part of his aim is clear from a consideration of the later teaching of medicine at Alexandria and by his own reputation as a philosopher, Athenaeus I.2. There still remains the problem over his relations with his contemporaries. How far we can accept him at his own valuation as an outstanding and individual doctor, standing alone in the sight of the emperor, whose theories and ideas were in advance of his time? His regular assertion of his own merits and the fact that so much of his work survives tends to obscure the fact that there were other doctors interested in similar subjects, whose wealth and patients were drawn from similar groups.

Let us consider more of Galen's patients, those of a more humble station, whom he treated like most other doctors in the normal course of events. I have already mentioned his service with the gladiators and his references to military medicine are few. He was, however, in close touch with the organisers of the gymnasia and treated several patients for afflictions brought on by training or over-exercise. A man who tore a muscle while running; a slave of the rich mimewriter Marullus, injured in the palaestra; athletes choked by dust; and an unusual case of a man with a dislocated shoulder, all came to Galen, and he claims that, when an exceptional case was discovered, all the doctors of Rome, Portus and Ostia wished to consult him, XVIII A 348. The gymnast Secundus gave him a clear account of his symptoms, as befitted a trainer, VIII 254, and Galen provided advice for others who had exerted themselves at the palaestra, X 608, 671. Overexercise must have brought on attacks of one sort or another, for when
Commodus fell ill on his return from the palaestra, XIV 661, Galen ascribed it to an excessive rub down at the hands of a trainer. Although we know much about the sort of person Galen treated, from senators and sophists to patients cured when he was passing by or who casually called to see him when they happened to be in the city, we know little about his wealth. He came from a rich family, despite his disclaimers, yet we have no record of any benefit to his home city, and he gives us scant information about his and his fellow doctors' finances. Pliny the Elder disapprovingly notes the high fees of his contemporaries, but Galen only once appears to receive a substantial sum. For his cure of Boethus' wife, XIV 647, he got HS 40,000 which provoked others to envy. These rewards do not appear to have been unusual especially when the patient seemed likely to die or, as in this case, to be permanently disabled, and when the patient's relatives were as wealthy as senators or top sophists. A young doctor, born at Pergamum, who had moved to Alexandria, tried to treat the wife of a wealthy Pergamen for childlessness according to the teachings of his master, the Hippocratic Metrodorus, CMG. V. 10.1.401. A huge fee was agreed if he proved successful, and the money was lodged with a trustee. Unfortunately for the doctor, who, had he succeeded, would have been rich for life, he failed and his reputation fell so low that he was unable to obtain patients. Galen alleges that such doctors, without means or education, XIV 623, come to Rome where they can escape the obloquy suffered in their home cities. Galen, as a man of wealth, provided many fellow doctors with drugs, instruments, and even ρηζοξεία, if they were in need, but such instances were few. When discussing criminal doctors, XIV 621, he remarks that the wicked at Rome contrive to make more money than at home, and although doctors without
philosophy are mere druggists, they do make money, I 61. The privilege of immunity granted to those doctors on the list of registered civic practitioners was an obvious attraction to those taking up medicine, V 751, and an easy possibility of enrichment is implied. The bet of one thousand drachmae made by an anatomist, to be paid if he could show the great artery empty of blood, indicates wealth on the part of some doctors, II 642. Although Galen wished the doctor to despise riches and earn sufficient to keep off hunger, thirst and rags, it is clear that this simple aim could be achieved without difficulty, and without difficulty surpassed, I 58. It is fair to point out that Galen may be thinking of doctors in Rome, those who intend to practise in the great city, XVIII 303, and the situation of a country doctor may not have been so easy. As was only to be expected, the level of fees was lower, and the patients were scattered over a wider area. A poor doctor complained that he found some of Galen's prescriptions useless, as he was unable to obtain a particular drug, nor had he all the equipment of a town doctor in his house, and that which he had was not easily portable, XII 908. He does not appear to be alone in this, and Galen says that he will write for such men and for their patients, who are reduced in time of illness to a very meagre diet. His solution, XII 909, is to allow rich doctors to prepare expensive drugs for their patients who could afford it, and to share his secrets also with poorer men, who, XII 918, could always make good use of windfalls. Needless to say, Galen appears to have concentrated upon his clientele in Rome, and though we have evidence to show that he concerned himself with patients from other parts of the Roman world, he was primarily a Roman doctor. Yet this statement should not be construed to mean that Galen
was as Roman in his ideas as Cassius Dio or that he regarded Rome and the West as anything other than a temporary residence. Pergamum is his homeland to which he returns and Asia and Pergamum are the places to which his loyalties lie. Even when he is writing some years after leaving Pergamum, he can still describe it as his homeland and he frequently allies himself with the inhabitants of Asia Minor in their particular terminology. Although he is well acquainted with all the major Greek authors he shows no such familiarity with Roman literature, and his long stay in Rome seems to have had little effect upon his Greekness. It is probable, if not certain, that he could speak Latin, for he converses with Marsiat hillmen who can hardly be expected to be fluent in Greek, yet his attitudes towards culture and to the achievements of Rome are those of a Greek.

Even the massive administration and building works of the Empire receive only a passing mention with a note on the straightness of Trajan's new roads in Italy, and we may conclude that he viewed the Roman Empire and its achievements with indifference. How far Galen is typical is difficult to say, but he may fairly be contrasted with the eulogistic Aristeides and with Cassius Dio who combined Roman political and national traditions with the cultural outlook of the Greeks. On the other hand, there is no evidence to decide whether the wealth that he obtained was expended upon Pergamum, as several of his rich townsmen had done, which would confirm in some way his Hellenocentricity, and thus no sure statement can be made of the extent of his involvement with the Greek world of Asia Minor.

I have tried to show Galen in context as a Greek doctor in Rome, a sophist, a man of letters and an imperial servant. In all these aspects parallels can be found in literature or among inscriptions, and thus he can
be treated less as the great original he claimed to be. The stress he laid on the philosophical side of medicine and on the need of a doctor to have a general education doubtless appealed only to those who could afford it, and therefore allied those members of the medical profession with the wealthy, the senatorial class and the friends of the emperor. This would have the result of increasing the status of physicians, at least of the more articulate of them, and I think that this participation in the second sophistic movement, of which Galen is the chief example, was of great importance in determining the future status and influence of physicians in the Roman empire. Galen's rise from well-to-do provincial society to friendship with the members of the imperial circle has earlier precedents in the careers of Stertinius Zenophon and Servius Sulpicius Hecataeus, and it is only because of his verbose outpourings and his subsequent success that he became regarded as something unusual, without antecedents. The social phenomenon of the success of the Greek doctor at Rome cannot be understood save by a consideration of the success of other comparable groups, e.g. sophists and other intellectuals, and Galen, who combined so many interests and acquaintances, may be untypical in his career as a doctor. Because he provides us with such information and at such length we are able to trace his career and his circle of friends, but, to obtain a truer picture of the status of the medical profession in the second and third centuries, it is necessary to compare with this singular paragon the evidence provided from all parts of the empire by means of inscriptions.
Notes to Chapter III.


4. Inscriptions of this man and his family are IGR 502 – 6. On the problem of Galen's name, probably Aelius Galen, see K. Kalbfleisch, AHE, 1902, 413; V. Bruhn, CIBA Zeitschrift, 43, 1937, 1509.

5. VI.749, XI 336, XIII 402, XVIII A 49.

6. V.42, VI 755, XIX 59.

7. X.561, cf. such observations as III 262 which may date from his youth.


11. II 224, XVI 484, XIX 57, Aristeides, XLIIX 7ff.

12. XCVIIIB 303, CNG V.10.22.412.

13. XVI 484, XVIIA 575, XVIIIIB 654, XIX 58. On the spelling of this name, which is corruptly preserved, see Knoepfleit, Scripta Minora Galeni, II,LXIV.

14. II 217 – 8, X.52.

15. Les Gladiateurs dans l'orient Grec. Paris, 1940

16. FE III.55, Robert, op. cit. 25f. "Les ἀνθρώποι d’Éphèse sont des amateurs de combats de gladiateurs". This one was under the patronage of the Vedii. A similar club existed at Termessus, TAM 3.1.400. On the relations between the high priest and the gladiators, see Robert, op. cit. 256f., 283 – 5. Cf. also IG IV 365, (Robert, n.61, p.117).
17. XIII 600.
19. XIII 599, XVIII 567, II 345, V.160 on which see Cobet, Mnemosyne, 1882, 185.
20. I prefer this version, recorded in an Arabic translation from a good source, Meyerhof, AGM, 1929, p.77, cf. 72, to that of the infallible Galen, XIII.600
23. XIV 622. On the date of Verus' return, see Barnes, JRS 1967, p.72.
24. Cp. the troubles of Dio Chrysostom at Frusa, Pliny Ep.X 81 - 2. It is unlikely that he left Rome to avoid the great plague, XIX 16 as he had departed before the arrival of Verus and his army.
25. The date is 168 or 169, XIV 650, XIX 18. Barnes, op. cit. p.73 argues with diffidence for 168.
30. Quoted by Rosenthal, Fortleben p.56. The same statement is found in Ishaq bin Hunayn, see Rosenthal, Oriens, 7, 1954, p.79, and may be traced at least to the Galenic scholar, Hunayn bin Ishaq, see Meyerhof, BMH 1945, p.172. Barhebraeus, Chronographia, ed. Budge, Cambridge 1932, gives this erroneous date of birth, p.54, relying upon a Syriac or Arabic tradition.
31. The date of his consulsip is uncertain, probably before 162, and one should prefer Στροφιαστικος, XIV 612, 627, XIX 13, to Στροφιαστικος, II 215. His activity in Palestine is recorded in II 215, XIX 16.
32. CIL VI 1803, the date of his first consulship is uncertain, Degrazi Fasti 131, and he is probably to be found as consul with A. Torquatus Asprenas under Antoninus, CIL VI 253.
33. Eusebius H.E. IV 26 3. All the Mss. read in Στροφιαστικος Παντως save two which give Στροφιαστικος and Στροφιαστικος. The Latin version of Rufinus reads 'Sergio', and Schwarz, Leipzig 1903, assumed that it was accidentally derived from a reminiscence of Acts 13.7. However, as we know that Sergius Paulus was consul at this period, c.164 - 6, the reading of Rufinus may be correct. I fail to understand what G. Bardy, note ad loc. in his edition, Paris 1952, means when he says" Il se peut que (Rufinus) ait raison, car L. Sergius fut en effet proconsul
of Asie vers 164 - 6" when our only evidence as yet for his proconsulship is this passage alone. Bowersock, p.83, is also doubtful.

34. II 218, XIV 612, CIL VI 1803. B. Borghesi, Oeuvres IX, Paris. 1879, 310 - 313.

35. XIV 612, 623; OGIS 546. He was the son of the consul of 146, of eastern origin, and he may be one of the suffect consuls of 160, see Degrassi, Fasti 132. Galen calls him, XIV 629, φιλάλογος, a term of approbation, see Robert, Hell. XIII 52, Bull. 1965, 180, and for its application to doctors, BCH 1926, 330, IGR III 534, Petersen and von Luschau, Reisen n.225, CIL III 614, and inscription app. I.B. Note also H. Kuch, Φιλάλογος, Berlin 1965.


37. XV 723. The Mass. read Victori, but as there is no senator or praefectus urbis with this name at this period it is best to follow the suggestion made by Borghesi, Oeuvres IX 317, and identify the man with the known praefectus, Victorinus. Borghesi, 314 - 319, cos.suff.155, cos.II,183, vid. PIR II, p. 276 - 9, n.1393. Pflaum, MAI 1966, 41 - 48.

38. This is the identification made by G. Barbieri, L'Albo Senatorio, Rome 1952, p.26 n.38, and see further J.A. Crook, Consilium Principis, p.80, 81 and n.3 p.81. Another possibility, though less likely, is the governor of Pamphylia under Commodus, C. Pomponius Terentianus, IGR III 582. Bowersock, p.25, wants a connection with certain Pergamenes.


40. III 695, D.49.14.42, CIL XIV 3587. Other possibilities are the historian Flavius Arrian, cos. after 127 and in retirement at Athens, or one of the Arriani of IG II 12 4251 - 3. The Mass. read ἄρπικος or ἴρπικος.

41. IX 369, who may be the wife of Boethus, XIV 641, cf.XI 341, X 1007.

42. The tract XI 357 - 378 is edited by O. Temkin, B.H.M., 1934, 179 - 189. Ilberg, RBW, 1896, dated this work to post 193, p.183, though it is possible that it was written earlier and revised for publication, cf. Ilberg, ib. p.177.

43. On his career, see Nagel, PW, sv. Sabucius I, and on that of Baebius, PIR I, p.346 n.14.

44. PIR II, Justus I, n.874.

45. Thus K. Bardong, NRG, 1942, p.609 - 610.

46. On this man see M. Fluss, PW, s.v. Modius n.11. However the man may be an unknown senator.

47. XVI 457. On the family of Martii, W. Kroll, PW, s.v. Martius 1,6.
48. The text, XVIIA 435, is corrupt and reads \( \Lambda \chi \alpha \iota \nu \alpha \sigma \nu \eta \). On some members of the Pergean family, Jameson, JRS, 1965, 54 - 58, cf. Bowereock, 22 n.5. A tempting possibility is T. Annaeus Placidus, PIR I, n.614, possibly praetor urbanus, ILS 3406, who was murdered by Commodus.

49. XIV 650, 655, 661.

50. XIV 652. Galen was informed of the illness by Severus. The problem of the identity of Sextus, who was suspected by Cichorius, N.J. 1905, 624, of being one of the Quintili, cos 172 and 180, as opposed to Stein, PIR s.v. G.24, who thought it was Commodus, has now been solved by J. Kollesch, NBG, 1965, 57 - 61, who shows that the reading in K. is corrupt and that one should follow the reading of the Laurentian Ms. which gives us a Sextus Quintilii f. The age of the invalid points to Sextus Quintilius Condivius, cos. 180, rather than his older brother.

51. XIV 663. I assume that this is the daughter of Marcus rather than his wife, and it would be an interesting speculation if the doctor were the methodist, Statilius Attalus.


54. CMG.V.10.22 486. Is Paulus the orator, XV.565, the praefectus urbis, Sergius Paulus, or some other speaker?


56. X.909f. On the location of Galen's argument, see H. Schoene, Hermes, 1917, 105 - 111.


58. Such examples are I 510, 518, 55; II 291; III 17, 21, 462, 585 - 6; IV 791, 512, 569, 620, 643, 663, 675, 724, 651 (I suspect 765 as part of a non-Galenic work, esp. in its division into \( \lambda \gamma \rho \theta \varepsilon \varphi ' \) and \( \chi \alpha \iota \nu \alpha \sigma \nu \eta \).)


59a. Other specialists could stress the philosophic quality of their art, cf. Vitruvius I.1ff. for architects and Lucian \( \tau \rho \iota \rho \iota \iota ' \phi \chi \xi p ' \), 35, 81 for the dance.


62. The statement on literacy, XIX 8, is a rhetorical exaggeration.

63. The requirements for the humble practitioners were not intellectually exacting. Soranus, ed. Ilberg 3, requires the midwife to be ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἀποφθέγματι to comprehend the theory of her art, and quickwitted to follow the instructions given her with speed.

64. XI 358, 466. The supreme example of Galen's exaltation of the doctor to the status of a philosopher is found in the tract: 'That the best doctor is also a philosopher', ed. with commentary by E. Wenkebach, OS, 3, 4, 1933, 155 - 175, and P. Bachmann, OS, 1965, 1 - 67.


67a. On the quarrel between sophists and philosophers, Bowersock, 11.

68. II 345, 385, III 269, IV 160, XIII 604, XIV 244, XV 709, XVIIA 10.

69. II 299, 632, III 890, XVIII 346f.

70. See above Ch. I note 75ff. The second century doctors do not appear to be able to compete in wealth with such sophists as Herodes or Polemo, but there is no indication of poverty. There is dispute over the legal manner in which fees were charged to a patient by a doctor working alone. Below, 81 - 107 argues that medicine was never practised as an ars liberalis and that payment was made, not through mandatum, but by locatio conductio, later replaced by a cognitio extraordinaria, but both the relevant texts D.9.2.7.8 and D.50.13.1 have been suspected and may be incompatible. Daube, JRS 1955, 179 - 180 argues that in all cases, although mandatum is theoretically inappropriate, as the gratuitous performance of an act on behalf of another, the doctor behaves as if it is appropriate, a very difficult notion in legal theory. Nevertheless, this seems to me to be more satisfactory in explaining the social relationship of the doctor and patient than Below's view and more acceptable in law than the supposition of A. Watson, The contract of mandate in Roman Law, Oxford, 1961, 99ff. that the action in law was a sort of tertium quid, whose details are unknown to us. This seems unlikely in view of the arguments on this that are presented in the Digest. As Daube rightly points out, the multiplicity of terms for the remuneration of a doctor working alone reflects the varied methods of selecting a doctor. For example, a retaining fee is implied in CT XIII.3.8, P.Oxy.1912, and D.19.5.26.1, and a salarium is given to a freedman in D.40.5.41.6, while an actio in factum is mentioned at D.19.5.26.1. On this vexed problem, see also Macqueron, Le travail des hommes libres, ALX, 1964,
Note also the comment of Crook, *Roman Law and Life*, p.205, who follows Daube. "The whole problem remains curiously unsolved; no coherent set of rules to cover all the cases can be discovered, and the reason is probably connected with the changes in the relative social dignity of various branches of labour, and also with the progressive abandonment in practice of the 'gratuitousness' of services which had in origin been given free on a basis of officium between status-equals. The tight and precise categories of the Roman law both of status and of contract are (and were) inadequate to characterize the rich and fluid diversity of social and economic situations in the Roman world".

71. AGM 1929, p.84. From the number of doctors in attendance at many cases it is clear that they were paid by results, though individual contracts could be negotiated, and gratitude on the part of a patient could replace a demand.

72. Touting for patients is implied in Epictetus III 22.

73. XIV 621, but there were a few rich patients, CMG V.10.1.401.

74. He replies to sufferers of eye-diseases who write to him from Iberia, Gaul, Asia and Thrace, VIII 224.


76. Examples are VI 287, XII 312, XIII 599, XVIII 567, CMG V.4.11, 435, 440. He also made several visits to the Eastern Mediterranean, but these cannot be dated exactly.

77. I count at least 31 authors, from Homer and Sappho, XVI 566 – 7, to Cercidas, X 406, Euphorion XVII 881 and Plutarch V.310.

78. XI 143, XII 316.

79. X 632 – 3.

80. On Aristeides and the Greeks see the cautious remarks of Bowersock, 15ff; and of Palma, *op. cit.* 75, 130ff.


82. Cf. Galen's comments on sophists, *Med. Terms* 8f., XVIII 258 and his practice, e.g. medical terms 31, XVII 58, and the massive list of writings XIX 8 – 49.

83. He was probably Galen's doctor, and calls himself 'friend of the emperor' AGIM 799. J.A. Crook in his prosopographical index to Consilium Principis includes Artorius Asclepiades and L. Gellius Maximus, but not this man, nor Statilius Criton, who are called 'friends of the emperor'.
CHAPTER FOUR.

East and West; the doctor in public life.

So far my exposition has concentrated upon doctors in the West of whom Galen is the most distinguished and accessible, and I have said little about doctors in the East. In this chapter I shall set out the evidence from the whole empire for the activities of the doctor in the public life of his community, as the holder of priesthoids and magistacies, as a civic benefactor, as the member of an important family, and as one of the pillars of society. Something has already been said about the great differences between the halves of the Empire in their attitudes towards doctors and this survey will provide confirmation and support for this opinion.

The doctors in the West, being mainly of immigrant origin, rarely hold a municipal office. Only at Sufetula in Africa, where the whole concia concurred in erecting a statue of Q. Iulius Q.f. Rogatianus, doctor and aedile and the provider of public games, is there an example of a doctor as a civic official. Few doctors indeed can be connected with important local families. A young man aged twenty, who possibly attended the amphitheatre at Aix as a vet. appears from the size of his memorial to have been wealthy, and a Greek from Ostia, C. Marcius De [Metrius?], married into a family rich enough to place a large statue in their well-appointed family vault.

Freedmen are much more in evidence. A doctor at Ostia was magister vicu in the first century and twelve doctors are recorded as seviri Augustales of whom two were rich enough to put a relief upon their tombs.

Another, P. Decimus P. l. Merula, a medicus clinicus chirurgus ocularius - a
remarkable series of specialities — paid fifty thousand sesterces for his freedom, far above the normal rate for the first century of two thousand, and a further two thousand to the city for his sevirate. The erection of statues in the temple of Hercules cost another thirty thousand, the paving of the roads thirty seven thousand, and at his death he left the impressive total of eight hundred thousand sesterces. Few Western doctors are so verbose or so ostentatiously wealthy, although Nicomedes of Smyrna who dedicated at Rome a statue sculpted by Boethus cannot have been poor. At Sassina, the doctor Vafer Nicephorus was made patron of the collegium centonariorum and there were collegiae composed entirely of members of the medical profession. Whatever the nature of the group of doctors at Velia, a collegium of doctors existed at Beneventum with a reversionary interest in the will of a rich citizen and his soldier son. A similar organisation is found at Aventicum, ILS 7786, while at Turin the doctors are associated with teachers in the worship of Asclepius, and such trade associations may not have been uncommon in Italy and Gaul. But not all collegiae were socially important. Barbius Zmaragdus was a humble member of the unimportant collegium sacrum Martis at Aquileia, and the presence of doctors in funeral associations at Tibur and Larinum attests poverty rather than wealth.

The evidence for the activities of the doctor in public life in the West is thus small, but before it can be concluded that a doctor was socially unimportant or lacked the wealth to hold such offices, other factors must be examined and discounted. Although in certain areas such as Africa it appears to have been unusual to mention a profession upon a tombstone, this by itself will not explain the absence of doctors from civic office,
and epigraphic fashion alone is an insubstantial argument. Much more attractive is the suggestion that, as doctors were mainly immigrants, their wealth was channelled back to benefit their families and to adorn their native cities in the East. But the medical profession provides few counterparts to A. Curtius Crispinus Arruntiamus, a resident of Praeneste, who gave money for the theatre at his home town of Aspendus. Statilius Attalus set up memorials to his family at Heraclea Salbace and gave a sum of money to the neuti there who struck three coin types in his honour, one under Antoninus Pius, the rest under Marcus Aurelius. Although the chronology of his medical career is uncertain, it seems likely that his gift was made when he was an imperial doctor resident in Rome. The only other benefactors who can be assumed to have amassed wealth in Rome and to have expended it on their return home are some of the doctors of the Julio-Claudians.

But what about the non-imperial doctors? Can it be assumed that the Greek doctors who came to Rome ever returned and left their money to their family, not to the beautification of their native cities? There is no disagreement about their arrival; they migrated to Rome from Smyrna and Tralles, Ephesus and Nicomedia, from Thyateira, from Lycia and Pamphylia, but those who returned were few. Our literary evidence shows two, Galen and Quintus, significant exceptions for they were expelled from Rome by the hostility of their fellow practitioners. The epigraphic evidence is equally thin; no doctor who is not an imperial doctor can be assumed with certainty to have visited Rome. Even when the Eastern doctors with Roman citizenship are considered as possible residents of Rome, little is revealed. Of 403 doctors recorded on Eastern inscriptions only 57 have Latin nomina or can be assumed to have been citizens before the edict of Caracalla, of
whom nine are imperial doctors. If the edict of Julius Caesar granting citizenship to all doctors residing in Rome was ever effective, then we must conclude that only a small proportion of those who moved to Rome ever returned, a possible confirmation of Galen's jibe, XIV 623, that because of the obloquy they suffered at home, those physicians who had hurriedly left for the anonymity of the imperial capital did not dare to return. Thus the argument that wealth amassed in Italy was diverted to the East cannot be sustained on the present evidence and it is probably true that the relative infrequency of the holding of offices by doctors in the West was due to the social prejudices against them and to their low status. A family from Beneventum may provide a paradigm of the rise in society of a doctor and his family. L. Staius Eutychus may have been a Greek doctor who moved to Beneventum in the mid-second century, for the absence of other Staii in the inscriptions of that city argues against his being a freedman of one of its inhabitants. L. Staius Rutilius Manilius, his son, became archiater of Beneventum and made enough money from his practice to obtain the rank of eques. He took an obvious and justifiable pride in the achievements of one of his sons, L. Staius L.f. Scrateius Manilianus, who became praetor Cerialis in 231. He was also praetor iure dicundo quinquennalis and both his father and grandfather erected inscriptions commemorating his various bounties to the citizens. He must have been aided by his father's wealth, and it is probably true to say that his father, a civic doctor, became rich but not entirely respectable, while the son was respectable and expended the wealth of his father. This survey of the doctors in the West, concentrating upon those who show obvious signs of wealth and of social importance, is necessarily
somewhat misleading, but a comparison with the doctors of the East emphasizes the difference between the social positions of doctors in the two areas during the first three centuries.

I have already mentioned briefly the offices held by Statilius Artemidorus at HeracleaSalbace, a city unusually rich in epigraphic records of doctors, where in about 50 A.D. Archelaos, a doctor, held every office in the city. In the third century, Aur. Charmides, an archiatros, was prytanis, stephanephorus, councillor and holder of every civic office and liturgy, and his father or son may have acted likewise. It is tempting to identify Diogenianus of Heraclea in Caria, mentioned by Suidas, with Euneicus Diogenianus, an important official, of whom an inscription survives, but it is more likely, from the omission on the inscription of any reference to his practice of medicine, that he was only a member of the same family.

Though Heraclea is unusual in its high proportion of known doctors, it is not so in its records of their activities. The Lycians sent Patron, a doctor, to Rome as their ambassador, while from Lydae came Ameinias, the complete doctor, a man of culture, of distinguished family, holding every office, and an ambassador of the Lycians to Rome at his own expense.

Unfortunately we have no other information about this paragon, and Hicks' attempts to relate another Lycian pharmacist, Diophantus, to an important family of Lydae are mere speculation. Also from Lycia comes Lysander, the doctor of Aperlae, whose family had held office for generations, who fulfilled all the offices in the city and among the Lycians, and who was commemorated by his great granddaughter, herself a high-priestess, with a statue in the agora.

These are important 'national' figures, but doctors are regularly
found as councillors. At Drobeta in Dacia, a legionary doctor was elected a decurion when under the prescribed age, ILS 7150a, and Q. Mofius Euhemerus, a benefactor of the colony of Philippi, may have been a member of the city council, like the father of the young doctor, BCH 1934, 472 - 3. At Kyparissos, IG.V.1.1245, a doctor may have been a councillor - he certainly came from a distinguished civic family - and Aur. Messala was elected to the council at Sebaste in Phrygia, CIG 3872b, CB n.451. Much more interesting is the inscription of Attalus Priscus, an archiatros from Ephesus, the son of a doctor, a councillor, temple official and guardian of the estate of Antonius around 160. At Troezen another archiatros, IG IV 762, is market warden, an office also held by Bresos, son of Bresos, an archiatros honoured at Hierapolis in the Ager Nytilensaeus. He held a remarkable series of priesthods and civic offices, as had his ancestors, and, like Leontidas, archiatros of Hermione, IG IV 723, he held the most appropriate office of periegete, guide to the shrines. Aurelius Aristo, a doctor, was archon at Citium, and at the small city of Keramos doctors appear as civic magistrates. The inscriptive evidence, shows M. Aur. Valens Poleites, an archiatros, as archon in 251 and responsible for the erection of an honorary monument to Hostillianus, son of the emperor Decius, but Head remarks on a coin of M. Aur. Euandrus that, among the archons or ex-archons who signed the coins, more than one is distinguished personally as archiatros.

Other doctors, while not attaining high office, enter the select social club of the gerousia. In 98/9, Theogenes, a doctor, was admitted to the gerousia of Sebaste in Phrygia together with an imperial freedman, a soldier and a Roman citizen. This may not be relevant to the problem of
the duties of the 'doctor to the gerousia' who is found at Magnesia on the Maeander, IMag, 119, or of the 'archiatros of the heads of the gerousia' at Venusia. Other doctors, like Galen, take an interest in the activities of the gymnasium, and we know of several doctors to the ephesos at Athens and Sparta. An archiatros at Lampsacus provided free oil for the gymnasium and one thousand drachmas for the gerousia, IGR IV 182, and Asclepiades Apella after military service, held the office of gymnasiarch at Odessus, GIB 150.

In addition to these civic activities, doctors are frequently found in religious organisations. An obstetrix is a member of a mystery cult at Cyme, and a doctor is priest of the emperor Claudius at Thasos. At Hypsea and at Koula doctors participate in religious associations, though the members of a collegium of some sort at Sosandra who include a doctor, do not appear to be particularly rich, and it is possible that this is a burial club. Two doctors are important at the shrine of Hecate at Lagina, both, it should be noticed, archiatri. Sulpicius Demetrius is superintendent of the mysteries, while the other, Menippus, has a daughter, who is a priestess, and a son, a priest.

The wealth that was expended by these doctors on their religious duties could also be spent on public buildings and shrines. Capaneus of Oenoanda, a doctor, gave a shrine of Asclepius to his fellow townsmen, and at Euromus, Menocrates, son of Menocrates, in his year of office as stephanephorus, gave a column complete with base to the temple of Zeus. At Nysa or Mastaura, a doctor, Samiades, was sufficiently wealthy to set up a shrine and sanctuary to Asclepius, while at Saribsel in Phrygia, Menodorus, a doctor and priest of Asclepius, joined with his son, a priest and magistrate, in providing a vaulted annexe, two pillars and a roof for the
Heracleitus of Rhodiapolis may be proposed as a Lycian counterpart to Galen, for, the first doctor of his age, he was a historian and author of works on medicine and philosophy. He travelled widely, receiving honours from Alexandria, Rhodes and Athens, where he was honoured also by the Areopagus and by the Epicureans, but he does not appear to have visited Rome. He was a priest of Asclepius and Hygiaea, built a temple and erected statues of the gods, expending upon the gods and the games of Asclepius fifteen thousand denarii. He received freedom from liturgies and the privilege of a front seat at the games, and provided free medical treatment. He was an honorary citizen of Rhodes, a somewhat questionable privilege, and a man of great importance in his own city, although unknown to us from any other sources.

The lengthy Greek inscriptions of doctors tell us much more about their families and their connections than the brief Roman epitaphs, and we can place several doctors in high provincial society. A doctor at Adada placed a statue of his wife, also a doctor, in the agora of the city, and a young medical student from the same city, son of the holder of a life priesthood of the emperors and Aphrodite, was commemorated by the council and people after his death while attending the medical school of Alexandria.

Aquilus, archiatros of Synnada, married his daughter into the highest provincial nobility: her elder brother-in-law was an advocate of the treasury, and her sister-in-law, Julia Marcellina, was priestess of the temple of Asia at Pergamum. Her father-in-law, Iulius Moschus, was a stephanephorus, descendant of the high priests of Asia, whose father-in-law, Ulpius, was an advocate of the treasury. A similar success for an archiatros is recorded at Thessalonica, where Aurelius Isidorus, a high priest, set up a memorial to his maternal grandson, Mareinianus Philippus (3), a priest, ephebarch.
and poleitarch. His father, Mareinius Philippus (2), high priest, president of the civic and colonial games, four times holder of the neocorate, was the son of the Macedonarch of 219. Almost certainly Aurelius Isidorus was a man of importance himself, and such a marriage illustrates the status of certain doctors, especially of the archiatri.

But greater prizes were within the reach of a family from Antioch in Pisidia — the empire itself. L. Gellius Maximus (Poly)histor, archiatros, member of the Museum, procurator of ducenarian rank, came from a long established Antiochene family, and inscriptions record his benefactions and his priesthood of Asclepius. Rather than a member of the Museum of Ephesus, as Stein thought, he belonged to that of Alexandria, and he may have held an active procuratorship, although it is possible that it was purely honorary. Hisson, Gellius Maximus, legate of leg. IV Scythica in Syria in 219, raised an unsuccessful revolt against Elagabalus and was executed, Dio LXXX.7.1. Dio who knew imperial doctors and did not regard them highly, LXXI.33.4, comments that things have come to a pretty pass when the son of a doctor can aspire to the empire.

Consider also the family of the Philalethae, priest kings at the shrine of Men Karou. Ramsay, C.R., n.196, suggested with good reason that one of the descendants of Demosthenes Philalethes, after imperial service, returned to Eumeneia and held the priesthood of Apollo Propylaeus, a suitable deity for a medical traveller. In the reign of Augustus, Laodicea minted coins with the legend "Zeuxis", and "Zeuxis Philalethes", and Ramsay suggested that the doctors at Men Karou made the short migration to Laodicea, where their head took part in the political life of the city.

The eastern doctors recorded on inscriptions appear to possess at
least moderate wealth. A humble doctor, such as Lucius, attached to the staff of Dexter, legatus propraetore of Cilicia, could set up a lengthy verse inscription and a statue in the shrine at Hierapolis-Castabala. The fact that he is left behind by the governor, who leaves for Italy and his consulship, and the peculiarly formal address to the goddess, suggest that he was probably a Cilician, taken upon the governor's staff. Menophilus of Cadyanda received a statue and a gold crown from a city grateful for the benefits conferred upon it. He came from an outstanding family and as well as practising medicine with skill and good fortune he had voluntarily served as prytaneis and expended much of his wealth upon the city. Doctors could indeed make much money. At Aphrodisias and Sidyma archiatri construct very elaborate tombs for their families and two doctors of the rank of eques come from Aphrodisias and Ephesus. To obtain entry into the privileged number of civic doctors would not be difficult if one were a member of a well-known local medical family, whose ancestral prestige would quickly secure preferment and the examples of medical families such as the Statilii at Heracles can be multiplied. At Nicaea, among seven members of the family of Peisistratus, two, father and son, are doctors, and a third is a member of the gerousia, while at Claudiopolis, Acilius Theodorus first among doctors, fair of speech and of deed, is buried by his son, Theodorus, while another Theodorus, an archiatros and a relative, sheds a tear over him. At Thyateira Hermophilos, son of Moschianos, is honoured by his friend Secundus, president of the games of Asclepius, and described as an archiatros and the father, uncle and brother of archiatri. A similar family of archiatri is found at Philadelphia, where one of its members, Aur. Lucianus, was honoured by senate and people
for his medical knowledge and his good character 74.

Other doctors were compelled to travel, either for study, as Orestes of Adada, IGR III 374, and Nicetes, who came as a student from Tision to Smyrna 75, or to secure a satisfactory practice. A doctor from Nicaea records that he visited the ends of the earth, Europe, Libya and Asia 76, and a Nicene doctor is buried at Perrhaebia in Thessaly, having travelled much over land and sea 77. A studiously composed epitaph records an Egyptian who travelled widely before ending his days at rocky Tithorea 78, and a doctor who had saved many from diseases and visited many cities died of poison on Thasos 79. One would also like to know more of the purpose of the visit of a doctor in the early first century to the Chersonnese which ended in his death 80.

Cohn-Haft has shown that during the Hellenistic age one of the qualifications available for a doctor was to secure the public testimony of an honorary decree or a statue 81, and as some of my examples have shown, this custom continued throughout the Empire. At Citium 82, Artemidorus was honoured as a doctor, and the Andrians, IG XII 5.719, gave a gold crown and set up an inscription in the temple to Artemidorus, son of Menodotus 83. Iasos honoured Gaius Cornelius Hecateus, a complete doctor, of glorious ancestry, who benefitted the city by his knowledge and consummate virtue, REG 1893, 180, while in the third century at Kibyra Minor Aur. Varianus, a follower of Asclepiades, was honoured with a statue 84. The Delphians frequently gave such privileges to doctors, the earliest decree of this sort dating from 215 B.C. 85. Two Pergamene doctors were honoured in 27 B.C. 86, like Nicon of Amphissa, an acquaintance of Antony and a distinguished resident in the city, who had served the god and treated the sick 87. Metrophanes
of Sardes, BCH 1928, 172, Dion, probably from Cos, and M. Aurelius Dionysianus are all physicians similarly honoured at Delphi with gifts of citizenship. Isidore, a son of Nicarchus, receives an honorary decree in the full Hellenistic tradition from the inhabitants of the Coan deme of Haleis, the landowners and farmers of Haleis and Pela, citizens, Romans and metics. From the style and language this predates the decree for Satyrus, son of Themistocles, who received a gold crown and statue for his medical services to the deme of Isthmus. As Paton and Hicks rightly saw, this cannot refer to the doctor mentioned by Galen, XII 323, and thus this decree and its accompanying epitaph have been dated to before 74 A.D. without further difficulty.

Those doctors who received honours, with the possible exception of those at Delphi, provided their services continuously for a city, residing there and taking part in public life, but from the Hellenistic times onwards there were great festivals and games, at which it was at least convenient to have a doctor in attendance. In 300 B.C. an honorary decree records the services of an agoranomos in securing a doctor for the festival, and at Priene, in the early years of the first century B.C., doctors shared in the distribution of food with the participants, the theoroi, the trainers and visitors. From Dionysopolis in Moesia come two inscriptions recording the distribution of food or banquets on the occasion of a festival. It is probable that among those given this privilege were councillors visiting the festival, doctors, merchants, trainers, teachers, those who hymned the emperor and the agoranomoi, all considered necessary for the good running of the festival.

Descending the social scale we come to the relatively numerous
female doctors and obstetrices who appear in the inscriptions. An obstetrix is depicted on a grave relief at Constantinople96, and a lady calling herself Αὐστηρή is found at a remote Phrygian village97. Having saved many bodies from disease, she hopes that Christ the saviour will do likewise for her soul, a pleasing Christian rendering of a theme found in earlier epitaphs98. The wife of Aur. Asclepiades is commemorated by a statue in the agora at Adada, IGR III 376, and other midwives and nurses may be found with suitable cognomina, the most remarkable being Empeiria Eiatreine from Apamea in Bithynia99. There does not appear to be much difference in the status of female doctors and midwives throughout the empire and the division between the activities of an obstetrix and a medica, to use the Latin terms, is unclear100. It is probably best to leave these ladies with the general comment that they very rarely appear to show any sign of wealth and high status, a not surprising conclusion.

This survey of such epigraphic references to doctors in the Roman empire shows clearly the great division which existed between the practitioners in the West and those in the East101. In Asia Minor and Greece there were many humble doctors, of whom we have a few inscriptions and references in Galen, but there are many of high social importance. The discrepancy between the numbers of wealthy doctors from important local families, who are civic benefactors or holders of religious offices, is striking, and testifies, in part at least, to different attitudes to the doctor in the East and the West. Archiatri especially appear to have amassed considerable wealth, and it may be no coincidence that the finest lettering upon any memorial to a doctor that I have seen in the West is found in connection with an archiater102. This is not surprising if we consider that appointment as archiater constituted
a qualification, attracting patients, and that their income from fees would
presumably be greater than that of one less qualified. The evidence of
inscriptions tells us about the 'haves' rather than the 'have nots' and there
were undoubtedly many humble practitioners, whose numbers cannot be estimated.
Yet one can only make comparisons between the wealth and status of doctors
who set up these inscriptions or who are commemorated by them, and conclusions
must be drawn from them. Whether one can then generalize about the status
of doctors throughout the empire is uncertain, but they at least give the lie
to Galen's implications that wealthy doctors were to be found only at Rome\textsuperscript{103}.
Magie\textsuperscript{104} suggested that the doctor in the middle and late third century was
seriously affected by the decline in general prosperity. There is little
evidence to support this view; inscriptions show doctors continuing to hold
high office in a city well into the fourth century\textsuperscript{105}, and literary testimony
confirms this. The granting of immunity, which, as far as I can see, was
never revoked, probably made the profession of medicine even more respectable
and desirable as time went on, and, as we shall see, many of the notables of
the Later Empire had medical connections. There appear to have been
differences in wealth between doctors, as one would expect; those in close
touch with the imperial household obtained great wealth\textsuperscript{106}, some medical
families in the East possessed riches and property, but the doctor in the
West, generally of freedman status until the third century\textsuperscript{107}, was a relatively
humble citizen. This distinction between East and West is resolved in the
later Empire. Though obvious economic differences remain, they are by no means
as striking as those revealed by a survey of the inscriptions of the first three
centuries, and it is possible to conclude that general attitudes towards the
doctor from the fourth century onwards as exemplified in the extant evidence,
were identical throughout the empire.
Notes to Chapter IV.

1. I have to omit much of what Oehler and Gummerus included, notably the common inscriptions solely with name and profession.

2. See appendices II and III. The percentage of non-Greeks recorded on inscriptions ranges from 50% in Africa (16% *peregrini*) and 48% in Gaul and Germany to 25% in Spain and 7% in Rome.

3. ILS 7796. A doctor's son at Beneventum holds such an office, ILS 6496.

4. CIL XII 533.


6. ILS 5395. Meiggs 222 discusses his functions.

7. CIL V 2396, 2530, 2857, 3940; IX 2680; X 6469; XI 5399 + 5400; 5412, 6232; XII 1804; NS 1959 275; App.I.k. Cf. CIL IX 340, 3641, I.It.IX. IX.1.27.

8. CIL V 2396, CILX 6469. The size of those of their memorials I have seen is much larger than normal.
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12. The *Collegium Asclepii et Hygiaeae*, CIL VI 10234, is irrelevant to medical organisation as it consists of humble persons associating for cult or funeral purposes. Cf. De Robertis, *Il fenomeno associativo*, 61.


14. ILS 6507. There is no need to suppose with Gummerus p.55, that the father, a landowner, CIL IX 1455, line 71, was a doctor, especially in view of the smallness of the bequest.

15. CIL V 6970.


17. CIL XIV 3550, the *magister* 3641.
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28. La Carie II n.72, above n.21.
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47. IGR IV 1383.
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69. CIG 2847, and IGR III 599, TAM II.2.221, cf. 224.
72. BCH 1903 517, GVI 686.
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90. P-H 344, IGR IV 1087.
91. P-H 418, EG 200, GVI 1566, AASA, 1963-4, p.147; P-H, 409 (IGR IV 1108).
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95. GFB 30, Robert, RPh. 1959, p.206f.
96. Robert and N. Firatlı, FS, 139, pl.35, 175f.
97. MAMA VII 566, at Çemmelı Zebrı. This suggests a debasement of the title archiatros to mean any doctor of note, however minor, and need not at this late date, 4 - 5 century, require a civic post.
98. GVI 1008, 1907, 1932, 1934, 1940.
99. CIG 3736. Others are AEM, 1885, 124 n.84, 1887, 59, n.111, P.Oxy. 1586.
Eberschott, Mission Archéologique, Paris, 1921, 53 n.10, Bean and Mitford
DAWI 1965, n.47, MAMA III 269, 292, 605, CIG 9209, TAM II.2.595,
JOAI 1914 B.133 - 140, IGR IV 507, IG III 3452, JHS 1887, 373 - 4.
100. There are two portrait reliefs in the West, Calza, Necronoli, 248 - 251, (Tabanelli, CIX) and CIL XIII 4334 (Espérandieu, Rec. Rel. 4363).
Inscriptions give CIL II 497, V 289, 3461, VI 4458, 6525, 6647, 6832, 6951, 7581, 8711, 9477, 9478, 9614, 9615, 9616, 9617, 9720, 9721, 9722, 9723, 9724, 37810; VIII 806, 4896, 5155, 15593, 24679, 25394; IX 5861; X 3972, 3980; XI 3391, 3706, 4128, 6394; XIII 3706, IG XIV 1751, GVI 1940 and AE 1937, 17.
101. I do not think that much can be drawn from the large numbers of doctors recorded along the W. and SW. coast of Asia Minor. There existed the most flourishing cities of the 2nd, and 3rd. centuries, the medical schools and the cultural and economic centres. These areas also produce the bulk of the Asian inscriptions, and thus one would expect
a numerical preponderance. On the other hand, the number of doctors recorded in Syria, Bithynia and Pontus is statistically compatible, and it would be unwise to draw any conclusion from a simple numerical preponderance.

102. CIL X.2858, Puteoli. A squeeze of this is deposited in the Museum of Archeology, Cambridge.

103. XII 908, 918, XIV 623,


105. E.g. Ramsay, CR, 1919, 2f.

106. This of course applies to the free born, private doctors to the emperor, rather than to the slave doctors who attended the other members of his household.

107. See appendix II.

which was treated as a special case with regulations which were unfamiliars to the majority of Asian citizens, a system of law and government differing from that of the rest of the empire, and a unique position in the imperial administration. Here within Egypt the status of an Alexandrian differed from that of an Egyptian from Thebes, and this distinction can be seen even in relation to medicine. Egypt is the Hellenistic age had been treated almost as the private property of the ruler, and hence a vast bureaucracy grew up and such arrangements were made for the practice of medicine and for those who were concerned more with the organization of the royal estates, including the Egyptians themselves, than with the health of the patients. We know that a special tax was paid by a doctor resident in the above, but it is clear from the receipts that a doctor also received fees from his patients. Often he was a small farmer with land for which he paid rent to the ruler and taxes and impositions like the rest of the population. Such a bureaucratic system and such rules for doctors have no counterpart elsewhere in the ancient evidence, and, even
CHAPTER FIVE.

Doctors in Roman Egypt.

So far in this discussion of the medical profession I have made little reference to the medical activities and status of the physicians of Roman Egypt because I consider that they are so different from those of the rest of the empire that any conclusion based upon analogy with a document from Egypt would risk being completely false. This accords with the Roman view of Egypt, which was treated as a special case with regulations which were unfamiliar to the majority of Roman citizens, a system of law and government differing from that of the rest of the empire and a unique position in the imperial administration. Even within Egypt the status of an Alexandrian differed from that of an Egyptian from Thebes, and this distinction can be seen even in relation to medicine. Egypt in the Hellenistic age had been treated almost as the private property of the ruler, and hence a vast bureaucracy grew up and such arrangements as were made for the practice of medicine and are known to us were concerned more with the organisation of the royal estates, including the Egyptians themselves, than with the health of the patients. We know that a special tax was paid by cleruchs, the ἱστοιχοι, which may have helped to provide a wage for a doctor resident in the χώρα, but it is clear from the receipts that a doctor also received fees from his patients. Often he was a small farmer with land for which he paid rent to the ruler and taxes and impositions like the rest of the population. Such a bureaucratic system and such rules for doctors have no counterpart elsewhere in the extant evidence, and, even though modified during the empire, they still make Egypt a singular example, to be treated rather as an event in the study of the medical profession in the Roman Empire.
though modified during the empire, they still make Egypt a singular example, to be treated rather as an appendix to a study of the medical profession in the Roman Empire.

One objection to this view is that Alexandria was the greatest medical centre in antiquity and thus Egypt might be considered as part of the Roman medical world. However it is impossible to gauge its influence on Egyptian medicine, and I shall deal with the Museum and the teaching of medicine at Alexandria in detail in Chapter 10. Few records survive of Alexandrian doctors outside the Museum, or of Alexandria and Alexandrian medicine in the papyri. The only mention of Alexandria as a medical centre comes in P. Lond 356, a request for drugs, but this need not mean that either of the two friends was a doctor, as we know of perfume and drug-sellers. Nor need the man who asks his father for his drugs and a couple of drugs, obtained from a doctor, be one himself, and although one correspondent in P. Merton 12 is a doctor, the other need not be. Nothing as yet shows the influence of a renowned medical centre, though the writer in the last papyrus is described by its editor as "a writer who addresses his correspondent in terms of equality, and was clearly a well educated man with some medical knowledge". A better guide to the influence of Alexandria or the Museum as a teaching centre may be the traces of medical literature which we find in the papyri, and which also attest the literacy of the Egyptian medical profession. The mass of medical literature which was floating around Alexandria has found its way into the surviving papyri. Probably the most interesting is a copy of the Hippocratic oath, found at Oxyrhynchus, which shows many variants from the text of our manuscripts. It would appear to be a text
in use, not just confined to a library, which has had the ionicisms
removed where they were found difficult, and the editor rightly noted that
the standards of textual accuracy to be found in a medical textbook were not
equal to those of a literary text. A recently discovered fragment of
Galen's 'On drugs, arranged by types' shows the same features; many textual
variants, different orders of words, and even a heading which does not
appear in our manuscripts. Many works on medicine by authors unknown to
us circulated freely, practical handbooks of compilations from earlier authors,
texts on sinews or on diet in cases of fever, and at Memphis in the third
century, among a library of philosophical and ethical text, we find a work
by the empiric doctor Theodas of Laodicea. The most important medical
work so far discovered is undoubtedly that ascribed to 'Anonymus Londinensis',
whose first editor, Jones, says that, to judge from the mistakes and
alterations, it is a private copy of a work designed for private use. The
first section consists of hair-splitting definitions "savouring more of the
grammarians and logician than of the physician" and suggests a series of
lecture notes. The remainder deals with the aetiology of disease and a
history of physiology from Herophilus to Alexander Philalethes. The
authorship of this part of the work is much disputed and Wellman argued for
Soranus as the author of the doxographic passages. However, if this is the
case, one must mark the later sections off from the earlier logical passages
and ascribe them to a student copying either lecture notes or, uncritically,
from such a compilation as the 'Apeiroutic' of Alexander Philalethes,
the latest author to be mentioned. Zalateo has suggested that much of
the surviving medical literature is in fact produced for the dokimasia, but
as there is good reason to disbelieve that the dokimasia was an examination
of professional competence, one need not follow him in his view\textsuperscript{22}. The catechetical literature could equally be the memoranda of a doctor lacking access to the lengthy and detailed original texts.

There is other evidence for the literacy of Egyptian doctors. In the third century a doctor Marcus sent a letter requesting Antonia to shake the dust off his medical library and to remove the rolls from the cupboard in which he had left them\textsuperscript{23}. An Ostian relief shows a doctor by an open cupboard containing book rolls\textsuperscript{24}, and it is probable that most literate doctors possessed a library, even if small. P. Merton 12 may be an instance of correspondence between doctors, or a doctor and a medically interested friend, on the properties of drugs and plasters to cauterize the feet. Nor should one forget the numerous prescriptions which have survived\textsuperscript{25} and the magical spells, which were probably considered as effective as rational medicine. In 358 Aurelius Pagennes, a doctor from Hermopolis, acted as scribe for an illiterate wishing to make a contract, as did another doctor, Aur. Aphthonius Pachomsaitos\textsuperscript{26}. Thus doctors may have been regarded as literate by the rest of the population, and what evidence we have suggests that they possessed sufficient reading ability to own a library and that their literacy may have been unusual in the areas in which they served\textsuperscript{27}.

Although the medical tax probably did not survive into Roman times\textsuperscript{28}, privileges as well as duties were given to those physicians who were approved by the strategos\textsuperscript{29}. They appear to have been freed from various burdens and taxes, although doctors appear regularly in the tax registers. A tax roll of 45 A.D.\textsuperscript{30} shows that a doctor Heron did not pay any tax in that year, and a list of exemptions at Philadelphia, P. Phil. I 30, includes physicians. The list is headed by priests of approved shrines and then follow cattle...
of professional competence, one need not follow him in his view\textsuperscript{22}. The catechetical literature could equally be the memoranda of a doctor lacking access to the lengthy and detailed original texts.

There is other evidence for the literacy of Egyptian doctors. In the third century a doctor Marcus sent a letter requesting Antonia to shake the dust off his medical library and to remove the rolls from the cupboard in which he had left them\textsuperscript{23}. An Ostian relief shows a doctor by an open cupboard containing book rolls\textsuperscript{24}, and it is probable that most literate doctors possessed a library, even if small. P. Merton 12 may be an instance of correspondence between doctors, or a doctor and a medically interested friend, on the properties of drugs and plasters to cauterize the feet. Nor should one forget the numerous prescriptions which have survived\textsuperscript{25} and the magical spells, which were probably considered as effective as rational medicine. In 338 Aurelius Pagennes, a doctor from Hermopolis, acted as scribe for an illiterate wishing to make a contract, as did another doctor, Aur. Aphthonius Pachomsaitos\textsuperscript{26}. Thus doctors may have been regarded as literate by the rest of the population, and what evidence we have suggests that they possessed sufficient reading ability to own a library and that their literacy may have been unusual in the areas in which they served\textsuperscript{27}.

Although the medical tax probably did not survive into Roman times\textsuperscript{28}, privileges as well as duties were given to those physicians who were approved by the strategos\textsuperscript{29}. They appear to have been freed from various burdens and taxes, although doctors appear regularly in the tax registers. A tax roll of 45 A.D.\textsuperscript{30} shows that a doctor Heron did not pay any tax in that year, and a list of exemptions at Philadelphia, P. Phil. I 30, includes physicians. The list is headed by priests of approved shrines and then follow cattle
raisers, registered invalids and those over age, doctors, oil producers, fullers, carpenters and any who perform a craft. This refers to freedom from certain liturgies and public taxes and the doctor obviously does not enjoy any outstanding privileges. On the land Tax register at Arsinoe the list of properties belonging to doctors does not include any surplus marginal land, whose cultivation is imposed upon the inhabitants of Arsinoe, and it has thus been suggested that such immunities as these were common to all doctors, and that public doctors enjoyed other and more local privileges.

More information comes from P. Fay 106, dated around 140 A.D., where M. Valerius Gemellus complains to the prefect of Egypt that, although such impositions are forbidden by law, he has been forced to watch over the confiscated property of two villages in the Arsinoite nome, Bacchias and Hephaestias, for four years. He asks to be freed from this duty and that those who practise medicine be completely freed from liturgies, especially those men who, like he, have been approved. This implies that it was illegal, though not uncommon, to impose liturgies upon members of the medical profession and that there was an additional division between those who were and those who were not. What the word means is disputed; Zalateo thought that the doctor had passed a qualifying examination by members of the 'city' which entitled him to receive certain privileges and to practise, but Lewis rightly says that it refers to one who had been admitted into a certain group of doctors, with certain special privileges. This papyrus also implies that doctors other than engage in practice, and the suggestion that an examination had to be passed before practising is surely wrong. Lewis is also correct in stating that dokimasia never refers to competence professionally assessed, and, if one can
use the evidence of Asia Minor, the word is an attestation of competence and
an assertion of belonging to a particular class of doctors, although the
examining body are laymen. Certain doctors may not have received the full
privileges to which they were legally entitled because of their humble social
position and the social pressures put upon them to accept liturgies without
complaint. Such a situation is evoked by P.Oxy.490 which records a court
case in 142 - 3. A native doctor Psasnis states that a liturgy has been
imposed upon him by men whom he has attended, and the prefect, Valerius
Budaemon, cuttingly remarks that this may have been due to his inefficient
treatment. In order for Psasnis to obtain exemption from liturgies he must
tell the strategos whether he is a suitable physician. One can see that
there is no question of the governor making an examination of the doctor's
competence and that all that is required is a statement that the doctor is
suitable to practise.

This division between doctors who are approved and included in a
select body of physicians and other doctors who enjoy only some immunities
is also clear from the medical reports submitted by doctors. The normal
procedure for a medical inspection is as follows: The sick man or a relative
asks the governor or the strategos to send a member of his staff, who is
provided with a dossier on the patient and takes with him a public doctor,
who makes an examination and certifies the patient's illness or death. The
only exception to this procedure appears in BGU 647, from Fayum in 130,
where the report is made by Gaius Menicius Valerianus, who is described as
having a surgery at Karanis. He makes the inspection, probably in the
absence of a recognised public doctor, and both signs his report and testifies
on oath to its accuracy. P.Oxy. 476, where two embalmers instead of a
doctor attest the death of Apis, breaks off before reaching the subscriptions and the probable oath. The earliest example of this sort of certificate, P.Oslo, 95, dates from 96 A.D., and the last is probably in the fourth century. This duty of a public doctor, to examine and certify death and injuries is probably confined to Egypt, and is thus another reason why physicians in Egypt are to be treated separately from those of other regions. This procedure is followed when attesting death, injury and non-attendance at work, or extent of injuries as evidence for a suit for assault.

Boswinkel endeavoured to discover the identity and duties of the public physician, and suggested that this title was given by the edict of Antoninus to those doctors who, among other things, performed these medical examinations. The earliest reference was thought to be in 173, P.Oxy.51, and others are dated to 178, P3I 455, and 182, P.Oxy.475, and thus it would appear that the title came into use in the mid-second century. However this scheme is more complicated than it at first appears. P.Oxy.40, now shows a doctor in 142 and thereby obtaining freedom from certain liturgies, and P. Fayum 106 mentions a doctor, specially approved, around 140 A.D. A report of a medical examination read out in court in 135 refers simply to a doctor, and in 170, Sarapion, P. Oxy. 2563, who brings a suit for wounding, has his injuries inspected by a doctor who makes the customary prosphonia. One can thus say that the organisation of public doctors at Oxyrhynchus is in existence before the formalisation of the title of public doctor around 170. Other titles are in use much later. A doctor on O. Tait, 2422 calls himself "iatropos", but such indications of place may refer to residence rather than a public
appointment, and similar remarks apply to doctors from Hermopolis, Arsinoe and Antaeopolis. Boswinkel p.185, suggested that Althaeus who styles himself 'doctor of the gymnasium' was also receiving immunity, although there is nothing in the papyrus, BGU 1898, 74, or elsewhere to confirm this statement. There may have been a fixed number of doctors at Hermopolis in the fourth century, though there is room for doubt, and a doctor from Hermopolis may be included in a body of approved doctors. It thus seems likely that there were two stages in the formation of a group of public doctors. At the first, certain of the doctors who practised were given special privileges above those of the other doctors; at the second, possibly after Antoninus' edict, this group received a formal title of 'public doctors' and special privileges, duties and immunities.

Where then do those doctors who are given the title archiatros fit into this picture of public medicine? A doctor to the Ptolemies with such a title may possibly be found in Pseudo-Aristeas, 162, and Athenagoras, an archiatros who gives regulations for burials to the priests at the Labyrinth, is an important official, almost certainly to be connected with the Ptolemaic court, SB 5216. The Roman period presents us with few examples. Ammonios the archiatros receives a letter from a friend who provided him with fruit and bread, and Eitrem suggested that this man was a civic doctor in the second century. However his reason for the infrequent appearance of such a title, the presence of the nobler name, ιη τῆς ἱατρῶν, can be ruled out as there is no other example of this euphonious title. The appearance of the word archiatros in a second century papyrus is a strange anomaly, and I wonder whether Ammonios was not either an Imperial doctor or, more likely, a civic doctor elsewhere.
in the East, who retained his title on his return to Egypt. The next reference is not until 338\(^51\), P. Lips.97, when a doctor from Hermopolis receives a payment, and as he is an 'acknowledged' doctor, this marks the first definite mention of a public doctor with this title in Egypt. The old name, public doctor, still continued in use at least until the beginning of the fifth century, alongside that of archiatros\(^52\), and I suggest that in the fourth and later centuries, civic doctors were gradually called archiatri, to the exclusion of the earlier word\(^53\). During the later Empire the nome organisation gave way to that of the city\(^54\), the selection of doctors by the strategos to that by the boule, and it becomes possible to rely upon the evidence of the papyri to elucidate problems elsewhere.

What were the duties of a public doctor in Egypt, and if they were immune from liturgies (a sign of status) do we know anything about their economic position? I have already explained the public examinations which fell to them, but there is no evidence for the view of Nanetti and Rostevtseff\(^55\) that another of their duties was to provide free treatment for soldiers and the poor. Diodorus, I.82.3, records that certain doctors who provided free treatment received \(τροφή\) from public funds but what this means is uncertain, and some\(^56\) have considered it a piece of historical fiction. Cohn-Haft has shown that there is no reason to attribute free medical treatment on a general basis to any society in the Mediterranean, and even the existence of a 'medical tax' may have had no more purpose than to secure the residence of a physician and possibly to provide him with money for drugs and other medical equipment; Nor should we forget that the majority of references to doctors in the papyri are not to public doctors, but to ordinary doctors who exist alongside their more exalted fellow practitioners.
The evidence we have does not suggest that the doctor was a man of outstanding wealth, though, in a small community, he may have ranked highly. At Arsinoe in the third century, P. Rylands II 206a, the highest amount, thirty-four artabae of barley, is paid in jointly by a veteran, a doctor and a duplicarius, and at Fayum in the first century, Dios, a doctor, sells the third highest amount of fodder, though he receives more in immediate payment than Demetroutos, who has the second highest. At Hermopolis, P. Amherst 128, a doctor receives sixty-eight drachmae in payment for rent and fodder while an orator receives eighty, and in 78-9 a doctor sells five separate lots of vegetables at twenty-one drachmae apiece, P.Lond. 131.8. In 302, P. Cornell 20, a doctor has a very small plot of land, and three-sixteenths arourae at New Ptolemais, though, as the doctor is said to come from Arsinoe, this plot may be a subsidiary holding, just as at Crocodilopolis in 47, P. Lond 604, two doctors who are resident in the city pay taxes at a smaller rate than Theon, a local doctor. Pheobammon, the son of an archiatros who was wealthy enough to have founded a hospital, appears in 570 as a man of substantial wealth, owning property in Antinooopolis and elsewhere, a boat and a vineyard, and drawing a yearly salary of sixty solidi.

Of the level of fees charged we know little, save that some payment was made for treatment. A Ptolemaic papyrus from Tebtunis, P.Tebt.112, records money paid to doctors, varying in amount, probably in accordance with the length of treatment, but at least twice the amount paid to a bath attendant. It is however evident that a poor person could be reduced to precarious straits by a doctor's bill. A suffering woman, P. Strassb. 73, requests her brother to come at once to her assistance, as she and her children are ill, and to pay the doctor up to twenty drachmae.
demand from a doctor for payment is found in the second century, P.Ross. Georg.V.4, and a pitiful message comes from P.Lond.982, of the fourth century: "Send money at once; we are ruined by hunger: I have spent my portion on the doctor". In Hermopolis in 390 a doctor receives ten measures of barley, a vet four, a saddler four, and a muleteer twenty-two, but it is difficult to see whether these are fees charged for treatment, or retainers, like those later paid to advocates. The level of fees does not compare for example with the four hundred silver drachmae paid to an orator for a ceremonial address, P.Brem.46, or the amounts paid in 215 and recorded in BGU 362. An orator for service in court receives sixty silver drachmae, a smith who polished the statues four, and the workmen who prepared an image of the god for the visit of the governor, thirty-two. When comparing trades and professions at this period one should also note the census return from Hermopolis, which informs us that a man had one son, a woodcarver, and a second, a doctor.

But medicine was carried on in Egypt by others of varying degrees of competence and respectability. Photios had read a novel by Antonius Diogenes which included an Egyptian herbalist and the astrological texts mention herbalists frequently, even suggesting that they may obtain great wealth. P.Oxy.2567 shows a druggist registering his stock with the lessees of the alum monopoly, and medical recipes and prescriptions are widespread. Astrological medicine flourished and I suspect that the astrological textbook which is sent to a friend by Heroios, a doctor, BGU 1674, was one which he himself used. The literary texts provide us with a great mass of medical mumbo-jumbo, especially in the Corpus Hermeticum, and Weinstock has proposed that the Prognostica de Decubitu found in the works
of Galen, XIX 529 - 573, is of Egyptian origin and related to the Corpus Hermeticum. A manuscript of this work at Oxford has the title 'Imbrasio of Ephesus, On Invalids' and he suggests that the author was an Egyptian from a Nile Island called Ephesus, and that the name may bear some connection with the mythical Jewish magician of the Corpus Hermeticum, Ambres, Iambris, Zambres, Imambres etc.

The inscriptions of Egypt confirm the supposition that the doctor was rarely a man of importance in the early period. Few contain more than a line or two, and the scribblings on the walls of the valley of the Kings at Thebes merely record stray visits from wandering doctors. Alexander, a doctor on the staff of Alexander, governor of Thebes, scratches his amazement, OGIS 690, like Theocritus a doctor from Cilicia. Asclepiades, a doctor in the leg. XII Traiana, engraved his name in 147, and, at Kalabchah, C. Marcus of the first mounted squadron of Thebans, his son, Valeras, a physician, and other members of their family set up a dedication. In 88 two native Egyptian doctors made a dedication at a shrine for the safety of the emperor Domitian and his family, and at the temple of Osiris at Abydos, Theophilos, the doctor, recorded his presence. A doctor from Tentyra, Apollomius, built a precinct wall on behalf of the emperor's Tyche in honour of the most mighty goddess, the only Egyptian example of a doctor wealthy enough to indulge in building at a shrine.

The doctors in Egypt do not appear to be of high status. I calculate that, of 97 doctors who date from 212 or earlier, only fifteen are Roman citizens, with twelve doubtful cases. Of the fifteen Roman citizens, six are certainly to be credited with military service and three more are probably soldiers. This all suggests that doctors in Egypt, outside
Alexandria, where one is dealing with a Greek community with Greek institutions, did not possess high status and were content to live as peasant farmers and doctors with purely local influence. They were not wealthy, though one should note that P. Phil.I.30 allows for the possibility of their wealth exceeding one talent, and P.Fayum 106 reveals that four years service as supervisor of the confiscated property reduced one doctor to penury. Possibly the best comment on the economic position of Egyptian doctors comes in a Ptolemaic papyrus, which suggests that, as a result of his good education, a boy is privileged to go to Alexandria and learn from an ιναποκαλυπτείται, and thus have an ἐπανδικτής εἰς τὸ νησὺς, an income until old age. Even if we say that this specialised form of medicine was not common in Egypt, the local doctor must have been considered in much the same way, a member of a profession in which to place a bright boy, deserving of respect and sufficiently wealthy to lead an untroubled financial life.

In this survey of medicine in Egypt I have tried to show two things; that the organisation of the medical profession in Ptolemaic Egypt, which differed from the rest of the Hellenistic world, gradually was assimilated to that of Rome and the empire, and that the individual statuses of doctors in Egypt were rarely high, and, though the practice of medicine was sufficiently lucrative to enable a man to live, it was hardly more so than that of the average craftsman. Doctors outside Alexandria, though literate, do not appear to have been much influenced by cultural contacts with the Museum, though textbooks reach them. No doctor takes part in a literary contest, or does much beyond practise medicine and agriculture, and one is justified in considering the average doctor to possess a
relatively humble status, intellectually, economically and socially.

One further point of interest and importance arises from this examination of Egyptian doctors. As is well known, the papyri present the daily life of Roman Egypt at a much humbler level than our other literary and epigraphic texts, and the activities and duties of the Egyptian doctors are without parallel elsewhere. But, while it is conceded that much is peculiar to Roman Egypt, the question must be raised whether the status and position of the average doctor throughout the Empire was not similar in many ways to that of the Egyptian doctor. This problem can not be satisfactorily resolved, because of the lack of evidence, but it is essential to propose it, and the possibility must always be borne in mind that the average Roman doctor's capabilities and interests may have been more akin to those of the Egyptians than to those of the physicians of the wealthy and the Court.
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CHAPTER SIX.

Medicine and the Roman Army.

Probably no other part of ancient medicine has attracted as much controversy in recent years as ancient military medicine, and even if the conclusions that can be attained are only tentative and frequently unsatisfactory, the methods that are used seem likely to lead to a better appreciation of the position of doctors in the Roman Army and Fleet.

One line of approach can be discounted as irrelevant and even misleading: this is the supplementation of insufficient evidence by conjectures based upon military medicine in other armies, where the choice of example is determined by the author's preconceptions of the result to be obtained. Thus Harmand attempts to fill out the meagre republican evidence for doctors in war, which derives almost entirely from the commentaries of Caesar, by references to medicine in the army of sixteenth century France.¹ As Sigerist pointed out, it is unwise to obscure the issue by introducing evidence and examples from different epochs with different cultural appreciations of medicine, unless close attention is paid to the fact that these are hypotheses, and no more. Alas, Harmand accepts the sixteenth century figures, and carries them over to his description of the medicine of the republican army, on the argument that these are both pre-industrial armies and must therefore be similar in many respects. Yet, when it can be shown that there is some change in the organisation of the medical services of the Roman army between the time of Caesar and Vespasian, it seems unlikely that a method of enquiry based essentially upon analogy will
produce a satisfactory conclusion.

A second procedure that has been employed, often with success, is that of a consideration of the evidence for the Roman Army medical services in a vacuum, as if they were autonomous and apart from other specialists in the army. It must be admitted that such compilations as those of Haberling and Garrison, who adopted this approach, contain much that is of importance and that cannot be discounted by a scrupulous investigator, especially as their authors were well acquainted with some of the practical problems involved, but the harvest which can be gathered by scholars who continually use the same methods over the same ground becomes increasingly meagre, and the latest worker, Scarborough, confesses a certain impatience with his results. His conclusion that the practice of medicine within the Roman Army was informal reflects his inadequate knowledge of all the relevant source material, and although his scepticism is a useful reaction against earlier system building, it is of little assistance in uncovering the organisation and activities of the Roman army medical services.

Modern research has furnished us with more accurate and detailed accounts of the Roman Army in almost all its aspects, and the combined evidence of papyri, inscriptions and archaeology has elucidated obscure statements in the Digest and in the historians. Especial attention has been paid to the details of army organisation and administration, and the lesser members of the legion have received their due notice. It is now possible to consider certain aspects of the medical services within the context of the army, and to bring for comparison, not examples from medieval or renaissance armies, but other specialists in the contemporary army. While it is impossible to follow Haberling in a detailed discussion of every piece
of evidence, I shall divide my account into a general description of the medicine and medical facilities of the Roman army, a consideration of various specialists, and some thoughts upon the rank of the doctor and upon his education within the army.

The medical services of the Roman army have been justly represented as a prime example of Roman planning for practical needs and of the Roman genius for adaptation. The Roman general prided himself on his care of the troops; Velleius regards it as a personal success for Tiberius that his closest officers were never ill and that the health of the army was aided by the provision of doctors, food and baths. The ministrations of physicians were assisted by encouraging speeches from the general and by regular exercises on the parade ground. Archaeology has revealed details of numerous hospitals and their development is clear. Although some have suspected traces of a hospital in the siege works of Scipio at Numantia, its existence is at best doubtful, and there is no word in the commentaries of Caesar to suggest that in Gaul there was a permanent hospital attached to the legion. In the civil war the wounded were frequently left behind in friendly towns to be treated in the valetudinaria of private houses, but this indicates the lack of provision for permanent hospitalization of the wounded, not the absence of doctors, and when legions were not yet entirely standing in fortresses, it is difficult to see what permanent installations would be necessary to deal with the injured. The evidence suggests that the walking wounded were attended by doctors, or by the soldiers themselves, while the more seriously injured were either treated in their own tents or were deposited in the safety of a friendly town. The earliest archaeological remains that can with certainty be ascribed to a hospital are
those in the fortress of Haltern and they appear to confirm the supposition that before the construction of permanent bases a hospital was a mere collection of tents. At Haltern the rooms that are supposed to represent a hospital resemble tents constructed in wood and arranged round an open space. Later hospitals retain the central space, and place the small wards around a large corridor, and a large operating room may also be included. In what is one of the most advanced hospitals, Inchtuthil, the doors of the wards which open onto the corridor are so arranged that there is no cross draught, and there is a refined lighting arrangement which would provide a good light but reduce the cold. While most legionary fortresses can be assumed to have had a hospital, not every auxiliary fort possessed one, and the plans differ slightly. As might be expected, where fewer men were concerned, there was no need for a square arrangement of the corridor, and Stuart Jones was probably right in suggesting that the auxiliary fort hospital was a legionary hospital reduced in size, still retaining the small subdivisions of the wards, but concentrated only upon a longitudinal corridor. At the advance base at Hod Hill in Dorset, where both legionaries and auxiliaries were quartered, the plan again differs slightly from the standard plans of legionary and auxiliary hospitals, and is adapted both to the military situation and to the geography of the site. It is also clear that the size of the hospital varied not only according to the numbers of men stationed there but also according to the purpose of the fortress. In a legionary fortress behind the frontier where the legion was rarely involved in action the expected casualty rate was lower than that at an advance fort; Richmond calculated that at Inchtuthil the rate was 13.5 per cent, with a maximum of 10 per cent, while at Hod Hill, the minimum was 12.5.
Modern archaeological techniques have done more to reveal the type of medicine practised within the legionary hospital. At Novaesium an examination of plant remain found within the hospital area shows centaury, henbane, St. John's wort and plantain, and among the vegetables are peas, lentils and radishes, which also had a medicinal use. The British root, which is known from Haltern, is probably *rumex aquaticus*, and may have helped to prevent scurvy. Medicinal wines were also transported to the legion; the remains of an amphora of Aminean wine are found at Caerleon, and another amphora containing *μπακςίον* comes from Carpow. The barrels in which the wine was carried were also used to line wells and they were also free from duty if intended for hospital use. In addition, flax may have been grown within the fortress to provide lint for bandages and Davies believes that the cache of old iron at Corbridge was buried to develop *ferrugo* or *aerugo*, which could then be used to heal certain ailments. Of the more practical medicine, the treatment of wounds, we know very little; Trajan's column depicts a wounded soldier being bandaged, and the relief from Burnum shows an open instrument box containing three scalpels, two hooked instruments, one ending in a scalpel, and a pair of pincers, all useful in extracting foreign bodies and in treating wounds. Galen tells of cuts and wounds and the mischief caused by poisoned darts, and details were carefully noted about the manner of removing objects from wounds. The literary and medical sources naturally stress the peculiar speciality of military medicine, the treatment of wounds, but the archaeological evidence confirms the plausible supposition that the doctors and staff of the legionary hospitals also concerned themselves with more normal medicine, the treatment of ordinary diseases by drugs and dietetics.
The legionary hospital was under the overall supervision of the praefectus castrorum, who was responsible for all the services of the camp, assisted by an optio valetudinarii. It is unlikely that this officer had any previous medical experience for the cursus inscriptions of such men show no further connection with medicine. C. Luccius C.f Sabinus began his career as a soldier in the first urban cohort, then became assistant to the tribune and then optio valetudinarii. His next post, optio carceris, and his subsequent offices have no associations with medicine, and L. Caecilius Urbanus, ILS 2437, became curator operi armentarii after his post of optio valetudinarii. In the third century, the tribune may have had charge of the hospital, for Aemilius Macer included among his duties 'valetudinarios inspicere'. Galen, recalling some of his experiences in 168–9, gives general advice on the siting of camps and wells, the provision of a legionary bathhouse, all tasks that could be performed without a knowledge of medicine. Clearly the optio was an administrative deputy of the camp prefect with special responsibility for the hospital and medical services, and he was concerned with organisation, not with medical practice.

The actual medical control of the hospital may have been in the hands of a medicus castrorum, an official whose duties are open to conjecture. It seems probable that rather than being simply a doctor attached to the fortress, as Haberling thought, this doctor was the chief doctor there and in charge of the hospital. Under him would be other medici, and the hospital orderlies, capsarii. These are included by Tarruntenus Paternus in his list of soldiers who are excused from routine duties because of their specialist activities. An inscription from lower Germany, ILS 9182, was set up by T. Fl. Processus, medicus hordinarius, to the genius of the capsarii of the
numerus Divitensium Gordianorum, which would seem to confirm the opinion of those who see the capsarii as medical orderlies, rather than as clerical assistants. Richmond suggested that it is an orderly who is featured on Trajan's column, bandaging a wounded man, and he claimed to be able to see the capsae or box in which he carried his medicaments. An inscription from Lambaesis records the members of a collegium who made a dedication to Septimus Severus and his family in which are included optiones valetudinarii, the 41 pecuarii, a clerk, possibly attached to the hospital, and the pupil capsarii. This makes it clear that some at least of the orderlies were taught their medicine within the army, either by senior capsarii, or by the medici, and that they were trained to act as doctors in emergencies such as following a battle.

The other members of the collegium are equally shadowy; a fragment of the Lambaesis customs tariff records an exemption made in favour of the pecuarii, but, unless they are subsumed under the veterinarii, they are not mentioned by Paternus in his list of immunes, which shows their lowly status. It has been suggested that they are not vets but a sort of shepherd who looked after the animals that grazed upon the prata legionis. The health of the animals was then looked after by the veterinarii, who were immune from munera graviors. Before considering the rank of the medici in the army, I turn to the doctors of the fleet, an institution with its own rules and promotions, which provides a rank for the doctors that is found nowhere else, that of the duplicarius. Our evidence for their activities is small. In the Aegean in 82 B.C. in the fleet of A. Terentius A.f. Varro, a doctor is included among the Coan sailors, and probably every Roman ship had its own doctor,
for two doctors list the ships in which they serve\textsuperscript{46}. With one exception, all the doctors mentioned on inscriptions are called \textit{duPLICARIUS}, possibly because they were given double pay to bring them into line with their colleagues in the army\textsuperscript{47}, or because of their responsibility as they worked alone. Nevertheless, CIL VI 3910, shows that the doctor was a ranking soldier, and his rank, as opposed to his pay, was that of a \textit{miles}\textsuperscript{47a}. Of their duties and activities we can say nothing, except to note that one of Galen's recipes was prepared by Axios, an oculist in the British fleet\textsuperscript{48}.

By far the most valuable source of information upon the army are inscriptions, yet the methods of certain investigators who have utilized them demand scrutiny. It has appeared axiomatic that a doctor whose inscription is found at a place with a legionary fortress must have served in the army\textsuperscript{49}. This disregards the substantial civilian settlements that existed alongside the camp\textsuperscript{50}, and it is probable that a doctor without a military record, an honourable duty worthy of commemoration, is not a military doctor. An inscription from Rome shows a military doctor with a civilian clientele, CIL VI 2532 - a possible interpretation of the word \textit{clinicus} - but this is unusual among the extant inscriptions, and although it is probable that military doctors also attended civilians, which the distribution of oculists' stamps would confirm\textsuperscript{51}, there is no definite evidence for this. Not that such activity would be difficult, for the law codes seem to imply an easy transfer between military life and civilian employment. Many doctors have thus been assigned to the army purely upon geographic grounds without consideration of their civilian status. L. Iulius Euthemus, a doctor, erected a memorial to his slave doctor and assistant in the cemetery west of the fortress of Carnuntum, and, as there is no indication of his military
service, I consider them both to be civilians, pace Gummerus. A similar inscription records L. Iulius Optatus, a doctor commemorated by his slave or freedman, and Betz rightly stated that there was no reason to suppose that he was not a civilian doctor whose patients included soldiers. A doctor from Mainz, was said by Domaszewski to be a soldier upon no other evidence than residence within an area with a legionary camp, and a dedication to Mars Augustus from Eburodunum need not mean that the doctor who erected it had an army career. Another military doctor who must be removed from the lists comes from Poetovio; the inscription of C. Rufius C.f.Ouf. med. miles leg. XIII Gem. who enlisted at the age of twenty and who completed fifteen years service is surmounted by a relief of a cavalryman. Thus Gummerus concluded that his cavalry service permitted him to be called miles. But, as Gummerus saw, the relief is totally irrelevant to a doctor, and Hoffiller preferred to see him as a native of Mediolanum. Serving in the same legion and at the same time are men from Cremona and Parma, and thus it is probable that this man too came from North Italy. Other abbreviations of medicus to med are either much later, or are found in fortresses where abbreviations of ranks and titles are common, but not designations of birthplaces. Nor is there another example of medicus miles, although the reverse order is not unusual. As well as this man, a doctor at Castra Regina and another at Lenuvium can be ascribed to scholarly fantasy, and the Greek doctors from Chester may have been the personal attendants of the general. On the other hand, no notice appears to have been taken of the relief from Odessus of a spear, shield, helmet, breastplate and greaves, and of Glaucias of Mesembria who appears to have seen military service. It is tempting to see another soldier doctor from Anatolia in Xenocrates of
Heraclea Pontica, but although the transcription of the doubtful letters would easily permit such a conjecture, it is difficult to see what the rest of the sentence means. A doctor from the Arsinoite nome paid a joint contribution with a veteran and a duplicarius, and thus it is probable that he too was a military doctor.

This list of doctors to be excluded or included also reveals what is probably the greatest difficulty; although the numbers of doctors within a cohort of Vigiles and Praetorians are known, and one doctor is found in a vexillatio of leg. XI. Claudia, the exact rank and position held by a legionary doctor is uncertain. The existence of doctors within a legion, a cohort and ala is certain, but their numbers are unknown, and it is unwise to assume from such a title as medicus legionis that the doctor was the senior or only doctor within the legion. The titles that are found on military inscriptions are partly legitimate, partly the invention of the dead man, and can be assumed to display some idiosyncrasies, possibly emphasizing some particular medical speciality of the deceased. This being so, the only titles that call for detailed comment are those of miles medicus and medicus ordinarius. Only two examples of the former are known, but an immediate analogy is suggested between the miles medicus and the miles librarius, and it is possible to conclude that the doctor in this case was stressing his membership of the army, the fact that he was a miles. Even as immunis or principalis, the doctor was still technically a miles, and this is the meaning of the phrase in this context. Medicus ordinarius is much more doubtful. Domaszewski and Gilliam, relying upon the apparently definite statements of Vegetius and Festus, believed that this was a doctor serving in the army as distinct from a civilian doctor, in this case an
'unofficial' title. Mommsen modified this view, claiming that this was a man who received a stipendium, not the salarium of the higher ranks of the army, and Passerini developed this to mean that he was a lower grade doctor in the army than the medicus. Finally, Sander suggested that the doctor held centurion rank and was in charge of other doctors and capsarii, an opinion that would explain the rich decoration on RIB 1618 and the dedication of ILS 9182. Yet his arguments are generally unconvincing and the general thesis of his article has not found acceptance. Certainly, if the medicus ordinarius was a supernumerary centurion there would be no room in the centurions' quarters at Inchtuthil for him, unless he slept in the hospital, and, although one doctor is also a centurion, it is impossible to tell whether his promotion transferred him to other duties. There is a further possible solution; the doctors in the Roman army held a diversity of ranks and of periods of service. At least two types of doctor can be proposed, and there may have been others. Some men entered the service already trained; a doctor is said to be a man of property before entry, D.4.6.33, and Dioscorides and possibly Archigenes were educated physicians before they enlisted. On the other hand, it is certain that there was some form of medical education available within the army, if only for the capsarii, and it is not unlikely that the more experienced orderlies could be transferred to act as doctors. It is also likely that a doctor also may have served only for a limited time, and that others may have served for the same period as their fellow legionaries, but uncertainty must remain. The Roman army in its medical services may be more diverse than has been thought, and it may be wrong to include every example within a straight-jacket, more so when it is doubtful how many of the designations upon military tombstones are
officially granted and approved.

A text from the Digest sets the army doctor into a context and prevents an exaggerated idea of his importance. Paternus records that the following soldiers are immunes, freed from certain duties in return for their special skills: mensores, optio valetudinarii, medici capsarii artifices et qui fossam faciunt, veterinarii, architectus, gubernatores, naupigi, ballistarii, specularii, fabri sagitarii, aerarii bucularum structores, carpentarii, cornuarii, scandularii, gladiatores, aquilices, tubarii, arcuarii, plumbarii, ferrarii, lapidarii et hi qui calcem cocunt et qui silvam infindunt, qui carbonem caedunt ac torrent: lanii venatores, victimarii, optio fabricae et qui aegris praesto sunt, librarii qui docere possint et horreorum librarii et librarii depoSitorum et librarii caducorum et adiutores corniculariorum et stratores et polliones et custodes armorum et praeco et bucinator. This wonderful list can be said to include all the administrative staff of the legion, the construction workers and the medical staff and it is clear that the doctors were not a group and that they may be fairly compared with other specialists.

First, there are similar possibilities for recruitment; it is almost certain that the military architect from Aquincum who enlisted at the age of thirty was already trained, and some have sought to find a trainee architect in a German inscription. Watson has also given further examples for the librarii; teaching was carried out within the army, but men could be seconded to this post also if they had possessed such abilities in civic life. While the optio fabricae, like the optio valetudinarii, was an administrative overlord, the staff under him may have been trained there or recruited as experienced artificers. The great majority of these immunes
ranked scarcely higher than the common soldier and were distinguished only by their privileges. Thus some of the librarii can emphasize the nature of their position by describing themselves as immunes librarii, although all librarii possessed immunity and the expression is therefore otiose.

Little more can be said about the legionary doctors; in the fourth century each legion is permitted two wagons for the transport of its wounded, which again shows that the lack of a permanent hospital does not necessarily mean the absence of trained doctors. As serving soldiers, the army doctor did not amass tremendous wealth, although Sander thinks that he might amass more than in private practice. This is doubtful, for the legal texts imply that a doctor would move from practice in the army to practice in a city as a civilian doctor, and experience in the army was thus a prelude to civic life. Dessau long ago noted the predominance of Greek names among the doctors of the army, and Antioch and Nicomedia are the homes of two military doctors, but it would be unwise from this to deduce that they had enlisted as doctors, for it is not unlikely that, when specialists had to be chosen, Greeks would be seconded to act as orderlies and doctors.

The evidence for the position of doctors within the Roman army and fleet is tantalising. We know sufficient to be able to construct some organisation, yet this may be looser and more diverse than is in fact assumed. Even the evidence of the inscriptions is sometimes illusory, for it is difficult to determine which epithet upon a tombstone is that of rank and which the personal addition of the doctor without official
approval. Nevertheless, despite the fragmentary state of our knowledge we may stay with Richmond and marvel at the hospitals, the operating theatres, the elaborate sanitary arrangements, the bath houses and so on, and gain a further appreciation by the consideration of the military doctor, not in a scholastic limbo, but in the context of the camp and its specialists.

6. I have answered Scarbrough's argument in *Medical History*, 1969, 25: 270; an article on this, also against Scarbrough, is promted by H.W. Deroes.

7. This is clear upon an inspection of the revised edition by Behrens of H. Domanski's *Die Anordnungen des römischen Heeres*.


10. H.1142. Sr. Vitae Alexandri Severi 47.2, and Ann. Marc. XXXVI. 4 where Valentian, having sent his doctors to attend the plague-stricken army, dies through lack of attention. I am sceptical of the latter of Aurelian, Vit. 7.3.

11. Vegetius III.2, *Commodor I.12*; note the speech of Hadrian, II.8 2604.

12. The only general survey of hospitals is by Senulius, Al. 1934, 54 - 64, to his account of legionary hospitals add: Aquincum, J. Bally, *Aquincum*, p.25; Carnuntum, H. Linder, 1966, 47; Bracc. 3, Petrikrivitas, *Das römische Österreich*, 42 - 43; Trechthall, M.R. 1957, 196 and Fig. 8 and 9; Carmicha Jth 1964, 195 add Fig. 10; the Flavian hospital has been discovered in 1966 beneath the second century hospital; *Lauriacum*, Jth 1970, 2: 2557.


15. This is assessed from the third century reference, *Vita Alex. Severi*: 47.2: "negregatius ipse visitavit per tantorius militarem"


17. This is assessed for Vesta II and Novaeilci, 1, 54 - 56, 60 - 61.

18. Jth 1957, 196: Richmond's reconstruction of the roofing and clerestory is not entirely convincing.

19. The hospital at Lastea suis is known from inscriptions, but live under modern buildings. Sr. also CIL III 10405, 14277, XIII 2009.
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CHAPTER SEVEN.

The Medical Profession after Galen: (i) Immunities and Privileges.

After the death of Galen darkness descends upon Roman medicine. The third century brings no identifiable medical texts and no writer of importance can be found until Oribasius in the fourth century. With him begins an age of compilation, when the works of ancient doctors are pillaged to provide material for medical encyclopaedias and collections, when experiment ceases and thought decays, when magic and spells, prayer and exorcism play as great a part in the struggle against disease as prognosis and diagnosis. Such is the traditional picture of medicine in the Later Roman Empire, and much of this is correct. But dangerous half-truths tend to drive out more reliable and sober interpretations, and the accumulation of evidence from the law codes, from pagan and Christian authors, from the biographies of sophists and saints is essential if we are to realign the picture of Roman medicine that is transmitted by the medical writers. Recent work has done much to elucidate the history of medicine and medical practice in the fourth and later centuries by producing such non-medical evidence and I hope in this and the next chapter to extend the clarification of certain aspects of medical practice.

The social position of the doctor in the Later Roman Empire also requires close attention, and theoretical misconceptions can distort the results of the inquiry. On the one hand, it is unwise to posit a definite break after Galen and to assume that the position of a doctor in the fourth century necessarily differed greatly from that of a doctor in the time of
Hadrian: on the other, the social pattern of the Later Roman Empire with its increasing rigidity, especially among certain occupations, imposes a difference in outlook and in social groupings that must be taken into consideration. There are survivals from the earlier period as well as innovations. There are several doctors in the fourth century who practice medicine as Galen had done, combining linguistic scholarship and philosophy with medicine, and Christian writers such as Origen and Basil attest the survival of a learned non-practical interest in medicine which may have been an important influence upon the attitudes of doctors. To consider only one aspect of the diverse evidence is to overlook much and the conclusions drawn from piece-meal investigation are erroneous and delusive.

The social position of the medical profession, and especially of the medici and archiatri, is given a theoretical basis by the legal enactments concerning it. While the legal position is clear, social pressures and weak resistance to them by doctors may produce a much hazier outline.

As had already been described, Antoninus Pius was only one of a line of emperors to grant tax concessions to intellectuals, and his achievement was to limit the rash benevolence of Hadrian to bounds that would satisfy both the sophists and doctors who desired to retain their immunity and the city councils who were unwilling to lose obvious sources of revenue. This tension continues throughout the empire and a series of laws reinforces the wisdom of Augustus, Vespasian and Antoninus. Commodus, D.27.1.6.9., confirmed the privileges granted to members of the liberal professions by Antoninus, but subsequent emperors imposed qualifications. Severus and Caracalla refused immunity in their patria to those teachers.
and doctors who practised elsewhere: a sophist from Comana employed at (Neo-) Caesarea did not enjoy immunity at Comana. This restriction may have brought protests; immunity in their own cities was granted to those philosophers and teachers resident in Rome, which Modestinus regards as the common patria of all citizens, and exemption was granted to men of great learning even if they were resident abroad or excluded from the numerus. Paulus, the author of this passage, relies upon a precedent of Antoninus Pius, which might seem to be a capitulation to the literati: for what sophist or doctor would not attest that he was not a man of consummate learning and ability?

The Historia Augusta attributes to Alexander Severus innovations concerning the medical profession which are uncorroborated by other evidence and which have been unhesitatingly accepted by all who have written on Roman medicine. The first passage, Vita Alexandri 44, reads as follows:

rhetoribus, grammaticis, medicis, haruspicibus, mathematicis, mechanicis, architectis salaria instituit et audiôria decrevit et discipulos cum annonis pauperum filios modo ingenuos dari iussit. etiam in provinciis oratoribus forensibus multum detulit, plerisque etiam annonas dedit..... Theatrum Marcelli reficere voluit. The first point to note is the topographical confusion that prevails. We begin with Rome — 'etiam in provinciis' implies a change of place — and we are brought back to Rome with the theatre of Marcellus. Are we to assume that the auditoria were to be built throughout the empire or in Rome only? There is small archaeological evidence for a school, even less for an auditorium, and I consider that what is meant resembles the small theatres in the gymnasium and in the Asclepieion at Pergamum rather than the exedra at the gymnasium or the curiously shaped
rooms at Ephesus which were said to be teaching or consulting rooms. Nor need the word 'decrevit' mean that they were built, any more than instituit refers to the first provision of salaria. Although Ulpian, D.50.9.4.2., refers to the provision of salaries for medicine and the liberal arts, there is no suggestion that this is an innovation, and an inscription from Viterbo already mentions a doctor with a civic salary. But look closer at the remarkable list of beneficiaries. As well as grammatici, medici and rhetores, who had received privileges from earlier emperors, we have mathematici, who are mentioned in the law codes as members of illegal associations to be condemned. There were those who practised 'white' magic and astrological medicine, but it is indeed strange to find such people receiving privileges, albeit from an emperor who was himself skilled in astrology and augury, and who, as well as permitting such men to teach, publicly entered into competition with them. On mechanici and architecti, our evidence is much less, but what there is suggests the unreliability of this passage. In 336, to remedy a shortage of architects, possibly because of his building programme at Constantinople, Constantine permitted student architects and their parents to receive immunity, and the students are to receive an appropriate salary. In 337, CT XIII.4.2, immunity is given to architects and medici engaged in teaching others, but the list of those to whom this privilege is granted shows the relatively low status of the architect and the ordinary medicus, as it includes painters, potters, fullers, gilders, quantity surveyors, vets, goldsmiths, masons and carpenters. Just as the previous law had stressed the educational requirement of a knowledge of liberal studies, so this emphasises the need for teaching, and provides an obvious model for this passage in the life of Alexander, if it is a pastiche of
later enactments. Yet the mechanicus is conspicuously absent in this list of thirty-five crafts. Not until 344, CT XIII.4.3, do we find a reference to mechanici, who receive immunity together with geometers, water-engineers and quantity surveyors, again because of their teaching duties.

The hundred year gap between the appearances of the mechanici suggests that this passage in the Life incorporates a mass of anachronistic material, some deriving from existing institutions - the provision of salaries for doctors and the existence of lecture halls - and some familiar sections from the law codes on the teaching duties of various craftsmen and on state subsidies for the education of children of poor parents. But to separate strands in the dubious cloth of the Historia Augusta is a dangerous and illusory task. The Fragmenta Vaticana 204 indicate existing tax-reliefs for students in the time of Commodus, and it is not improbable that Alexander Severus at least confirmed existing privileges of intellectuals. Nevertheless to attribute far-reaching reforms to Alexander Severus on the basis of this doubtful passage seems a little rash, and, while accepting that there may be some truth behind this pastiche, I am unwilling to give it precision.

The suspicion engendered by the use of the word annonae in section 44 is confirmed by a second passage in the Life,42. "Medicus sub eo unus palatinus salarium accepit, ceterique omnes qui usque ad sex fuerunt annonas binas aut ternas accipiebant ita ut mundas singulas consequerentur, alias aliter". This is the reading of Peter and Hohl, although Ms. B.P.M. and some editors place "qui" after "fuerunt". The payment of salaries in kind, annonae, does not occur before the late third century14, and thus both passages may be suspected as anachronistic. But it is possible that at 44, the author was merely using a term current in his time to describe an
institution of an earlier date, 'pay' in general rather than specifically 'payment in kind', and thus the argument cannot be pressed strongly. At 42, however, the fact that the 'annonae' are divided in a manner that can only indicate payment in kind shows that here the institution as well as its description are anachronisms. But there are further difficulties in this passage. Taking Peter's reading first, it is clear that a distinction is to be made between one doctor who is called 'palatinus' and six others who serve the emperor. The position of imperial doctor is variously named in the law codes, but never 'medicus palatinus', nor can such a reference be found earlier. Why only one doctor appointed to the emperor should be called 'palatinus' and what title was given to those who accepted 'annonae' so curiously divided, are alike uncertain. If the alternative reading is adopted, the sentence improves in grammar, if not in conviction, and it remains unclear whether the six did without a salary and took annonae instead. As it stands, the passage is obscure, possibly even corrupt, and certainly anachronistic and, although Peter's reading makes some sense, the author of this Life had little concern for syntactic niceties. Care should thus be taken not to attribute too much to dubious portions of a Life whose purpose has been suspected. The suggestions that these passages taken together show several anachronisms and are more informative about the situation in the fourth rather than the third century accord well with the hypothesis that in this Life Alexander is presented as a model for future rulers. The perfect monarch should be omniscient, desirous of the cultural welfare of his people and eager to aid the poor. Whatever date we assign to this tractate, it must be agreed that the attribution of sweeping reforms in medical organisation and the establishment
of formal medical teaching centres to Alexander Severus is unwise. Far better to treat with scepticism any statements found in these two passages and to confess ignorance of the reforms of this scholarly monarch that have passed unrecorded elsewhere. Such a silence and what little we know of regulations for doctors from the preceding and succeeding periods incline me to consider that Alexander Severus, even if he had a definite cultural policy and promulgated favourable laws, cannot be said to have had any influence upon his successors for one hundred years, if they ever relied upon his precedent.

Our next legal reference comes from the time of Diocletian and Maximian, CJ X 53.5, who stated that doctors were not to be included in the select number against the wishes of the decurions, who were responsible for grants and the most likely to suffer from immunities given to others. It is important to note that throughout the later empire, there never appears to be an attempt by higher authorities to reduce the doctor's privileges, though the constant ratification of edicts attests the attempts of lesser officials and city councils to infringe them. A doctor in the imperial service might expect to face a long absence from his home and property, and in 266, the emperors agreed to the plea of an archiater to be restored to his property which had been seized in his absence.

In 321, CT XIII.3.1, a general law exempted doctors, grammarians and teachers of literary studies, making it an offence to bring them to court, presumably for the non-performance of duties, or to cause them injury. They are to receive fees and salaries, and are permitted to hold public offices, if they wish, but there is to be no compulsion. In 333, Constantine confirmed the practice of previous rulers of exempting doctors, teachers of literary
studies, their wives and families from all munera, military service, compulsory billeting, that they might encourage others to practise the liberal arts. This stress on teaching is found in the decree for architects, CT XIII.4.1 and in the list of privileged craftsmen, CT XIII.4.2, who include medici, the ordinary doctors. Some controversy has arisen concerning the date of CT XIII.3.2, apparently 326, but dated by Seeck to 320. This freed all archiatri and ex-arachiatri from various munera, including that of providing a levy of gold, silver or horses[^19], and these privileges are extended to their sons. It is somewhat strange suddenly to find court doctors with the rank of senators or comites in 320 or so, and the payments imposed upon them seem more to agree with a mid-fourth century date.

Mommsen, in a note on CT II.9.1, set out the evidence for assigning other laws directed at Rufinus to the period 352 - 354, and Jones in his forthcoming Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire adopts his dating for this law, 354, cf. IX 23.1. This formalisation of duties and privileges agrees more with the later dating than with Seeck's suggestion, and one should observe the extremely high status enjoyed by court doctors at this period.

In 362, Julian, writing from Constantinople, CT XIII.3.4, confirmed the privileges granted to the archiatri. At the same time he wrote a letter, EP.75b, saying that to propagate the saving art of medicine, doctors were to be freed from civic liturgies, and, from a letter of Libanius, Ep.723, this privilege was given to all doctors. He reports that a doctor, Philo, has been forced to act as a decurion by the people of Rhosua, and claims that this is illegal. "If the Rhosians do not know that Philo is a doctor, they are to cease molesting him, now they have been informed; if they already knew, though Philo himself is weak, the law is
strong". Ensslin, Klio 1922, p.148, supposed that the law referring to archiatri was extended in public estimation to cover all doctors, but it is probably better to consider that the two regulations are different and that the edict in favour of doctors in general was not included in the Theodosian code. The qualifications for the office of civic doctor would still appear to have been the correct moral qualities rather than outstanding ability, and approbatio by the decurions was a test of civic fitness made by amateurs 20.

In 368, CT XIII.3.8, Valentinian instituted archiatri for the various regions of the city of Rome, as well as those the archiatri of the Xystus and of the Vestal Virgins, and laid down regulations for service.

"Exceptis portus Sixti virginum Vestalium quot regiones urbis sunt totidem constituantur archiatri". This is a strange sentence, requiring elucidation. I am unable to find any reference to a regio Portus Sixti, or, following Gothofredus and Mommsen, porticus Xysti, nor to a regio Vestalium Virginum 21, and Pazzini sought to avoid this crux by reading: Portus, Xysti, Virginum Vestalium 22. An inscription from Thyateira provided Robert with an ingenious solution. Heleis came from Thyateira to Rome to become archiatros of the 'United Xystus', the general association of athletes, residing at the baths of Trajan, and thus Robert suggested that we should read 'totius Xysti', corresponding to the Greek ὑστάτος Υστέου 23. But even if we accept this emendation, further explanation is required. In order to make sense of the passage and the word 'exceptis' one must either assume that in two regions already existing archiatri must extend their areas of activity, or emend further to obtain the meaning: 'in addition to the doctors of.....'.

These civic doctors, realising that their wages came from the people, were to
serve the poorer members of the community rather than disgracefully toady to the rich. They could accept retaining fees\textsuperscript{25}, but not the presumably vast sums which dying men would offer for their recovery. Election to this body of doctors was not to be through powerful patronage nor through the favour of the judge, but by the loyal and circumspect choice of the members of the body, who submitted the candidate's name for imperial approval. Further instructions followed on the organisation of this body in 370, GT XIII.3.9. The selection is now to be made by at least the first seven members of the collegium, and the successful candidate is not to enjoy immediately the privileges of the senior members, but will attain them gradually by the natural workings of promotion. This is the first attested case of state provision of medical aid, other than that of securing the residence of a qualified physician, and may have been extended at some later date to Constantinople\textsuperscript{26}. Probably because of these privileges, which were confined to a very limited number of select doctors, there was an immediate protest from those doctors at Rome who were excluded and who were afraid that they were to lose all their ancient rights. In 370 or 371 these less important doctors were confirmed in their enjoyment of their immunities\textsuperscript{27}.

The institution of doctors with special responsibility for the care of poor citizens is very unusual. Certainly there is no suggestion that physicians approved by the city are to devote themselves to works of charity, and the strong statements in these laws imply that this was an innovation. From other sources we know that the Jews had communal doctors and hospitals in which fellow Jews were treated without respect for wealth, and Julian had already remarked upon the Christian's acts of charity\textsuperscript{28}, and it is likely that, in stressing the charitable aspects of civic medicine,
the emperor Valentinian was institutionalising these private activities. It is possible to speculate upon Valentinian's reason for this innovation. Rather than assume a remarkable care for the humbler classes, for Valentinian's reforms, especially of civic administration, can be thus interpreted, I prefer to consider this as a further move in the emperor's struggle against the senate whereby he robbed them of a means of obtaining support, cf. Jones, LRE I 142 ff. Yet even with these restrictions the position of archiater at Rome was eagerly desired. Symmachus, praefectus urbis in 384 - 5, wrote to the emperor, Rel. 27, about an ambitious doctor, John, v.p., who had attempted to secure the second place in the college. He relates that it had been the legal custom to enquire into the scientific ability of the applicants and the leading doctors made the choice. John, relying upon his service in the palace and the demands of an imperial pronouncement, applied for the post which was still being held by Epictetus, the archiater. As law and custom demanded, a meeting of the collegium was held, whose decision was that the place could not be given, though there was a possibility that he might have qualified through imperial service, during which he might have been appointed to the collegium by the emperor. When he was asked for evidence of his qualifications John claimed that they had been stolen from his house, and that many doctors had passed from imperial to civic service, while retaining their privileged position. It is evident that this case was unusual and that Symmachus and the doctors, careful not to offend the emperor, with a possible loss of privilege, hedge and shuffle round what appears to be a simple decision. In 387 the emperor gave his decision, CT XIII.3.13, and reaffirmed the original regulations. Let us take the evidence of the law codes further. In 379, in a
law addressed to Vindicianus, himself a doctor, CT XIII.3.12, we find that archiatri on completion of service with the imperial family, as custom demanded, were given the rank of 'comes' and they and their heirs were to be immune from the duties attendant upon such a rank. A similar law issued at Constantinople, whence all subsequent edicts are sent, confirms these privileges for ever, CT XIII.3.14, although a further confirmation in 393, CT XIII.3.15, might suggest that attempts were being made to infringe them.

The comites archiatrorum along with other viri spectabiles are freed from the duty of providing substitutes for their army duty, either by providing persons or by commuting this munus for cash, a further indication of the importance of those doctors close to the emperor, CT XI.18.1. In 414 the medici, grammarians, orators and teachers of philosophy are confirmed in their immunity, CT XIII.3.16, and those archiatri of the palace who have attained the rank of comes are to be freed from the accompanying tasks of entertaining soldiers or a judge, and this privilege, as before, is extended to their children. This is again confirmed by a law of 427, CT XIII.3.18, designed pro necessariis artibus et liberalibus disciplinis to return to the idea of the importance of teaching such arts - and confirming that it is illegal to billet troops upon the houses of teachers and archiatri. In 413, an attempt was made to disentangle the complicated social position arising out of the various grants of the 'comitia primiti ordinis'. Provincial governors, archiatri sacri palatii, and assessors of the illustrious magistrates in receipt of the comitia primiti ordinis, ranked with vicars, but architects so rewarded for public services ranked only with consulars.

There is to be no distinction between the archiatri of this grade and the vicars and duces who have served as administrators, save in the length of
time they hold the grade. Probably only the most important of the court doctors reached this grade; for, CT XIII.3.16, there is a distinction made between counts of the first and second grade. On the other hand, a suggestion that court doctors could reach even higher grades is made by CT XIII.3.19, again confirming privileges of immunity: si qui ex his aut primi ordinis adepti fuerint domitivam aut maioris gradum dignitatis ascendenterint.

The legal position of the doctor in the Later Roman Empire has now been set out, and a few comments are required to place these enactments within the context of other imperial decrees. First, it is necessary to repeat that social pressures, as is clear from the letters of Libanius, could nullify the privileges formally granted by the law, and there must have been some doctors, who, lacking a powerful advocate such as Libanius, were compelled to perform unwanted liturgies to the delight of their fellow curiales. These privileges of immunity are never reduced after the reign of Caracalla, and it is obvious that they gained in importance; when such as Julian extended the privileges of immunity from duties, they took doctors and teachers as their paradigm. As the burdens imposed upon the curial class increased, the importance attached to a profession such as medicine and to the teaching of higher studies where immunity could be obtained also increased. One would then expect that the practitioners of medicine secured a higher status and that members of curial families from the West as well as from the East would participate. The laws relating to doctors also show that those in close contact with the emperor have the best chance of retaining, if not increasing, their privileges, and although the medici tenaciously cling to the privileges granted to them centuries before, the archiatri (sacri
palatii) obtain more and more advantages. There is however one great problem about these legal enactments; it is uncertain to whom they refer, especially as the legal meaning of archiater and medicus may not coincide with the popular definition. I have already suggested that by the edict of Antoninus Pius there came into existence as the title of a city doctor, archiater, and that this drove out, in Egypt at least, the older title of 'public doctor'. On the other hand, there is no evidence for this being the legal title of such doctors before the fifth century at earliest, although such a supposition might indeed be made. Nor should it be automatically assumed that the social situation that brought about the reform of Antoninus continued to exist for two hundred years. As will be seen in the next chapter, both doctors and archiatri are found, and it may be that there was still a distinction between those who belonged to a select numerus and those who did not. But the examples of the use of this word from Nola, Seleucia and remote Phrygia seem to indicate a debasement of the word to little more than 'important doctor', an epithet that could be easily subsumed upon a gravestone without giving too much offence. Such appropriations, however, need not affect the general picture of the legal regulations governing doctors. The law codes are clear on the meaning of archiater: with the exception of the two laws relating to the archiatri of Rome, only at CT XIII.3.4, can archiater be assumed to be a civic doctor, and here, as I have argued above, it is best to take this as relating to the imperial physicians and to assume that another law, now lost, dealt with the medici. The later and fuller titles may thus be attempts to distinguish the archiatri from the civic doctors who had appropriated the epithet in fact, if not in law. CJ X.53.5 refers to the doctors within the
numerus as medici, and CT XIII.3.17, if the text is complete, implies that these medici can obtain the grade of comes of the first or second rank.

It is thus probable that in law at least only the doctors to the emperor, and those of Rome and Constantinople, were given the title of archiatri. The legal distinction between archiatri and medici does not coincide with the everyday distinction where, without doubt, both imperial and civic doctors are called archiatri, and where it is still possible to see the humble medicus as a practitioner, possibly within a numerus, but in general without many privileges. The continued presence in the literary sources of archiatri who are not imperial doctors suggests the retention of the numerus system, by which they are marked off from other doctors. On the other hand, although I consider this less likely, in time all doctors may be included within the number of those privileged as medici, and the distinction between archiater and medicus became one of prestige, not of privilege. In this case, the literary references may be taken as anachronistic or mere affectation. The survival of a body of approved doctors in Egypt in the fourth century appears to tell against such an interpretation, but there is no similar refutation available for the fifth and sixth centuries. It would not be surprising to find the law and everyday custom divided over the question of nomenclature, especially when custom seeks to extend the coverage of a particular title, as here, and I prefer to retain this difference rather than to abolish the distinction between archiatri and medici that is clear from literary and epigraphic sources.

The law codes provide a chronological framework around which our other evidence may be placed. Nevertheless, as has already been seen, they concentrate more upon the doctors of the court and of Rome than upon the
medical profession in general, and thus they have to be supplemented. Nor can a general attitude towards the doctor be deduced from these enactments, and it would be unwise from this limited selection to decide whether these laws were formulated in advance of public opinion or not. What is clear is the constant struggle to make the doctors who were wealthy enough to be members of the curial class pay their share and hold responsible offices, and the doctors' reluctance to conform. The imperial physicians in as much as they were closest to the emperor therefore obtained the greatest protection, and were more frequently assailed, but the town medicus was an equal combatant. Even if the curial class declined, the doctor retained his privileges, and in comparison with the local landowner and town councillor, he probably increased them.
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19. On the financial impositions on senators and honorati, see Jones, LRE, 430 - 1, III 105 - 8.

20. Cf. CT XIII 5.6.7.

21. There is nothing in Platner and Ashby, Topographical Dictionary, nor in the Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae, nor in Valentini and Zucchetti, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia, 81. We have no evidence beyond this for doctors attached to the Vestals.


23. Hell. IX 25 - 7, other references to the Xystus include P.Logd. 1178, EGH 1928, 420 - 1, IG XIV 1102, 1104, I.ILO, OGIS 714.
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27. CT.XIII.3.10, written to the praefectus urbis. Archiatri of this period recorded on inscriptions are CIL VI 9562 - 5 (ILS 605 - 6), ICVR 5412. There may have been doctors or midwives practising in a region before, CIL VI 9477.

29. Libanius, Ep. 756, shows an attempt to make a doctor perform curial duties.


31. Julian granted immunity to the staff of the scrinia after 15 years service, CT VI 26. 1, to agentes in rebus, CT VI. 27. 2, to a father of thirteen children, CT XII. 1. 55. Valens, Valentinian and Gratian to teachers of painting, CT XIII. 4. 4.

32. A similar distinction may be found among teachers. Although orators, grammarians and teachers receive privileges like the medici, CT XIII. 3. 1, 3. 10, 16, there is a greater emphasis on teachers of the liberal arts, CT XIII. 3. 18, who may be those to whom state salaries were given by CT XIII. 3. 13 and who formed a select group with the teaching profession equivalent at least to the Antonine numerus, possibly to the archiatri. No immunity is granted to these professors that is also granted to the archiatri, but the converse is not true, and the importance of the archiatri may be deemed greater than that of the professors. Craftsmen only receive these immunity privileges in as much as they emphasize their teaching of their craft, i.e. becoming teachers, CT XIII. 4. 1, 2, 3, 4.
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34. Artium liberalium professoribus ac praecipue medicis qui cum comitivae primi ordinis ac secundi militare ducite, privilegia et beneficia tenaciter observati oportet. The previous law also of the same date, CT XII. 3. 16, refers to those doctors qui ... militare. Should we read in CT XIII. 3. 17 'medicis et praecipue eis qui ... ' ? However it is possible to keep the text, noting that the archiatri are a specific group within the medici.

CJ III 28. 37. 1 associates archiatri with teachers of liberal studies and those who receive public salaries or stipends, but its date 521, may be of small assistance in determining the meaning of archiatri in 414. The archiatri here may be civic doctors, but imperial doctors are not excluded.
CHAPTER EIGHT.

The Medical Profession after Galen: (ii) activities and offices.

The evidence for the social position and status of doctors in the Later Roman Empire is fuller and more diverse than that of earlier centuries. While few inscriptions survive — and even their survival is significant — church historians and episcopal letter writers supplement secular historians and litterateurs. The scope and bias of the evidence ranges from the popular Acta Sanctorum to the refined correspondence of Libanius and may thus give a more realistic picture of the doctor's status than the exclusively upper class effusions of the Early Empire.

Possibly more serious and also possibly irrelevant is the interjection of the medical profession into theological debate. Theoretical sermons on scriptural texts display an ambivalence towards the doctor which would at first sight appear to affect the acceptance of the members of the medical profession within Christian society at least, and which contradicts in part the view of a doctor as a pillar of secular and religious society. There is a tension between the majority of Christian authors who accept medicine and its practitioners and certain fundamentalists which recalls the well known debate upon the propriety of pagan learning in a Christian society. On the one hand, the statement of St. James which apparently repudiates secular healing in favour of prayer led Nicetas, Bishop of Remesiana, to advise his flock to avoid all doctors and to trust in Christ alone, while SS. Cyrus and John, preferring the words of the Gospel, established their surgery in direct opposition to pagan methods of healing.
On the other hand, the biographer of SS. Cosmas and Damian imagined that they made good use of the works of Galen and Hippocrates, and the early church regulations favour doctors. The Traditio Apostolica, although forbidding enchanters, astrologers, diviners, soothsayers, users of magic verses and makers of amulets to be produced for examination, does not prohibit doctors, and although it demands the resignation from his post of a teacher of young children on becoming a Christian, doctors are permitted to practise.

Practical nursing was carried on in monasteries, although whether monks or outsiders performed this task could be disputed. Basil, while considering medicine a necessary art, adds that, although the monks of his community must employ the usual means of secular healing, they are not to place excessive trust in the hands of doctors alone. Thus, although certain bishops might have theological doubts about accepting secular medicine, especially as medicine was one of the last strongholds of paganism, they were a tiny and probably uninfluential minority, and other sources, legal, historical and literary, confirm the impression that their eccentricities had small effect upon the actions of the majority of their contemporaries.

It is not difficult to show the existence in important church circles of men who had taken a great interest in medicine and had even practised, and the church elder at Tyre, Eusebius, H.E. X.4.11, who quoted Hippocrates is not an isolated example. Nemesius, Bishop of Emesa and author of a tract 'On the nature of Man' led a varied career. To judge from his work he studied medicine, probably at Alexandria, in the mid-fourth century, for he quotes from and summarises portions of at least fifteen treatises by Galen, and even shows a knowledge of medical thought and developments of post-Galenic physicians, whose work is now lost. At 272 a
space is left in the text for a Galenic quotation, which suggests that the relevant work was at hand and only opportunity of consultation was lacking. The outstanding personal revelation of the author which the book affords is of his having received a very good medical education. But he never appeals to his clinical practice or gives any indication of having practised. We must conclude that he studied medicine as a department of philosophy, specially suited to the education of a gentleman and as a preparation for being the master of a household. Tillemont suggested that the author was Nemesius, governor of Cappadocia, a correspondent of Gregory of Nazianzus, and Telfer, ed. p.210, though saying "non liguet" is inclined to agree, pointing out that it was by no means unusual for men of culture and learning to be placed in imperial administrative posts.

The brother of Gregory of Nazianzus, Caesarius, is another example of a member of a respectable Christian family entering the medical profession. Caesarius, when the time came for him to leave home and study elsewhere, went to Alexandria, the workshop of all learning, to learn medicine, Greg.Or.VII,6. He was a most successful student, outstanding in geometry, astronomy, mathematics, medicine, in both practical and philosophical aspects, Ib.7. He then came with his brother to Constantinople, where his reputation was such that public honours were given to him, he married into a noble family, joined the senate, and acted as ambassador on behalf of the city, Ib.8. He rapidly became the first man in the city, and was appointed to be imperial physician and a close friend of the emperor. He provided his services free of charge to the officials, and, accessible to all, he gained the respect of the most important in the state. Then came a setback: Julian attacked him for being a Christian and he had to withdraw to Cappadocia, 11 - 12.
With a change of emperor, he returned to his former post, becoming a valued confidant of the emperor, and was appointed *comes largitionum* of the diocese of Pontica, a sure sign of intended higher offices. In the earthquake of Nicaea, he alone of the officials was saved, and he had to take over the administration at a time of crisis. His rise to further greatness was cut off by his death shortly after, and his brother rejoices to see him, no longer voyaging afar as a doctor bothered by others, but residing peacefully in heaven.

Basil the Great also studied medicine, "His bodily weakness and his care of the sick made medicine, the fruit of philosophy and industry, a necessity for him. From such a beginning he advanced to mastery of this art, practical and theoretical." He healed the prefect of the city, and, but for the folly of the emperor in changing the treatment, would have cured Galates, the son of Valens, when all the best doctors had failed. It was possibly this interest in medicine which led him to set up a hospital for lepers, who, driven out of the cities, were wandering in multitudes about the country. He corresponded with Eustathius, the *archiatros*, probably the son of the doctor, Oribasios; Meletios, the *archiatros*, Ep.193 and Pasinicus, a doctor, Ep.324, and the lengthy descriptions of his illness, couched in medical terms, suggest that his friend Eusebius of Samosata also possessed medical learning. This is not surprising considering that at Alexandria, and possibly elsewhere, medicine was taught in a manner akin to philosophy, and that Gregory of Nazianzus, another chronic invalid, can quote Hippocrates, *Or.II.27*, and refer to Basil's practice of medicine as 'our common intellectual avocation'.

Other clerics had earlier practised medicine. Theodotus, bishop
of Laodicea, a see famed for its intellectual occupants, excelled in medicine, both bodily and spiritual\textsuperscript{20}, and Zenobius, a presbyter and doctor of Sidon who was martyred at Antioch, provided the model for several medical martyrdoms\textsuperscript{21}. Leaving aside the shadowy figures of the Acta Sanctorum, we find Hieracas of Leonton, trained in Greek learning, the art of the iatrosophists, magic and astrology; and Eusebius, pope, 309 – 310, was a doctor or the son of one\textsuperscript{22}.

But it was not only the educated Christian who proclaimed an interest in medicine. From Antioch in Pisidia, an outpost of pagan culture, we have three fourth century inscriptions which record doctors. An archiatros of the empiric sect is found on the earliest\textsuperscript{23}, and the others refer to members of the important local family, the Calpurnii. C. Calpurnius Macedo, councillor, a man of consummate virtue, an orator worthy of inclusion among the canon of ten Attic orators, a follower of Socrates and Plato, held the post of archiatros, knowing well the tenets of Hippocrates, and cast off his cloak of earthly clay at the age of thirty\textsuperscript{24}. He was evidently a man of great culture and wealth, as befitted a member of such a family, and there is a marked contrast between his son's rough memorial and this fulsome epitaph. Collega, his doctor son, died at the age of twenty, and his epitaph, though full of unusual words, does not find space to praise his cultural achievements\textsuperscript{25}. In Rome we find a doctor, Asclepiades, whose views on the afterlife, possibly depicted on his tomb, have occasioned much speculation\textsuperscript{26}. He wrote a work on the immortality of the soul, and the language of his inscription suggests neo-platonism or neo-pythagoreanism. By his studies and his speculations he thought he would obtain a right to blessed immortality. Boyance\textsuperscript{27} considered Asclepiades a philosophic
theurgic doctor, following Bidez, who suggested that, because of the vogue of psychic cures and inner purifications, to obtain an intellectual - and, one would think, well-paying - clientele, it was necessary to know the secrets of metaphysics and psychology. This agrees well with what we know of the friends of Plotinus. Paulinus of Scythopolis, a medical man, Eustochius of Alexandria, a man with the character of a true philosopher, and Zethus of Arabia, a friend of the philosopher Ammonios, attended Plotinus on his last journey to Campania and attempted in vain to cure him. The philosopher Iamblichus is described by Leontius the Scholastic, Anth.Pal. XVI.272, as practising the works of healing and teaching wisdom, though perhaps the evidence of so late a writer should not be pressed.

It is not surprising therefore that, when we reach the works of Eunapius, many of his 'pagan saints' are physicians. He himself was a doctor, or had medical knowledge, and he received one of the works of his great friend Oribasius, who had inspired him to continue the history of Dexippus and provided him with information on Julian's Parthian campaign. Oribasius is one of the most important doctors known to us, whose influence upon political events may have been great. He was born at Pergamum, though his family came from Sardes in Lydia, and he was personal physician to Julian in Gaul, where he took part in the plot to bring him to power, and where they passed many an evening in discussing the works of Galen. He travelled with Julian to Antioch in 361/2 as one of his intimate advisers, and was promoted to quaestor palatii. He was a friend of the sophist Chrysanthius, whom he treated in his last illness, Eunapius, 505, and may have written some volumes on 'Kingship', though this may be a misinterpretation by Suidas of the story of his moral advice to Julian. His works, which
are mostly compilations from older authorities, gave him a wide reputation, which may be gauged by the two laudatory epigrams written upon him in the Anthology.\textsuperscript{40}

Other members of his circle were interested in philosophy, rhetoric and medicine. His master was Zeno of Cyprus, equally skilled in rhetoric and medicine, whose pupils became famous physicians and orators, Eun. 497 - 8. I consider it possible\textsuperscript{41} that he is the same as the archiatros expelled in 362 from Alexandria by George, the bishop, who successfully appealed to Julian for assistance to return, and he is the probable recipient of a letter from Libanius, Ep.171, which expatiates upon the successes of his numerous pupils.

One of these students, who is known to us from other sources, was Magnus, the iatrosothist, a friend of Oribasius, who came from Nisibis to establish a school at Alexandria\textsuperscript{42}. Eunapius says that he proved good or bad health by logical arguments, although his actual practice did not equal his rhetorical and dialectical abilities. He obtained a great following, and Libanius, Ep.843, requested his help in bringing contestants to the games at the shrine of Daphne in 388. Less attractive is the story of his dealings with a young student, Chrysogonus\textsuperscript{43}. This young man from the interior of Phoenicia had been robbed of his wealth and property by his guardians while he was studying at Antioch with Libanius. He was not a bad student and, at the invitation of Magnus, a distant relative, he went off to Egypt to study medicine, only to find that Magnus claimed not to recognise him. Of the medical works of Magnus we have an epigram of Galen, and a reference to his lectures upon Urine\textsuperscript{44}. These appear to have commented upon the previous work of Galen, and, as he was notoriously unskilful in the
practice of medicine, he divided and subdivided the teachings of Galen and
others on purely logical grounds. His fellow student, Ionicus of Sardes,
the son of a famous physician, is much more attractive: an expert on
anatomy, bandaging, amputation and practical medicine, a philosopher, orator
and poet, who had an imposing clientele. Nor is Oribasius the only doctor to attain high civil office.
As has often been remarked, a literary and philosophic education was an
advantage in an administrative career, and in the relatively rigid
stratification of the late empire intellectual qualifications provided one
of the few means of rapid advancement. We should not therefore be surprised
to find that doctors appear in important positions both within their own
cities and in imperial government, and also that the profession of medicine
became regarded as one which could compensate its practitioners. The
family of Ausonius has recently been studied as an example of rapid social
advancement through intellectual ability. Ausonius is silent about his
paternal grandfather, a curious omission by one so verbose, and it was
suggested that, as his son was unable to speak Latin fluently, but only
Greek, he was a Greek physician, possibly brought to Gaul as a slave.
Ausonius the elder was a decurion at both Bazas and Bordeaux, though he had
estates only at Bordeaux, and Hopkins, p.241, suggested that his grandfather
was manumitted by a man with land at Bazas, hence the patria of his son,
and that Ausonius the elder obtained his estate at Bordeaux through
marriage. As a medical student, he married a daughter of a poor landowner,
but his wife's uncle, a professor at Bordeaux, was promoted by Constantine
to a chair at Constantinople. In the late 320s Ausonius' daughter
married the leader of the senate at Bordeaux, quite an achievement for a
doctor's daughter who can not have had a large dowry, and though doctors
were respected and had wealth, they were hardly the equals of the great
landowners. Marcellus Empiricus, himself a doctor from Bordeaux who became
*magister officiorum* under Theodosius I, refers, Pf.I, to his medical
writings, and clearly Ausonius the elder remained quietly in Gaul. His sons,
while they lived, prospered. Avitianus, one of his sons, died while
training to be a doctor, but the eldest, Ausonius, the poet, by favour of
the emperors, became Prefect of Gaul, Libya and Latium and consul in 379.
His father at the age of eighty or more was summoned by Gratian in 375 or
378 to become praefectus Illyrici, an honour which should be ascribed to
the intellectual success of his son rather than to the merits of his medical
career.

Even if we regard Ausonius' case as exceptional, other examples

can be brought. Augustine, Ep.XLI.2, mentions Hilarinus, archiater of
Hippo and principalis, evidently a man of wealth and influence, and Cassius
Felix, if the identification is correct, was archiater at Carthage and a
leading member of the Christian community there. Vindicianus, the author
of a poem and a letter on drugs, is another doctor who rose to become a
proconsul. Marcellus Empiricus, p.21, refers to him as *comes archiatrorum*
under Valentinian, a post of wealth and importance, and he appears in the
law codes, where he is addressed, CT.X 19.9, as *vicarius* and again in 379
when he received a law from the emperor, CT XIII.3.12. He met Augustine
during his proconsulship of Africa, when he presided over a rhetorical
contest, and discussed with him the merits of astrology, confessing that in
his youth he too had studied it, but had forsaken it to concentrate upon
medicine, as he was unwilling to make a living by cheating.
doctor's daughter who can not have had a large dowry, and though doctors were respected and had wealth, they were hardly the equals of the great landowners. Marcellus Empiricus, himself a doctor from Bordeaux who became magister officiorum under Theodosius I, 50a, refers, Pf.I, to his medical writings, and clearly Ausonius the elder remained quietly in Gaul. His sons, while they lived, prospered. Avitianus, one of his sons, died while training to be a doctor, but the eldest, Ausonius, the poet, by favour of the emperors, became Prefect of Gaul, Libya and Latium and consul in 379. His father at the age of eighty or more was summoned by Gratian in 375 or 378 to become praefectus illyrici, an honour which should be ascribed to the intellectual success of his son rather than to the merits of his medical career.

Even if we regard Ausonius' case as exceptional, other examples can be brought. Augustine, Ep.XLI.2, mentions Hilarinus, archiater of Hippo and principalis, evidently a man of wealth and influence, and Cassius Felix, if the identification is correct, was archiater at Carthage and a leading member of the Christian community there. Vindicianus, the author of a poem and a letter on drugs, is another doctor who rose to become a proconsul. Marcellus Empiricus, p.21, refers to him as comes archiatrorum under Valentinian, a post of wealth and importance, and he appears in the law codes, where he is addressed, CT.X 19.9, as vicarius and again in 379 when he received a law from the emperor, CT XIII.3.12. He met Augustine during his proconsulship of Africa, when he presided over a rhetorical contest, and discussed with him the merits of astrology, confessing that in his youth he too had studied it, but had forsaken it to concentrate upon medicine, as he was unwilling to make a living by cheating. Augustine
respected him greatly: "Vir sagax, medicinae artis peritissimus atque in ea
bilibissimus, magnus ille nostrorum temporum medicus" is praise indeed, and
he is used as an example of wisdom in Ep. 138 (412 A.D.). He had advised
a man to take a drug during his illness and when, some years later he took a
second dose to ward off an attack, he became much worse and rushed with his
supporters to him to complain. The bystanders thought that Vindicianus had
relied upon illegal means rather than upon medical art, but he simply replied
that the drug was now unsuitable for a man so old.

In the late fifth and sixth centuries doctors appear as ambassadors,
especially in dealings with Persia. A tradition records that when Aurelian
made peace with Persia and gave his daughter in marriage, she took with her
to Gondishapur distinguished Greek physicians who propagated the system of
Hippocratic medicine in the East. The Persian monarchs appear to have
long been favourable to Greek learning and culture and the great schools at
Nisibis, Edessa and Gondishapur flourished under their patronage. It is
not surprising therefore to find, in the time of Justinian, doctors who
serve as representatives of both rulers or as envoys of a city. Stephen of
Edessa, a renowned doctor, moved to the Persian court where he cured King
Cabadas. Later he returned to Edessa whose envoy to King Chosroes he
became when it was besieged. In the subsequent peace terms Chosroes
insisted upon the return of his physician Tribunus, who later secured the
freedom of three hundred Roman captives. Menander records the participation
of several doctors in embassies to Chosroes, and other sources confirm
this. Nor should one forget the Christian embassy led by Narses, which
appealed to Chosroes in 564–7, nor the medical conference held in 550,
Elgood, *op. cit.* p.54, nor the machinations of Joseph, doctor, politician,
and Catholikos of Seleucia. But one greater than these can be found. Theoctistus, an Alexandrian physician, was appointed magister officiorum by Basiliscus upon his taking control from the emperor Zeno in 476, and was induced by his brother, a monk, to effect the recall of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria. His monophysite views would not have endeared him to the population of Constantinople, if we can trust the author of the life of St. Daniel Stylites, and, on Zeno's restoration, the crowds shouted for his death.

Doctors also became bishops and church leaders, and educated men understood medical theory. Although Tertullian appears to know the works of Soranus and other doctors, this does not permit us to call him a physician, and other instances are found. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, included in his 'Dialogue' a section on the alimentary system, p.217, and, in the 'De Providentia', references to medical ideas and examples. Methodius set his dialogue on the Resurrection at the house of the doctor Aglaophon of Patara who is one of the chief speakers. Probably it is best to regard as doctors only those authors who inform us that they studied medicine, or like Nemesius, appear to know more than one encyclopedic textbook.

Basil, bishop of Ancyra, studied medicine in his early career, and the clumsy foot of Maruthas, bishop of Martyropolis, another medical ambassador, brought death to the enemy of the faith, Cyrinus, bishop of Chalcedon. A possible doctor is S. Ephraim, born at Nisibis, who visited Edessa when a famine was raging, persuaded the rich to accept the assistance of doctors, and set up an emergency bed service. He treated the sick in the public stoas, citizens and strangers alike, and then returned to his cell and monastic philosophy. Not all medical ecclesiastics were as
scrupulous as Ephraim. Basil of Ancyra was deposed for failing to excommunicate a quack doctor who had killed several of his patients. Another deacon and doctor, Gerontius, defied Ambrose's request to remain in seclusion in Milan after he had claimed to have seen a demon, and fled to Constantinople, where his powerful friends secured his preferment to the bishopric of Nicomedia. Ambrose invoked the assistance of John Chrysostom in deposing him, but the Nicomedians complained, praising his unstinting use of his medical abilities among them.

The career of Aetius the heretic is also significant for the understanding of the medical profession in the fourth century, showing the possibilities open to an unscrupulous and untrained doctor. He was born in Syria and apprenticed to a goldsmith on the death of his father. After his mother's death he took to dialectic under Paulinus, a former bishop of Tyre, and then moved to Anazarbus, where he attempted to learn the trade of a grammaticus. He was expelled by his master, and, after wandering through Syria and Cilicia, returned to Antioch, where he attached himself to Sopolis, a doctor on whose merits theological odium has cast considerable doubt. He amassed wealth, and Philostorgius says that in his zeal for medicine and the free treatment of the poor, he refused to seek food during the day, when he practised, but was fed by his fellow practitioners out of their own stores. Gregory, who can see no virtue at all in the heretic, says that he cheated one Armenius into subsidising him, and that he claimed to be a doctor on the basis of a few cures, Contra Eunomium, I 42. He made use of his rhetorical talents by holding forth at length in medical debates, and thereby gained a reputation. When his qualifications were suspected, so Gregory says, he forsook medicine, having studied the theological controversies that reverberated round the surgeries.
Despite the theological dust which obscures the details of Aetius' life, it is clear that no qualifications apart from success were necessarily required for a man to call himself a doctor, and that the medical profession always offered hopes or expectations of wealth. Chrysogonus, an impoverished student of Libanius, Ep.1208, first chose medicine as a career, perhaps in view of its profitability, and went to Alexandria, the benefits of whose education are stated by Ammianus, XXII.16.18. Libanius certainly thought that the career of medicine would provide a respectable living for those who adopted it, and he hints that a doctor could expect to make money. A rich man called Cyrus married his two daughters to doctors, who, as yet, were not wealthy, and thereby conferred a benefit upon the city. The word οἱμνω surely indicates that they were expected to acquire wealth befitting sons-in-law of a wealthy citizen. Another friend, Heracleides, a doctor from Memphis, an ornament of his city and to Asclepius, is said to have expended much on his city and upon his friends, Ep.212, 291, 292, 839, while in writing a request to prosdocius of Tyre to come and practise at Antioch, Ep.1018, Libanius can assure him of a high reputation, and possibly financial reward. Other medical friends are commended for their reluctance to treat only the rich and for their willingness to attend the poorer citizens, Ep.992, 1018. Another doctor, Marcellus, was wealthy enough to enrol illegally his sons at birth in the agentes in rebus, Ep.362, and sought Libanius' aid in keeping them registered. Notice too the fears of the people of Edessa, Sozomen III 16, that those doctors willing to attend them during a plague intended to exploit them financially. In Africa, in the time of Justinian, Pegasus of Laribus was sufficiently rich to ransom Solomon, nephew of the governor of Africa, for fifty solidi, about ten
year's pay for a soldier \(^78\).

Our best evidence for the wealth of a doctor in the Later Empire is provided by a papyrus, P.Cairo Masp.67151, recording the will made in 570 by Phoebammon. He was the son of Euprepes the archiatros and himself became archiatros at Antinopolis, where he shared in the running of the hospital with his brother. He wills an aroura of his land in his vineyard and its equipment to the abbot of the monastery, without taxes, and also gives a small boat with fittings, one of the two he possesses. He bequeaths a piece of property to an aunt to be sold off to pay a debt, and enjoins Abbot Besa to pay to Christopher fifty solidi in payment of a debt and to take the money from the customary annonae paid to him, which amounted to sixty solidi per annum. Justinian, when reorganising the province of Africa after the Vandal conquest, provided for five doctors, the senior of which received ninety-nine solidi, the second, seventy, and the rest fifty a year \(^79\).

The professors, grammarians and sophists at Carthage were to receive seventy solidi a year, while the judicial assessor of the 'spectabiles' magistrates received seventy-two solidi, those of the clarissimi, fifty a year \(^80\). In the case of doctors and teachers, as Greenslade points out \(^81\), there would be fees and gifts from grateful patients and pupils, which under exceptional circumstances might provide them with an income equivalent to that of a bishop.

The position of a doctor to a city, which carried immunity with it, was eagerly sought after, as can be seen by the stringent regulations laid down for the archiatri of Rome \(^82\). The doctor, because of his wealth, was likely to be harried by tax-gatherers and legal experts eager to remove some of his riches and privileges \(^83\). Even in this the Gothic kingdom of
Theoderic recalls the contemporary Eastern Empire. Theoderic declared that John the archiater, having been unfairly pursued and condemned by Vivianus, a lawyer, was to be restored to his property as his daily tasks were in the public interest. Cassiodorus in his regulations for the post of comes archiatrorum provides a verbose description of the glories of medicine and the honourable duties of the physicians, Var.VI 19. "If a lawyer is honoured for saving a client, how much more should we respect a doctor who constantly battles against death and disease? The count should be above all contentions and rivalries, devoting himself to the dutiful care of the emperor". Possibly this exalted post was held by Anthimus, who, expelled by Zeno from Constantinople in 476 for plotting with Theoderic, dedicated to him a tract of foods.

The career of another doctor at the court of Theoderic deserves mention, as it combines Christian, imperial and civic medicine, and shows the wide experience and travel of an important doctor in the sixth century. I refer to the doctor and deacon, Elpidius, whose life has been described in shorthand and unannotated form by Positano. "An Elpidius is known as a famous Greek doctor, who established himself first at Arles, then at Spoleto, and attended Theodosius (sic!) during his last days". The details are not entirely correct. The birthplace of Elpidius is unknown; he may have had some connection with Lyons, for the Vita Aviti, p.181, calls him a deacon there, and Avitus, Ep.XXXVIII, found a servant of his passing through Vienne. His letter also suggests that Elpidius, who was in Italy before 516, had been a doctor, as his help was requested in curing the son of Ceretus, vir illustris. He was a friend of Ennodius, a native of Arles and bishop of Ticinum, who addressed several letters to him, calling him a doctor, and
implying that he resided for a time in Liguria, Ep.437, and at Milan, Ep.445, from which, like Icarus, he flew into the unknown. He refers to his fluency in speech, his Attic eloquence, Ep.384, and his Pontic rudeness, which may, if these are not stock phrases, imply that he could speak Greek and had visited Constantinople, perhaps on an embassy. This clerical doctor is next found at Spoleto, where he obtained permission to restore some half ruined baths, and, as imperial physician, he followed Theoderic to Ravenna. A curious tale is here told of him, Vita S. Caesarii, I.41, "The doctor Elpidius, a friend and earnest servant of the imperial majesty, was attacked by demons, not only in various ambushes, but even by a shower of stones in his own house. He prayed to God that he might be freed, and S. Caesarius came and exorcised the spirits which afflicted him". Procopius, V.1.38, records a prodigy which appeared to the dying Theoderic who then "expressed in broken murmurs to his physician Elpidius his deep repentance for the murders of Boethius and Symmachus". As Gibbon rightly remarked, one would like to know whether Procopius received this curious anecdote from common report or from Elpidius himself. Thus the career of Elpidius the deacon is not without interest, and illustrates the varied activities of a doctor of learning and importance.

At the other end of the social scale, the humble epigraphic records of doctors still continue, even though, as has often been remarked, descriptions of profession become rare. The attestation of medical competence on a Christian tomb also indicates that this was a profession sufficiently approved by the ecclesiastical authorities to merit inclusion in an epitaph. A varied collection appears. A doctor from Claudiopolis is found at Verona, an Egyptian doctor comes to Milan, a Syrian, a Spaniard,
two Gauls are buried in Rome. Dionysius, a doctor and priest, ILCV 1233, who gave free treatment, records his capture and release by the Goths, and an Egyptian astrologer doctor is buried at Ragusa. From Capua comes a long epitaph on Scantia Redempta, a lady whose merits the abilities of men cannot record and among whose activities was counted the pursuit of medicine. A Sicilian doctor paid one aureus for a tomb, and a Roman doctor complains that, though he could cure others, he failed to cure himself, ILCV 611, cf. 612. At Cartenna in Mauretania a fine mosaic bears the name of Rozonus, a doctor who died in 357 aged seventy, and other mosaics donated by doctors are to be found at Tralles and at Furni in Africa. Alexander, whose statue in rhetorical pose stands on the Street of the Kouretes at Ephesus, was an important citizen, and a doctor presumably contributed towards an ecclesiastical building at Aphrodisias. The word archiater may have suffered some debasement, and examples from Nola, Seleucia and Phrygia mean little more than 'important doctor'. An imperial doctor is found at Hebron and Theodorus, the doctor to a hospital in Galatia, must have had local importance. Although a bishop at Domoim is described as a wise physician, it remains doubtful whether he was a doctor or merely a priest to whom these epithets had been applied upon the model of Christ the physician.

The law codes also refer to slave doctors, and the two passages demand comment. Laws of 530 and 531 fix the maximum price of a slave doctor at sixty solidi, ten more than a secretary, and the question must be raised whether these laws are not socially irrelevant. Excepting these, I have discovered no text later than the third century which can be referred with certainty to a slave doctor. There were medical assistants, whose
social status is uncertain\textsuperscript{108}, and the \textit{pueri} or \textit{oster} may be either children or slaves\textsuperscript{109}. Thus a first conclusion would suggest that Justinian was legislating for a problem that did not exist, and that very few slaves, if any, were to be found practising medicine in the sixth century. However, the context of these regulations indicates the opposite conclusion. The first law is eminently practical, dealing with the prices to be paid by one of the joint owners to the others if he wishes to manumit a slave held in common, and Justinian expressly imposes a solution upon an old and much-discussed problem. The second law lays down a similar price to be paid when one member of a group wishes to buy a slave who has been left as a legacy to them all, again a practical law. That there were some slaves over whom such disputes might arise is clear from this passage: what is not clear is their number. Whether we follow the hazardous procedure of discounting this legal evidence or prefer to see slave doctors in the sixth century, it is obvious that beneath the apparent unanimity of the literary sources there are still many variations.

The doctor in the Later Roman Empire is in general much more important than in the Early Empire. His immunity helped to secure his riches from the rapacity of his fellow \textit{curiales} and no literary text suggests that town doctors were lacking in wealth. On the other hand, beneath this level of social respectability, as always, lurk the exorcists, the peripatetic druggists, the magicians and the faith healers, about whom we know little and with whom the respectable \textit{medicus} or \textit{archiater} did not concern himself. The Later Empire provides us with a clear picture of the doctor in society, performing as \textit{bishop}, \textit{governor} and \textit{ambassador}, a man of
importance and moderate wealth in the city where he found himself, whose literacy and education enable him to gain social advancement even in the relatively static society of the time. Although to describe in detail the processes of any social change is difficult, if not impossible, the transition from slave and freedmen doctors to free and respectable physicians is here obvious even when the other statuses and specialities of the medical profession are taken into account.
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CHAPTER NINE.

The Study of Medicine: the Early Empire.

The training of a doctor can be divided into two parts; that which equips him for the practical activities of his career, the study of anatomy, pharmacy and so on, and that which enables him to understand and converse with his patients, an education of a more general nature. In antiquity, the second part became more and more important, especially in relation to the curriculum followed at Alexandria, and the emphasis on practical training, carried on in an institution under supervision, diminished, with the result that, obtaining the reputation of intelligence and culture, the doctor gained increased status, which did not depend entirely upon his practical abilities. As medicine became part of a general education, available to those who could afford it, so the standing of the doctor brought up in such a tradition increased, certainly among his educated patients, and probably among the others. However our knowledge of medical education in antiquity is sadly deficient, and I hope in this and the next chapter to discuss, firstly, the evidence we have for medical schools or teaching centres, secondly their curricula, and finally the school of Alexandria, and its influence in the Later Empire.

I define a medical school as an association of doctors, formally constituted in a Museum or collegium, or an institution from which derive works of medicine, or of whose teaching we have evidence. This definition excludes those cities where inscriptions relating to doctors have been found, but from which come neither medical writings nor doctors claiming allegiance
to them as part of their qualifications. Geographical unity is a shaky base on which to construct medical schools and the presence of doctors recorded over a long period may imply nothing more than the existence of physicians in that community. This is not to deny that much teaching was carried on informally, by precept and practice from father to son, or from master to apprentice, but although this probably provided the training for most physicians, as a formal qualification, it ranked below attendance at a medical centre.

The island of Cos was the centre for medical teaching in the Hellenistic age; doctors go from there to Delos, Gortyn and Aptera, and there may have been some sort of formal medical organisation which merited the title of school. While there the pupil would undergo theoretical instruction, and the Hippocratic Corpus may derive from works available to students and teachers. A similar situation is presumed to have existed at Cnidos, where another branch of the Asclepiadic tradition had long existed, though in the Roman period there is little evidence even for the presence of doctors.

More is known about the medical school of Ephesus, even though Keil's attempt to locate its headquarters has not found favour. Doctors formed part of an educational establishment called 'the Museum', and were organised under an archon and a priest. As a body they received bequests, guarded the tombs of their former members and participated in the normal religious duties of the paedeutai and paedonomoi. A first century inscription records a discussion, either of the council or of the doctors themselves, dealing with the problem of exorbitant fees and of doctors eager for money. A series of inscriptions shows medical contests at the end of
the second century, which were probably annual and lasted two days, open to
any doctor who wished. There were four sections, σύνταγμα, πρόβλημα, 
χειρουργία, ὄργανο, but the meaning of these terms is unclear. The
first of these may have some connection with pharmacy, πρόβλημα was
said by Keil 'to provide the correct diagnosis in difficult cases', and
the others are concerned with surgery. Keil, to whom these contests
represented a final examination after which the winner was called archiatros,
assumed that the surgical or practical sections, 3 and 4, were held on the
two days of the meeting, the others judged upon the results of the year's
work. As Wolters, JOAI, 1906, B, 295, demonstrated the error of Keil's
premisses, we must make a re-examination of the subjects of the contest.
From the names alone, two sections appear concerned with surgery, one with
pharmacy and one, πρόβλημα, remains doubtful, and I suggest, in the
interests of symmetry, that it deals with pharmacy. Assuming that the
sections correspond one with another, I suppose that πρόβλημα and
surgery refer to practical examinations held on the two days, and that awards
were made in the other two sections on the new prescriptions and new
instruments submitted to the judges. This avoids the difficulty of splitting
practical surgery into χειρουργία and ὄργανο as Keil had done,
and also provides a similar basis for a division of pharmacy into the
discovery and composition of a drug, σύνταγμα, and the diagnosis and
prescription in a difficult case. This implies that there was a pharmacopoeia
well known to the contestants, from which they were expected to choose, a
not impossible situation, to judge from the numbers of drug books recorded
by Galen.

Have we any other evidence for similar medical contests? It can
hardly be expected that all games dedicated to Asclepius contained such a contest, especially as Galen remains silent, and, save possibly from Smyrna, where an inscription, _Lebas-W, III 1523_, associates and *archiatros* and an *agonothete*, there is nothing. Smyrna also possessed a Museum, Robert, _EA_, 146–8, which may be connected with the school of Erasistrateans founded by Hicesius in the generation before Strabo. The name Hicesius is common at Smyrna, and it is unsound to consider all bearers of the name as related to this man. For example, a large statue of fine workmanship depicts Artemon, son of Artemidorus, son of Hicesius, holding in his left hand a roll and with two children at his side, and Holländer, who was the first to publish a photograph, _fig. 395_, pronounced him a doctor without hesitation or references. The only conclusion that can be drawn at once is that this represents a man of culture and importance, as the statues, CIG 3217, 3226, and 3244 also show a man holding a bookroll. No inscription refers to Artemon as a doctor, but Pliny, _NH.XXVIII.7_, refers to a recipe by Artemon, and Wellmann considers that the Artemon salve was called after the same man. This man must have lived at the latest in the first half of the first century A.D., and possibly earlier, and it is tempting, though not necessary, to connect the statue with the medical author.

Though Hicesius and his school were Erasistrateans, Smyrna also produced M. Modius Asiaticus, head of the methodist medical school. Cadoux has made an ingenious attempt to connect the Erasistrateans with one of the notables of the later first century, Hermogenes, son of Charidemus, who died at the age of seventy-seven, a learned and prolific writer, CIG 3311. As well as seventy-seven books on medicine, he wrote on local history, Homeric wisdom, foundation stories and made a chronological table of Roman
and Smyrnaean magistrates. He may be the zealous Erasistratean mentioned by Galen, XI 432, whose father may be a follower of Erasistratus mentioned by Cælius Aurelianus, and Cadoux would even attribute to him the references in the Anthology. These may equally well apply to other well known doctors of the same name, such as Hadrian's doctor, but, leaving them aside, we can see Hermogenes as a prominent local worthy and a learned and enthusiastic citizen.

Our evidence for a school at Tarsus is much slighter and almost entirely literary. Ramsay, describing the intellectual life of the city, omits the teaching of medicine, but there appears to have been a local pharmacological tradition. The earliest known doctor from Tarsus may be Philo, whose drug, described in verse, was especially famous. Laecanius Bassus, consul 64, was the patron of Laecanius Arius, a follower of Asclepiades, Galen XIII 857, who wrote a compendium of drugs, and notes on the genealogy of Hippocrates. Bassus was also known to Pedanius Dioscorides, a close friend of Arius, who served as a soldier, studied or stayed some time at Tarsus, and dedicated another work, 'On Simples' to Andromachus, Nero's doctor. His contemporary may be Lucius of Tarsus, whose works were used by Asclepiades Pharmacion, and then by Criton and Andromachus the younger. Kind identified Lucius of Tarsus, Galen XIII 295, with Lucius the teacher, XIII 292, and Asclepiades Pharmacion, who uses Lucius and Laecanius Arius as sources, can thus be considered heir to the Tarsian pharmacological tradition, which would also explain the appearance of other Tarsian pharmacists in his writings. Doctors thus appear associated together at Tarsus, the authors of works especially on pharmacology, and there was clearly some tradition of medical learning which I consider to
represent a school.

If we regard Italy and the West, there are two apparently conflicting pieces of evidence. Save for Massilia, which as a Greek city continues the Greek tradition of education and medical learning, our authorities never refer to formally organised medical schools except in Rome. On the other hand, associations of doctors are known from inscriptions at Aventicum, Turin and Beneventum, and, while it is clear that these collegia served as social centres for doctors and may be widespread, one still has no evidence to connect them with the organised teaching of medicine. A school of medicine has been posited at Velia, but, though there was undoubtedly an organisation in which doctors, male and female, participated, it has still to be proved that it was more than a cult organisation or pythagorean ἐκκλησία. Arguments from archaeological find-spots are at best inconclusive, as the 'cryptoporticus', which was assumed to be the headquarters of the association, has been shown to have no connection with the medical school, which was probably sited higher up the hill. Even if we assume that this was a medical teaching centre, there is no evidence at all to support Ebner's contention that there is continuity between Velia and the medieval school of Salerno.

The tract ascribed to Galen, 'On Theriac to Pamphilianus' mentions teachers of medicine active at Rome. The author's oldest teacher, Aelianus Maecius, records his use of theriac in curing a plague that was ravaging Italy, and, XIV 304, the author gives a description of a treatment learned from his teachers in Rome. This tract, though contemporary with Galen, can not be ascribed to him, for we nowhere hear of him deriving profit or instruction from teachers and fellow doctors at Rome. Epigraphy confirms
the existence of this school. One inscription, ILS 7617, mentions a scriba medicorum, which implies a formally constituted body; another, ILS 5481, records the removal of a statue from the schola medicorum. Literary and archaeological evidence may give precision to the site of the school. Galen X.909f., records a debate with Attalus at the gymnasium of Trajan on the Esquiline, and Pazzini suggested that this was a meeting place for doctors. In the Curiosum Urbis a temple of Minerva Medica appears on the Esquiline, but votive deposits found there in 1825 and 1887, while confirming the existence of a healing shrine, say nothing about a medical association.

Maiuri located a shrine of Asclepius on the Esquiline, and it is possible that an association of doctors was situated somewhere on the Esquiline, but its activities are unknown to us.

As well as these teaching centres which may be called 'schools', there were also groups of medical theorists whose unity of approach can be characterised as a 'sect', the Methodists, the Dogmatists, the Empirics, the Pneumatics and so on. As Temkin has pointed out, they differed from each other upon the principles behind the treatment of disease and opposed one another on philosophic rather than medical issues. Certain areas had a reputation for a particular method of teaching - Smyrna had Erasistrateans, and Tarsus preserved a tradition of Asclepiadean medicine - but the acceptance of the ideas of a medical sect does not demand residence at one of the 'medical schools'. The transmission of ideas from master to pupil, whether in a formal teaching centre or not, leads to the formation of a set of accepted dogmas which may solidify into the rigid dogmas of a sect. While it is possible to pick out the leading opinions of the major sects, it should not be forgotten that there were some who founded their own sects.
or who practised like Galen a resolute eclecticism. Like the sophists who preserved lists of masters and pupils, the doctors compiled notices of their philosophic heads in an attempt to demonstrate a diadoche, a direct line of teaching, and it is from these and from information preserved by Galen that we can trace the origins and views of the more important sects.

A comparison with the methods of legal education is instructive. Not until the late second or early third century with the formation of the law school of Berytus is there any formal teaching centre comparable to the medical school of Alexandria, although lawyers are found at the Museum of Smyrna. While there are examples of teachers of law, which suggests a relationship between a lawyer and his pupil similar to that of a doctor and his assistant, they are few, and our knowledge of legal education in the early Empire derives to a large extent from the references to the dispute between the Sabinians and the Proculians. While there is no evidence for the 'educational establishments' assumed by Schulz and Honoré, it may be assumed that there were informal groups of students meeting in Rome around a distinguished lawyer. Although a diadoche has been preserved of the heads of the two law 'schools', and thus provides a comparison with the medical schools, the differences between them, unlike those between the sects, which concern fundamental suppositions on the basic processes of health, do not appear to derive from any dispute over major and theoretical suppositions. Legal historians have had great difficulty in discovering a theoretical basis for disagreement, and some have resigned themselves to seeing little more than slight differences in interpretation. These schools are thus not divided upon theoretical disputes, but may derive from the association of lawyers and students around a distinguished practitioner. It is assumed,
not without some reason, that many of the leading lawyers also taught pupils, which provides a comparison with the civic and imperial doctors who also imparted instruction. The methods of legal education in the early empire can thus be compared with medical education and they show obvious similarities both in their informality and in the division into sects.

Medicine, like law, was not necessarily organised into schools. Pliny idealises traditional family medicine and medical teaching, handed down from father to son, and designed more to deal with domestic ailments than to gain a public reputation by the use of drugs. Undoubtedly this was the usual way of learning medicine, and I suspect that it was only the wealthy and ambitious who travelled to Alexandria and other similar medical centres, and that success in treatment rather than knowledge derived from books counted most in admitting a doctor to the privileged numerus. Here we come up against a problem that will be surveyed at length in Chapter 11; while the medical authors and most of our literary references mention doctors and their methods of training, they say little about the pharmacists whose works were probably the most widespread of all medical literature. Scribonius implies their great influence with the public at large, and the notices preserved to us shows the great number of pharmacological works in circulation. The list stretches from Xenocrates and Anaxilaus, through Scribonius and Galen to the fourth and fifth century compilations of Martialis, Marcellus and Pseudo-Apuleius. Even if these authors attended some 'medical school', the obscure writers who provide them with their material can hardly have done so, and it is easiest to assume that if they did instruct pupils in medicine, this was done in the informal master – pupil tradition rather than within a medical training centre.
Leaving aside these druggists in the obscurity of their distant homes, let us consider how medicine was taught in the time of Galen. A pupil wishing to study medicine would attach himself to a doctor, possibly for a fee\(^{52}\), and he would attend lectures which were given in public places and were open to all\(^{53}\). Occasional demonstrations of anatomy took place upon pigs, apes and goats in Galen's time\(^ {54}\), though only at Alexandria, II 220, was human dissection still practised. Galen and Dio make it clear that any who wished might attend and Galen heard the lectures of Satyrus, Aeficianus, Stratonicus and Julian among others\(^ {55}\). Dio describes the lecture of a quack doctor thus\(^ {56}\): "They sit out in front, surrounded by arrangements and rearrangements of bones, and they go through describing everything, pores, breaths, excretions. His audience gape and are deceived more than children". In the Hellenistic age doctors gave public demonstrations and lectures, and this tradition continued. Galen performed a Caesarian operation of a goat; the kid stood up tentatively, fell down, then shook off the moisture from its skin and scratched its ribs with a foot; the audience cheered wildly\(^ {57}\). Anatomy demonstrations, whether on the vocal nerves of pigs, II 669, or on stranger animals, attracted audiences and debate. When an elephant was killed in Rome, all the doctors crowded round, arguing whether the heart contained a bone. After the heart had been removed by the emperor's cook, Galen by a friend's aid had the bone preserved for him, II 619 - 20. Anatomists could be challenged to show their skill by a practical demonstration, and heavy wagers were laid upon the result, II 642 - 5, while others, through fear of defeat in public debate, II 283, refused to display their anatomical knowledge, a portent for the future of anatomy.
Public lectures were not confined to anatomy, though these may have drawn the biggest crowds. A sophist, Lucian, wrote a book, ascribing it to the Alexandrian anatomist Herophilus, which some of his friends brought to a philosopher and requested him to lecture and comment upon. He agreed, not seeing the forgery, and thought that he was publishing a first edition, and by this means was disgraced. Lucian also provided similar grammatical problems to secure the disgrace of a grammarian. Lectures were delivered, especially upon the Hippocratic commentaries, and Galen published his lectures on anatomy and other medical subjects. Galen refuses to comment upon grammatical points in his Hippocratic lectures — though his practice does not bear out this profession — and he tells of attending a lecture at Alexandria on the text: "Silenus lived in Platamon, unable to sleep at night, voluble, laughed, sang". The commentator explained that this was because he was Silenus, drunkard and lunatic, and his pupils jumped up and cheered at this revelation, XVIIA 499. Some commentators on this passage of the Epidemics I even discussed whether Silenus lived at Platanon or Platamon.

Galen's Hippocratic commentaries give us some ideas of the methods of exposition of those authors now lost to us. Stratonicus and Epicurus, an empiric from Pergamum, never published any of their lecture notes, and Lycus of Macedon's works had no reputation in his lifetime but spread widely after his death. Others, such as Pelops, only let into circulation part of their commentaries, while others, such as Satyrus, Philip, and doctors contemporary with Galen's father, published many volumes, most of them quickly lost.
Hippocrates and was undoubtedly Galen's main source for his textual variants. Thus Galen can speak on manuscript readings, XV 105, XVIII 630, and the history of the texts. He relies upon his own clinical experience, and his wide knowledge to explain difficult points: Homer is quoted at least eleven times, and twenty-seven classical authors are summoned to aid

Breadth of learning, logic and medical knowledge all serve to elucidate the difficult cases of Hippocrates and to provide guidance for those seeking to emulate him.

As well as attending lectures, students could also obtain books on medicine and, apparently, there was a considerable market. Galen insists that he has never written a book save at the request of a friend, and his works were often pirated. An Arabic source records a meeting of Galen and a man from Aleppo, who claimed to have met and studied with Galen. He had a medicine which cured worms in the teeth and he practised this and a form of venesection on unsuspecting fools, until Galen revealed him as a swindler and had him punished. It was easy to copy and forge Galen's works as he never signed them, despising fame as no use to the dead and a hindrance to the living. Frequently he found copies of his own works in general circulation, or others' productions marketed under his name. As he walked one day in the Sandalarium, the street of the booksellers, he saw two men arguing whether a certain book was by Galen. One had just bought 'The doctor' by Galen, and the other, after reading the first few lines, pronounced it spurious, different in language and style.

Galen also produced lecture notes which were handed to pupils and friends at their behest or were taken down by private shorthand writers, XIX 10, and which, upon the death of the pupil, were read by his executors and made the
basis of their lectures. In time, after these notes had circulated in Rome and the provinces, there would be a demand for a definitive edition by the author, II 217, XIX 10. As all Galen's work was contained in lecture notes there were several versions in use, and he was often invited to publish them formally as an introduction to various parts of medicine. Thus on his second visit to Rome, XIX 12, he was presented with copies of lectures delivered on his first visit, even though he possessed no copy himself, some of which he published, though he declined to reissue a polemical tract against Martialis. Galen was not troubled by this situation and regarded it as normal, still continuing to write for the few, although he expected his writings to be treated as an orphan child among drunkards, IV 22. Although a work so published came into the hands of ignorant doctors, unable to use them, XIII 563, it was possible for a doctor who, like Galen, had lost a copy of his works, to recover at least a part and to contemplate a revised edition. There were the dangers too that a series of lecture notes, copied and published, might only contain part of the teaching, and thus Galen, XV 2, had to expand the introduction to a commentary on Hippocrates: 'The Nature of Man'. A new work might prove to duplicate earlier material, and so Galen, asked for copies of his work on drugs, had to avoid repetition and attacked those who misrepresented his views and instructions. Just as the authors of works on the Mysteries wrote only for the initiated, though they were also generally read, so Galen's medical textbooks, though not written for the general public, still found readers, XII 2. Most of his readers were ignorant of anatomy, XVIII 321, and so he tried to adapt his method of exegis to his audience, aiming at the middle intellect, though his less educated audience preferred to hear the conflicting opinions
of teachers, rather than study textbooks. He emphasised the need for modern and accurate textbooks, II 659, and claimed that the writing of textbooks and introductions was not only without reproach, but also of the greatest use. There was a public willing to buy the forty-eight books of Julian on the Aphorisms of Hippocrates, XVII A 248, and an inspection of the Galenic Corpus enlightens us about the medical teaching methods of others. We may possess a discourse, written for a debate or contest, on 'Is the foetus a living animal?'. This, replete with historical and mythological allusions, can hardly be said to advance our anatomical knowledge of the subject, while other Galenic works may have served as catechisms for medical students or as doxographical compilations. Non-Galenic works, such as 'On Pulses for Antonius', and the 'Medical definitions' show a technique of logical subdivision which becomes common later, and fall into the tradition of 'question and answer' textbooks. 'On the condition of Medicine' and 'The Medical Art' divide medicine into its appropriate parts and were used as elementary textbooks. Another man wrote a large book on fevers, giving every rule and every example, VII 488, astounding Galen, who produced a short table to expound the principle of his diagnosis.

Although these texts were in circulation, there appears to have been no formally approved method of training. What then were the qualifications of a doctor? The test must have been success, and the care of a distinguished or long-lived patient was a frequent recommendation. Family tradition could secure a place in the civic numerus of doctors, but what if the doctor came from outside the city? In the Hellenistic age a doctor was often granted a decree by a city for his services, which would be set up in his home town and to which he could refer as an indication of
his abilities. They are still to be found in Roman times, but the emphasis is upon public benefactions rather than medical services. To judge from Galen, who may be an exception, one would seek out a patron, or advertise one's skill, either by public demonstration and debate, or by attending a rich and important citizen. Attendance at a recognised medical centre, such as Alexandria, is counted a suitable qualification and victory in a contest such as at Ephesus would doubtless be rewarded by some benefit. Throughout the period, from Cicero to Libanius, the personal recommendation of a distinguished friend would secure employment and financial gain for an almost unknown doctor. Not that there were not some who turned to medicine without any training whatsoever, and even these found acceptance in country areas, where specialists were few and where necessity did not permit suspicion of the doctor's ability and qualifications.

One means of deciding upon a doctor's ability was to hold a joint consultation, which is familiar to us from the writings of Galen, Gellius and Aristeides. Frequently these conferences also provided an opportunity to instruct students in correct diagnosis and clinical procedure. Martial's jibe, V.9, about the patient who was brought into a fever by the cold hands of the hundred pupils of the doctor, Symmachus, is well known, and appear to learn practical medicine, possibly as assistants during operations. They possess a knowledge of the properties of drugs, and the names of diseases, medicines and the parts of the body; they stand by at an operation, saw off bones and act as nurses to the patient. The meaning of the word may be in doubt; although it probably means servants or slaves of doctors, who could then be either sold as doctors or hired out, there is nothing to prevent a doctor from employing a
child and thereby teaching him the family profession. The youth of some
recorded as doctors, eighteen and nineteen\textsuperscript{90}, shows that their medical
training began earlier and (Soranus) recommends a start at the age of
fifteen, Introd., 244.

The impression of medical training in the first three centuries
A.D. is one of informality. Textbooks circulated widely, and were bought
by any who wished, medical and non-medical students alike\textsuperscript{91}. For a fee, or
through an introduction, a student attached himself to a doctor, accompanying
him to lectures and demonstrations, and discussing with him medical and
philosophical problems. Proof of formal qualifications was never given and
never demanded, even by those responsible for electing doctors to the
numerus, whose interests were in the civic and moral qualities of the
practitioners\textsuperscript{92}. The epigraphic records of collegia of doctors tell us
nothing about their activities, and the informal relationship between master
and pupil was the main method of instruction.
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CHAPTER TEN.

The Study of Medicine: Alexandria and the Later Empire.

Compared with the scanty notices of teaching in the West, the Alexandria medical school is well known and its members familiar names. In Ptolemaic times it boasted such as Erasistratus and Herophilus, and a relative of Ptolemy, Chryseimus, became head of the Museum and in charge of the doctors\(^1\), though one would be wrong to assume that the doctors necessarily formed part of the Museum, even if closely connected\(^2\). Philo describes the activities of his contemporaries thus\(^3\): "Some doctors know how to treat almost every kind of ailment, disease and weakness but cannot express themselves or give an account of probabilities, others are clever with words and fine interpreters of symptoms, causes and the treatments which make up medicine, but are hopeless at treating the sick". This marks a division between practice and theory which continued at Alexandria into the time of Magnus of Nisibis\(^4\) and beyond. Julian, born at Alexandria, is another who is censured for the lack of medical experience shown in his works, and for his inability to define such words as ailment and sickness. He was a pupil of Apollonius of Cyprus, a pupil of Olympicus, whose beliefs, though he recognised them to be wrong, he refused to abandon\(^5\). Galen complains that such sophists as Philistion give irrelevant lectures upon Hippocrates, and only escape censure because they are teaching young lads straight from school\(^6\).

The Alexandrian doctors were famous for their skill in anatomy; Galen went there to study under Heraclianus and Numisianus, a pupil of Quintus, and found teachers who were willing to show to students the anatomy of the
human body by dissection, which was permitted there and nowhere else, II 218, 220. Tertullian, who appears to follow Soranus, a methodist and anti-anatomical source, condemns those who practise anatomy and describes Herophilus as a mere butcher 7. Prudentius, Peristephanon, 10, 498, describes anatomy as 'laniena Hippocratica' and there was a general condemnation of those who practised dissection, especially on humans. Apuleius, Apol. 36, records the dangers that were faced by any who dissected even animals, and Fulgentius thus describes contemporary medicine at Alexandria. "Galen's family, which is more cruel than wars and which is so implanted in almost all of Alexandria's alleys that one can count more surgical butchers' stalls than dwelling places" 8. Augustine, Civ.Dei, 22.24, may refer to an existing situation when he says: "With a cruel zeal for science, some medical men called anatomists have dissected the bodies of the dead and of sick persons who have then died, trying in vain to discover the secrets of the human body and disease" 9. However, when doctors are summoned to decide upon an operation on Innocentius for a fistula, Civ.Dei, 22.8, the weightiest authority is an Alexandrian doctor of great repute. Certainly surgery, and possibly anatomy, were practised in the fourth and fifth centuries at Alexandria, while at Constantinople, despite public operations in the theatres and in the streets, doctors in the time of Jacobus Psychrestus, Photius, 344A refused to perform a venesection.

The Museum and its doctors enjoyed a great reputation. An anonymous geographer 11 states: "Asclepius wished to grant (Alexandria) skill in medicine, and deigned that it should provide the finest doctors in the world, and that the city should be the foundation of health for all men". Gregory of Nyssa, PG 46, 961, recalls that Gregory Thaumaturgus stayed at
Alexandria, to which came all the young students of philosophy and medicine, for there it was possible to study philosophy, rhetoric, astronomy, logic, mathematics and the theory and practice of medicine. Students came from all parts of the East, and went out to Constantinople, Ankara, Nisibis, Amida, Carthage, Sicily, Milan. It was a distributing centre for drugs for the rest of Egypt, even if its influence on medical scholarship in the Chora was slight, and by combining several aspects of culture and scholarship, it gained the advantage of a theoretical variety of subject.

What survives of later Alexandrian medicine can be conveniently divided into two. Handbooks of practical medicine with a minimum of theorisation were written by Oribasius, Aetius of Amida, Alexander of Tralles, Paul of Aegina and so on, and, although there are indications of an Alexandrian origin for many of these, they were written as a result of clinical experience and without much reference to the second group of medical writings. These are the theoretical works current at Alexandria from which we can derive some indication of teaching methods. They come from two sources. Some late Alexandrian lecture notes have survived and have been published mainly by Dietz, and we have several Arabic references to works of Galen extant in the sixth century, and notes by such as Hunayn and his followers, who were Galenic scholars of the highest order and who possessed more of his works than have survived to us. It is from this source especially that our information comes, but it is essential to stress that it is confined to theoretical medicine and that we have no idea of the contemporary practical training of a doctor. Hence we may obtain a false impression of the School and consider that here the potential separation of theoretical and practical medicine became actual. The commentaries rely
for much of their effect upon good presentation and logic, and it would be
unwise to assume that authors such as Aetius, whose material is more important
than his manner of presentation, were never interested in the theoretical
problems posed by the iatrosophists. This word, applied to Magnus of
Nisibis\(^{19}\) and to a participant in the debate with Mani at Carrhae\(^{20}\), refers
especially to those medical worthies who gave public lectures on medicine
and whose practical abilities may have been limited.

The fourth and fifth century medical school of Alexandria adopted
philosophy to its purposes, and, as an understanding of the philosophical
nature of the later medical texts depends in part upon some knowledge of
their authors, I think it best to begin with a brief description of what we
know of the Alexandrian medical authorities in the sixth century. An Arabic
source, deriving possibly from Philoponus, says that among noteworthy
physicians after Galen were the Alexandrians, Stephen, Gesius, Aquilas and
Marinus\(^{21}\), who made commented resumes of certain works of Galen and lengthy
commentaries on others. Aquilas is otherwise unknown to us, though there
may be a connection with Agnellus the iatrosophist, of whose teachings we
possess a small fragment\(^{22}\), and Stephanus is known from commentaries preserved
by Dietz, I, 51, 233, where he is described as Stephen, the philosopher.

Much more is known about Gesius and Marinus, and they can be related to the
Neo-Platonist school of Athens. Marinus of Sichem, the biographer of
Proclus, whom he succeeded as head of the school of Athens, was also a
mathematician and author of a commentary on the Philebus, which he destroyed
because of the faint praise of his pupil, Isidore\(^{23}\). Apart from this
Arabic reference, which Temkin, *Kyklos*, p.73, thought applied to a later al-
chemist, there is no indication that he practised medicine, but Damascius\(^{24}\).
records that in his views on Plato's Parmenides, he dissented from his master, Proclus, and followed the erroneous views of Galen and Firmus. This indicates that he was well acquainted with the Galenic corpus, at least from a philosophic standpoint.

Of Gesius we know much more. Although no works by him survive, Photius, Cod. 242, 352B, tells that he obtained great glory, not only for his medical training, both theoretical and practical, but for his learning and dialectical ability. Zacharias of Mytilene, the brother of Procopius of Gaza, wrote a dialogue in which Gesius participates. "On the next day, Gesius, who now boasts of the learning of Hippocrates and Galen and is the master of those who philosophize about medicine, thought it right to hold a debate in the garden of the Muses." Aeneas of Gaza wrote to him asking for advice on his illness, and comparing his diagnosis with a bright light, which brings a sure relief, Ep.19, 20. Procopius of Gaza tells us more. He has just written a letter to Gesius recommending a student of his from the flourishing rhetorical and medical centre of Gaza, who is warmly welcomed at Alexandria by Gesius, whose rhetorical abilities have removed all difficulties of medical exposition. In Ep.122, he recommends a student, a widow's son, who though an earnest and careful worker, has been prevented by his poverty from attaining his full potential, and Gesius, whose teaching will lead him to a life of respectable wealth, is asked to look after this new student. Procopius, Ep.125, thanks him for his letter of condolence on the death of his wife and children, and includes a Galenic story, V 413K, appropriate to a commentator on 'On the nature of the Embryo' and other medical works. Although officially a Christian, he appears as a pagan sympathiser. Suidas, s.v. Gesius, tells us, in a passage taken from
Damascius, that he was born at Petra and had as teacher, Domnus, a friend of Marinus, whom he supplanted, taking away all his pupils, and then became the most famous doctor and iatrosophist of his time. He obtained great wealth and honours from the emperor, and Damascius, Photius, records a courageous act. The philosopher Heraiscus, who was one of the pagan philosophers who endeavoured to defend the oracle at Menuthis from the Christians, was pursued by the emperor Zeno. Gesius received him into his house, and gave him a decent burial when he fell ill and died. Sophronius, PG 77.3 3513, Mir.30, records that he was the wisest sophist at Alexandria, and that, baptized only through fear of the emperor, he treated Christianity light-heartedly. Cyrus and John, whose shrine at Menuthis had been deliberately erected to replace a temple of Isis, PG 77, 1105, were regarded generally as healing saints, but Gesius, a professional physician, announced that their cures were performed by normal means, this being the treatment of Hippocrates, this of Galen and so on. As a punishment for his impiety, he was attacked by a disease which defied all medicines and plasters of the doctors, and was only cured by the intervention of the saints and by a contrite confession of his impiety.

The passages recorded in Suidas and Photius, deriving from Damascius’ Life of Isidore, inform us about the relations between Athens and Alexandria, medicine and philosophy, and it is not surprising to find philosophers and sophists from both cities meeting and collaborating. We are told of an Athenian, Theagenes, of great wealth and civic sentiment, who expended much money on attracting philosophers and doctors to Athens. Another Athenian found at Alexandria is Agapius, who was imprisoned by Zeno after the Menuthis affair, Suidas s.v.Gesius. A combination of the two
accounts of him in Suidas reveals that he was an Alexandrian expositor of medical learning who settled at Byzantium and who by his noble character and his skill became famous there and obtained great wealth. At some point he studied under Marinus and had a reputation for setting difficult logical problems. Proclus, the predecessor of Marinus, apparently lectured upon 'Nature' but this may not be sufficient to permit us to call him a doctor 33. Asclepius the pupil of the philosopher Ammonius, became a teacher of medicine after preliminary training in Aristotelian logic 34, and some commentators have ascribed the seventh and tenth books of Aristotle's Historia Animalium to a late Alexandrian iatrosophist 35. The ties between medicine and philosophy are thus clear even in this catalogue of minor practitioners.

There are two members of the group of friends and associates of Isidore as yet not mentioned who are of importance for medicine in the fifth and sixth centuries, Jacobus Psychrestus and Asclepiodotus the elder. Jacobus was the son of a doctor from Syria, who visited Rhodes, Sicily, Alexandria and Italy, before settling at Constantinople. He may have taught his son medicine at Alexandria, but he left him to go to Constantinople, where Jacobus later joined him 36. Both father and son were pagans, and in 467 37, Jacobus interceded with Zeno for the pagan philosopher Isocasius. Jacobus became doctor to the emperor and displayed a technique superior to that of all the other doctors, who were ignorant of the accuracy of their art, making use neither of experience nor of textbooks, and preferring argument to practice. They used purgatives and baths rather than surgery and venesection, and prescribed diets for illnesses 38.

Jacobus changed all this and invented a 'refreshing' technique - hence his nickname - which would reduce nervous tension and worry about money and
affairs. He ordered the rich to aid the poor, and, relying only upon the annonae given to him as a civic doctor, he treated the poor free of charge. Many wondrous stories were recorded of this great 'Philosopher and doctor', loved by emperor and people alike, who received statues from Athens and Constantinople.

One of his pupils, probably around 457 - 462, was Asclepiodotus, born at Alexandria, who, after studying at Laodicea, visited Constantinople to study under Jacobus. He followed in the steps of his master, obtaining a fine knowledge of plants and minerals, and discovered the virtues of white hellebore. He regarded Jacobus as the only modern authority worth following, and as the equal of Hippocrates and Soranus of Nallus. He was a philosopher and pagan mystic, and, during his life at Aphrodisias, he expended much of his wealth, which he gained from his practice and from his estates, upon civic and religious services, and became a friend of the emperor. He married one of his daughters to another Alexandrian philosopher, Asclepiodotus, which, not unnaturally, has caused confusion among commentators eager to identify one of the pair with the man mentioned on an inscription from Aphrodisias. Asclepiodotus the younger, an important man in the opinion of Zacharias Scholasticus, who came to Menoothis to seek advice about his childlessness, managed to buy a child from a nearby village and foist it off as his own. Paralius of Aphrodisias, hearing the story of the goddess' miraculous gift and convinced that it was untrue, reported home, but the messenger, being bribed, failed to deliver the message and the position of the Asclepiodoti was safe, Ib. 36. To which of these Asclepiodoti belongs the funeral epitaph? Robert is certainly correct in seeking to assign it to the resident of Aphrodisias, a friend of the emperor.
and member of the council, for the stone speaks of a ἀρχηγὸς and of the dead man as 'The founder' of the city, without reference to his philosophical abilities. However the sources disagree as to who resided there. I assume that Zacharias' Alexandrian magician and philosopher is not Asclepiodotus the great, the pupil of Proclus and author of a commentary on the Timaeus, preferring to rely upon the statement in Photius that the daughter of Asclepiodotus the great married a second Asclepiodotus. It is also true that if the Asclepiodotus mentioned by Zacharias were the philosopher and doctor, there would be a problem, for Suidas states that he left his estate, already mortgaged, to his daughters and thus a childless couple surprisingly produce a number of children. Far better to assume, with Asmus, that Asclepiodotus the elder resided as a mystic and doctor for a long while at Aphrodisias and obtained all the privileges mentioned by Zacharias, marrying his daughter to another Alexandrian philosopher.

Two late Alexandrian philosophers deserve mention for their part in the later tradition of medicine. John the Grammarian or John Philoponus, a pupil of Ammonius, commented upon Aristotle and possibly other medical works, and played a large part in the christianization of the school of Alexandria. A late Arabic source records him as responsible for commentaries and the standard editions of Galen. He is usually identified with a commentator upon Hippocrates' 'On the nature of the child' and Epidemics VI, but this is doubtful. Meyerhof, SDAW, 1930, 397, thought that he had no connection at all with the Galenic recension, but there is other evidence from Arabic sources to suggest that he was a medical author. In the tenth century there still existed a history of medical writers, compiled by John Philoponus, which was used by Ishaq. b. Hunayn in his
History of Doctors, and it appears probable that this derived from a work by the sixth century Christian philosopher\textsuperscript{51}. Finally let us consider the life and work of a Syriac doctor and philosopher, Sergius of Resaena, who was responsible for much of the transmission of Greek medical thought to the East. He came from Antioch and studied at Alexandria before settling as archiater at Resaena. Assem\textsuperscript{53} suggested that he was the Sergius mentioned by Agathias, IV 30, as residing in Persia with the king, who translated into Greek a history of the Kings of Persia. He composed commentaries on Dialectic, on the nature of the universe, and on the influence of the moon, and translated much of Galen into Syriac. Hunayn, in his catalogue of the works of Galen, records twenty-two translations made by Sergius, some when he was at school in Alexandria, others when he was a more competent scholar\textsuperscript{54}. He also translated other works on medicine by non-Galenic authors, including one by Pelops, Hunayn, n.101, and a manuscript in the British Museum contains his translations of the Isagoge and Tabula of Porphyry, of Aristotle's Categories, and of his 'On the Soul'. Even sources which are hostile to his beliefs concur in praising his scholarship and linguistic abilities, and the part he played in the transmission of Greek medicine is evident from his inclusion in the list of notable Syriac physicians given by Barhebraeus, p.56. Probably a deacon in the Syriac church, he was a friend of Severus of Antioch, and, well acquainted with the works of Origen, Dionysius and the Alexandrians, he wrote a treatise on 'Faith'\textsuperscript{55}. He played a considerable part in an obscure theological dispute with his bishop, Asylus, and has been vilified by pro-Monophysite sources such as Pseudo-Zachary\textsuperscript{56} and the History of the Patriarchs\textsuperscript{57}, the first calling him 'lustful after women, incontinent.
and greedy for money', the second describing him as 'a eunuch, as is evident from his Prologue, corrupt and immoral'. Assemani went so far as to doubt the historical accuracy of the whole story, and certainly the sources in no way favour Sergius. In 535 he fell out with Asylus, bishop of Resaena, and visited Ephraem, the Syriac patriarch of Antioch, to complain of his ill-treatment. He was then sent on to Rome with a letter for Pope Agapetus, accompanied by Eustathius, a young architect from Amida, who may be the source of Pseudo-Zachary. On his return to Constantinople in 536, Sergius was seized with an unmentionable disease and died in agony. The architect presumably passed on the details of the journey and the transactions, which Zachary omits to spare his readers embarrassment.

This biographical sketch of the medical luminaries of the later school of Alexandria shows the close connection between medicine and philosophy, and it would be perfectly possible for a student, taking up medicine after a philosophic training, to encounter his former masters as his teachers in medicine. It is difficult to distinguish those who were medically interested philosophers from those doctors with an interest in logic and philosophy. Again, it is necessary to stress that we are dealing, in most of the surviving literature, with literary works, rather than with practical handbooks of medicine, in which exposition and logical reasoning are more important than practical considerations, and we know nothing about the training in practical medicine. This distorts our view of the life of the Alexandrian medical school, but it is possible to reach some conclusion about its theoretical methods of training.

The close links with Aristotelean and Neo-Platonist philosophy are visible in the teaching syllabus. Just as the philosophy course
opened with introductory comments upon the 'Introduction' of Porphyry, and then studied commentaries on Aristotle and then on Plato, so the medical syllabus began with a commentary upon Galen's 'On Sects', followed by lectures on works by Galen, and then by Hippocrates. A similar type of analogy is found in the philosophical, rhetorical and medical works of the school, and also a common method of division of works into sections and chapters. This, according to Praechter, BZ, 1909, 531, does not come until the school of Ammonius in the late fifth century, but it can be traced in such a work as the commentary on Hippocrates' Aphorisms, ascribed, wrongly, to Oribasius. We possess a few fragments of commentaries on the works of Galen, and in organisation, and occasionally in vocabulary, they recall the contemporary commentators on philosophy. They derive from lecture notes, taken by a pupil from his master, and may have suffered contamination in the process. They give us the name of Palladius, a mysterious Arch( )des, and, in a late Milan manuscript, probably from Ravenna, Agnellus the iatrosophist. The teaching of medicine by commentaries on a standard text goes back a long way. Hippocrates was commented upon by many authors, as were Aristotle and Plato, and, although Galen shows that other authors were in circulation in excerpts, if not entire, the theoretical works we discover in sixth century Alexandria are commentaries upon the works of Hippocrates and Galen.

Perhaps of greater interest is the formation of a canon of Galenic works, which derives mainly from Arabic sources. It seems likely that, apart from renaissance forgeries, the works ascribed to Galen and found in Kühn's edition, were all in existence by the late third century, but their quantity made their use difficult. Galen had provided an order in which his works could be read, XIX 50f., beginning with his 'On Sects' which may
have been followed in general study. But the bulk of his work, if instruction was to be given by commentaries, was an obstacle, and, at some time in the late fifth and early sixth centuries, the Alexandrians drew up a canon of works regarded as essential reading for students. Its final form may have taken some time to achieve, and there appear to be differences even in the Arabic tradition, represented by Hunayn. Works of Galen were combined to form introductory compendia, a work for beginners, one on dissection, and one on pulses. In Hunayn's time the Alexandrians began the day with a reading and commentary upon a set text, following the synopses of the Alexandrians, and once these had been read the student was free to read whichever of the 140 or so works of Galen he wished.

The fact that a book was not included in the Alexandrian canon prejudiced its chances of survival, and Hunayn records the great difficulty he had in obtaining manuscripts of the complete work 'On Pulses', or in translating from the defective manuscripts he discovered after a diligent search throughout Syria, Egypt and Persia. Even in the time of Oribasius Galen's work 'On Simples' was considered lost, though Hunayn claimed to have discovered a copy, and a treatise of Pelops survived until his time. Other works, especially those of a more practical nature, which were used as handbooks, rather than as subjects for cultured exposition, had a better chance of survival. Oribasius, Paul, Magnus of Alexandria, Dioscorides the ophthalmologist, were all translated by Hunayn, and a brief practical treatise such as Theophilus 'On Urines' has been preserved. As Temkin points out, the medical teaching of which we know is of a theoretical and philosophical nature, acceptable to Christian and pagan alike, and especially suited to those who intended to profess a philosophical interest in medicine.
The system of medical teaching at Alexandria in the late empire was suitable for those who could afford the time and expense, and was concerned, at least in its formal aspects, with the theoretical basis of the healing art. What the situation was outside of Alexandria we do not know, and the manner in which medicine was taught outside formal lectures or an apprenticeship with a master requires further elucidation. At Constantinople, it should be noted, no provision was made for the teaching of medicine when the university was constituted, and references to doctors teaching there are few.

Medical writings from the West in the fourth and later centuries testify to the paucity of teaching centres. I have already mentioned the works of pharmacy which were in wide circulation, and the provinces, rather than Italy, are the source of original writings, as opposed to translations from the Greek. Cassius Felix, Theodore Priscian, Vindicianus all come from Africa, as does Caelius Aurelianus, whose work is a translation, with some additions, of the doxographical work of Soranus. In his preface, Caelius states that he is envied for his accomplishments and refers to another work of his, the 'Questions', which he had dedicated to a friend, Lucretius, who knew Greek, a not inconsiderable achievement at the time. Although his work has a practical application, it is still a work of literary medicine, retaining the opinions and prescriptions of earlier doctors, and as such, is unusual in the West.

In the sixth century, Italy, especially around the court of Theoderic, produced medical works and translations of Greek medical texts based upon Alexandrian models. Our evidence for this renewal of interest in Hippocrates and ancient medicine is, with one major exception, derived from a study of the language and provenance of medical writings and
translations of the period. The exception is Cassiodorus, who gives instructions to the inhabitants of his monastic community for the preservation of health and for the activities of the monastic physicians. He counsels: "Those who with earnest endeavour regard the health of the body to attend the feeble sincerely and to accept a reward only from him who disposes of eternal, not temporal, rewards". They are to learn the properties of plants and drugs, and Cassiodorus refers to the work of Gargilius Martialis upon the nutritional values of vegetables. The monks are expected to be literate, though not necessarily in Greek, and he suggests that among the works in the library which should be studied are the herbal of Dioscorides and the Latin versions of Hippocrates and Galen, that is the 'Therapeutic method for Glaucon' and an anonymous compendium of early Greek medical writings. Then they can read the work 'On Medicine' by Caelius Aurelianus: Hippocrates' 'On herbs and drugs', and other medical works in the library. The practical nature of this library is obvious, and this suggests that those works with an immediate practical application were translated, though there might be others which treated of medical theory and similar topics.

A tenth century manuscript from Milan contains glosses to Galen's 'On Sects', 'The Art of Medicine', 'On pulses for Glaucon', all forming part of the late Alexandrian syllabus, and then three treatises, ending with the words: "Ex voce Agnello iatrosophista ego Simplicius deo iuvante legi at scripsi in Ravenna feliciter". Sigerist thought this colophon was taken from an earlier work, which was produced in the early sixth century at Ravenna. Ex voce recalls the Greek ἐκ τοῦ δόξος which occurs frequently at the beginning of Alexandrian commentaries, and he concluded that in Ravenna in the sixth century, around the court of
Theoderic, there was a school of medical writers who had a Galenic canon and teaching methods similar to those of Alexandria. Have we any further evidence for a school of medical writers? Morland has shown by an examination of the language of translations of Oribasius that the Latin versions were produced at two different dates. One group, termed As, contains a reference to the Goths, and is possibly to be dated to around 500, the other, La, on the evidence of language is slightly later, p.189. From references to a 'Martyrius archiater Ravennae' and to 'pimentarii' Morland assumes that these translations were made at or near Ravenna, p.199, and are possibly connected with the Gothic court. Diller also conjectures that the translations into Latin of Hippocrates' 'On Hebdomada', 'On the Nature of Man', 'Prognostic', 'On Diet' and 'Aphorisms' form part of 'eine ganze Literatur für Barbaren'. Köhlewein, to whom much of the credit for unearthing these late Roman medical texts is due, compared the style and language of the various Hippocratic translations which have survived, and drew the following conclusions. The Milan Ms. which contains the Galenic commentaries also includes a translation of the Prognosticon of Hippocrates, dating from the early sixth century, and other hippocratic translations are to be placed in the fifth and sixth centuries, possibly in South Italy.

The whole collection of medical translations, whether made in Ravenna or at a monastery such as Cassino, shows an interest in medicine which is not entirely practical, but it is uncertain how far we are to take these chance survivals as evidence for active encouragement on the part of the barbarian invaders towards the study of medicine, and it would be unwise to assume that this theoretical interest, possibly influenced by Alexandria, was widespread.

Our evidence for practical training in the late empire is scanty.
Joint consultations are still to be found, and Sidonius records his disgust at the doctors who attend a patient and argue over him. Origen says that a wise archiater will pass on his knowledge of medicine, and both S. Thallulaeus and S. Panteleon were apprenticed to civic doctors. Of the methods other than private example and instruction we know nothing, and I assume that apprenticeship was still the main source of entry into the medical profession.

This survey of the methods of teaching medicine in the Roman empire must of necessity reflect only the more literate aspects of teaching, the writings produced by doctors, which were either of sufficient literary merit or of practical use to survive. The practice of reducing medical learning to encyclopaedias undoubtedly meant that many texts became superfluous and were therefore lost, and the writings of Alexandrians such as Erasistratus were only notes in the sections of the works of Aetius and Paulus. It may be unjust to assume a dichotomy between those students of medicine to whom the Alexandrian commentators appealed with their doxographies, and those whose interest was of a more practical nature, and who were unable either to understand or to appreciate the philosophical subtleties of the commentators. The limited number of such schools, as far as we know, meant that travel was necessary to attend them, and hence such a course was only open to those who could afford it, or who lived there. The philosophical nature of part of the Alexandrian syllabus, while fulfilling one of Galen's hopes, can not have been of interest or use to the practitioner in remote Asia Minor, and allied those doctors who took such a course with the wealthier members of the community. Ammianus' remark about attendance at the school of Alexandria being its own passport to success does not refer only to medical and
intellectual activities, while the philosophers of Athens and Alexandria are regarded with favour by pagan historians and with respect by their opponents.

The close connection of philosophy, whether pagan, as professed by Asclepiodotus, or Christian, such as by Philoponus, with medicine enhanced the standing of those who followed such a course - and possibly of all doctors - and in areas where literacy became less usual, the doctor was regularly one of the few who could read or write. Our evidence comes from literate sources, and it is possible that many doctors relied upon tradition orally transmitted and upon empiricism. The physicians seem to have been dogged by an inferiority complex. From Hippocrates to Galen they go on saying: "The physician is a philosopher as well ... they longed to join in with the general culture on a genuinely human level; and for this they did not rely upon their technical training, but, as can be seen in Roman times in the case of Galen, they tried to be educated men like all the others, men who knew their classics, men who could speak like rhetors and argue like philosophers". When this had been attained, their status rose by their association on equal terms with those already favoured. In the fifth and sixth centuries the methods of teaching and study of medicine and philosophy became almost indistinguishable, and their practitioners are often the same, proof that here the doctor had achieved the position and status longed for by such as Galen.
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CHAPTER ELEVEN.

The availability of medical assistance.

In 403 A.D. John Chrysostom was exiled to Cucusus in Armenia and he describes in gruesome detail his sufferings upon his journey through Asia Minor. He fell ill almost as soon as he left Constantinople, but it was not until he reached Caesarea in Cappadocia that he found doctors to treat him with drugs and sympathy. He stayed at an inn on the outskirts where he received clerics and physicians and he availed himself of their assistance until, his fever having subsided, he obtained a promise from a doctor to accompany him to Cucusus. His precipitate and enforced departure, the bad roads and the lack of doctors and provisions brought on a further bout of illness, and although he made some improvement at Cucusus, the bad climate and the shortage of doctors, drugs and other necessities, aggravated his miseries. He earnestly requested Olympias to send him experienced doctors with drugs, relied upon pharmaceutical prescriptions handed on by his friends and requested those who possessed some medical knowledge to visit him.

Although some allowance must be made for the exaggerations of this complaining cleric, other evidence confirms the difficulty of securing treatment in the countryside. Apollonius went into Alexandria to bring back supplies of collyria for the monks of the desert, and John of Hephaestopolis was permitted to return from exile in Thrace to Constantinople for treatment. Even untrained and inexperienced doctors are rarely received when they venture into country areas where the services of a specialist are needed, and it is not surprising to find doctors as favourite travelling companions, and they were regularly in.
doctors are warmly received when they venture into country areas where the services of a specialist doctor are rare. For those who were on a journey, the perils were greater, the treatment more rough and ready, and it is not surprising to find doctors as favourite travelling companions, and they were regularly included in the staff of a provincial governor setting out from Rome.

There is some evidence that even in cities there may have been a similar shortage. Cohn-Haft, p.46 - 55, has suggested that cities vied with one another in the Hellenistic age to secure the services of the best physicians and would offer such privileges as are recorded on their honorary decrees, but such instances are fewer in the Roman Empire. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus in Syria, writes that after the departure of the presbyter doctor, Petrus, who had been trained at Alexandria, he will have difficulty in finding a successor, and that many of his flock have already departed.

Even if a doctor was usually to be found in a city, the frequent ravages of plague could render his efforts unavailing. During a plague at Edessa, it required many doctors who came and offered assistance, and the erection of temporary hospitals in stoas and baths to defeat the disease. On the other hand, our evidence shows a number of doctors simultaneously in the same town. It is only to be expected that there were many doctors at Rome and Constantinople, where in the fifth century it was the custom for rich invalids to scour the city, regularly changing doctors at great expense until they found someone who had been cured or obtained the details from an old woman. But even at tiny Lebadea in the second century joint consultations and debates between doctors could occur without it being regarded as unusual.
The distribution of inscriptions recording doctors may be delusory; they record the presence, rather than the absence, of doctors and may testify either to their small numbers or to the caprice of epigraphic survival. The mention of a profession on a tombstone or honorific inscription, which is the only guide, may not have been fashionable at certain times and in certain areas. Some provinces such as Asia contain much epigraphic material, fulsome and informative, others, such as Britain and Syria, are almost dumb, and others, such as Africa, record much material with local characteristics in which the absence of doctors and members of other professions may easily be ascribed to epigraphic taste. As might be expected also, military doctors are found where there are legions and fleets, and in the Western provinces, one third of all recorded doctors are military.

There are two objections to a blind reliance on the distribution map as an indication of the areas where doctors are to be found. The first is that, like the sophists, the doctor in the Roman Empire must have been a familiar figure upon the road, travelling from one end of the world to the other. Galen traversed much of the Eastern Mediterranean in his search for drugs, a Phrygian made his way to Lyons, an African came from Hippo to Carthage and then to Rome, and an Egyptian travelled widely before his death at Tithorea. This may also mean that in certain areas the immigrant doctor might be buried without any memorial, a stranger in a distant land.

The second objection is more serious; a consideration of those practitioners who call themselves 'doctors' omits those who are known to possess medical knowledge but who are described in different terms. The first group is that of the oculists, whose stamps are found in the North-Western provinces of the Empire, where their distribution, complementing that
of inscriptions, has often been commented upon. Archaeological evidence confirms the suspicion that these 'oculists' also practised general medicine. None of the kits of instruments excludes the possibility of their performance of elementary medicine, and general medicine is included in the ophthalmological works of Demosthenes Philalethes. In Gaul and Germany oculists' stamps and kits are rarely found in areas associated with legionary settlement, although frequently at shrines and marketing centres. An argument that these regions were particularly prone to eye diseases fails to convince as such areas as Thrace and parts of Asia, where sufferers are reported, do not provide similar stamps. A legal reference may provide a clue. Modestinus, D.27.1.6.1, refers to doctors called, a word also found in Galen, XII 844, and in remote Lycaonia. When this word is used of athletes and sophists it implies a regular circuit of festivals and games which was visited by a group of performers. Can it be assumed that there was a sort of circuit system for doctors, especially in rural areas such as Lycaonia? Here and in the North-West provinces there were few settlements that corresponded to the cities of Western Asia Minor or Syria, and thus employment for doctors would be less, unless they travelled about. In the small mining town of Vipasca, there are schoolmasters and barbers who are exempt from the procurator's taxation, but there is no resident doctor mentioned - I suggest because there was none. Yet stronger argument is at hand. Postumius Hermes who erected an inscription at Aventicum to the teachers and doctors has been plausibly identified with the oculist, Q. Postumius Hermes whose stamp was found some miles away at Lausanne-Vidy. One has no need to follow Voirol in assuming a medical institute at Aventicum, but it is clear that if this identification is
accepted, we must conclude that the doctors in certain areas had a base. This would be confirmed by the presence of numbers of stamps in particular towns, such as Rheims and Bavae, and Dollfus suggested that they were centres for medical association, possibly also for instruction. Even these oculist doctors can not be identified as practitioners of native medicine and of local origin, as Deneffe thought, p.30, for 70 out of 284 bear Greek names and three show Latin names written on the slab in Greek lettering. If this circuit system of doctors or oculists is accepted, this solves one of the problems of the oculist's stamps, their peculiar distribution. The other, that of the terminal date, which seems to be around 350 A.D. must be left undecided, although the unsettled conditions caused by the German invasions may have brought about the disruption of this system.

These oculists who ministered in rural areas raise the question of the relationship of the minor doctors to Galen and his friends. How far are we to consider the ideal physician, trained in the intricacies of anatomy and scholarship, exemplified by Galen and his circle, typical of doctors in general? Was the Roman doctor a literate reasoning individual, a member of a sect, acquainted with the great works of the past and with modern discoveries, or was he a shadowy figure, travelling around the country or making part-time use of a knowledge of drugs and incantations? Our literary evidence deals mainly with the literate doctors among the upper classes, and while some conclusions may be drawn about their acceptability, this tells us little about the oculists and pharmacists of rural Gaul. Even inscriptions, which indicate some developments in the status of doctors, may not be sufficiently free from bias to permit a broad generalisation about these men, and the oculists' stamps come rather into the category of 'litter'
rather than of a memorial.

A consideration of the works of the pharmacists may confirm these difficulties. Some authors are respectable Greek doctors; Asclepiades Pharmacion, the two Andromachi, Damocrates, Scribonius Largus and Galen himself. But others who are recorded within the pages of Galen are more obscure and of varying statuses and occupations; Antonius, the druggist, a man from Aezani, Abascantus, a doctor from Lyons, Flavius the boxer, Achilles the vet, Diogas the trainer, a Bithynian barber, Orion the currier, Phonases the rootcutter, Euschemus the eunuch, men from Egypt, Crete and Britain. Even such a reputable physician as Philippus of Tralles may have traversed Asia Minor and been recorded at Pergamum and Caesarea, and a number of Magni cause confusion. One is a Pneumatic, another an archiatros, one from Philadelphia, one from Tarsus, one a circuit doctor, another a clinician, and the bewildering number of names prompts thought about their training and even occupation. If these druggists were trained, almost certainly they received instruction outside a recognised school such as Alexandria, and probably from a master, although it cannot be dismissed that collegia in rural areas provided a social and possibly educational meeting place for them. The variety of profession recorded among the pharmacological authors recalls the situation in Egypt where doctors also farmed and can scarcely be distinguished from other members of the local community, and it seems probable, that in remote and rural areas, where patients were insufficient to provide a full-time doctor with a living, a resident often practised some pharmacology and prescribed drugs and elementary treatment. Of the status of these men there can be little doubt. Like the practitioners of native Roman medicine, they ranked only low in the social
scale, and there can have been little development throughout the empire. The evidence of the pharmacological handbooks suggests that there was a break between the pharmacy practised in the West and in the East, where more sophisticated techniques were retained\textsuperscript{32}, and it is possible to argue that while the more literate doctor became a worthy member of society in the West, the humble druggist became even more disreputable in the eyes of the upper classes as he lost his connection with Greek medicine.

These oculists and druggists provided some medical assistance especially in rural areas, and healing shrines and magicians were never absent. A patient could reside at a shrine such as Ephesus or Trikka in one of the incubation chambers or hostels specially constructed for the worshippers of Asclepius. The Later Empire saw a further institution which provided aid, the hospital, which may have come into existence with the decline of the major healing shrines in the third and fourth centuries\textsuperscript{33}.

Although Lactantius, VI.11.18, believed that the Christians should help the sick, this need not imply a formal organisation, and it was Basil the Great who was the first to set up an institution for the care of the sick and aged. His intention is clear from ep.94: "Whom do we wrong when we build hostels for strangers, provide consolation for passing travellers and those who through illness need the care of another, and establish attendants and doctors, relieving burdens and providing companionship?" Gregory Nazianzen, Or. 43.63, says the hospital was built because of the large numbers of lepers who were roaming about, driven from their homes and cities. Some in desperation had forced their way back, half dying of ulcers and sores, into churches and temples, seeking divine aid\textsuperscript{34}.

Although some have seen the establishment of hospitals as a result
of Christian charity, private valetudinaria had long been known, and were used in time of public emergency, or when commandeered by an army commander for billeting his troops, but they were never numerous and were confined to the houses of the wealthy. Baron has recently suggested that a Jewish origin must be considered for hospitals, and his point may in part be conceded. Basil's hospital at Caesarea and its immediate successors can be fitly compared with the Jewish organisation. It was at the same time a lodging house for travellers, a surgery for invalids, a social centre, a home for old folk, and its official title was that of 'poorhouse'. The word is first found in Jerome, Ep.77, where Fabiola is praised as the first to institute a in Rome, where she fed and treated the sick collected from the streets. The law codes provide a variety of names for this institution, reflecting the particular specialities or activities of a Christian hospital. Baron states that the increased number of homeless and transient Jews in the first century A.D. was lodged in hospices attached to synagogues, the centres of communal life. A synagogue in Jerusalem, built for the law and the teaching of the commandments, also contained a hostel, rooms and a water supply for needy strangers. The Talmud records that among the things needed for a happy life are a synagogue, a bathhouse, a doctor, a surgeon-masseur, services which should be provided by the community and Julian, Ep.22, desired pagans to follow the Jewish example in their charity towards fellow-believers. These instances suffice to show that there was a tradition of care for public health among the Jews, and Baron is right to indicate the similarities between Christian and Jewish hospitals.

Basil's example was followed by others; Eustathius in Pontus,
Chrysostom at Constantinople and Bassianus, Bishop of Ephesus in 451, who claimed that from his youth he had served the poor, attending the sick and providing seventy beds for the poorhouse. Pammachius built a xenodochium at Ostia, Pope Symmachus two poorhouses in Rome, and Augustine persuaded a priest to construct one at Hippo. Alexandria had a special group of parabalani, attendants, who were deputed to care for the sick under the direction of the bishop, and whose organisation, bodily strength and theological bigotry made them as useful in religious warfare as in medical assistance. At Jerusalem, Justinian built at S. Saba's request a hospice in the middle of the city, with one hundred beds and a yearly income, not subject to tax, of 1850 solidi. He was later persuaded by the saint to double its size and to adjust its revenue accordingly. The most famous hospice at Constantinople was that of S. Sampson, erected possibly in the reign of Justinian. Metaphrastes, the author of the life of the saint, attributes its construction to the saint's successful treatment of the emperor and as a reward for his services as host and almoner to the poor and sick in his own house. Procopius in his list of imperial buildings records that the hospice, which stood between the churches of S. Irene and Hagia Sophia, was destroyed in the Nika riots, and rebuilt by Justinian on a larger scale and with an annual income sufficient to provide shelter for the sick and needy. At Antioch Justinian also built a hospital with provision for the separate treatment of men and women and for the entertainment of strangers. Temkin, DOP 1962, 114, saw in this adaptation of monasteries and hospices in part to the practice of medicine and in the institution of hospitals one of the ways in which those who did not attend a recognised...
school of medicine or had not received instruction from their family or from an individual teacher could obtain sufficient practical experience to qualify them for the pursuit of medicine. But the evidence for doctors learning their profession in this way is slight. No doctor as far as I know claims to have learnt medicine there, and, although S. Sampson is said to be well skilled in medicine, this need not mean that he had picked up his training in a hospital. Isaac the protector left Dara to live an undisturbed life as a sick attendant at Constantinople, and Marathonius, a rich army officer, became superintendent of a home for the relief of the sick and destitute. These examples show that, if medicine was practised, it was not on a very high level and no specialised medical knowledge was required to minister within a hospital.

These charitable institutions, founded by wealthy Christians who were not usually doctors, provided, as well as practical experience and instruction, an additional source of medical care for the neighbouring sick. It provided assistance for the chronically ill, the leprous and aged, who had previously been neglected, except possibly among the Jews, and it can be considered as much the product of the Christian 'social conscience' and social pressures as the realisation of a need for regular and organised medical services.

The doctors and staff in the hospitals are almost unknown to us, and in this anonymity they can fitly be compared with the oculists and pharmacists who existed in the rural areas. Hospitals were medical centres and were situated in cities rather than in the country, whereas the evidence suggests that at least the oculists practised on a sort of circuit. In the Western Empire, where there may have been fewer urban units capable of
supporting a doctor, oculists, druggists and other peripatetic doctors may have been the main means of medical aid, whereas other considerations apply to the more urban East\textsuperscript{52}. Their existence necessitates caution when seeking to apply a generalisation to the whole of the medical profession of the Roman Empire, and a comparison between the learning, status and clientele of Galen and a travelling doctor from Bavae might reveal little in common save a knowledge of Greek. Our knowledge of the medical profession is therefore symptomatic of our knowledge of the Roman Empire as a whole. Upon the court, the wealthy senators, the local nobilities, events in the great urban centres of Rome, Constantinople, Athens, Alexandria and Antioch we are reasonably well informed, and the upper class bias of the sources tends to produce a uniform picture, but one which only reflects the surface of things. Our knowledge of the lower classes of the empire, of country districts, of the social and economic life of the more remote provinces is carefully amassed, piece by piece, by combining diverse sources of evidence. While the medical school of Alexandria and the lives of doctors turned bishops are not unfamiliar, the lesser doctors are almost unknown, and the archaeological finds of oculists' stamps and kits have to be brought into conjunction with literary and epigraphic records to throw even the smallest light upon the mysterious oculists of the West.
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So far in this thesis little has been said about those methods of healing which existed alongside secular and rational medicine, and which played an important part in the struggle against disease. If a doctor was unavailable or failed in his treatment by conventional and rational means, then a patient could betake himself to a healing shrine or to some magical practitioner, and it may be that the cure produced by a god was more effective and less costly than that of a doctor.

Healing shrines are found throughout the Roman Empire and the divinities to whom medicinal powers are ascribed are numerous. In the West they were frequently located at springs and thermal centres, for example at the headwaters of the Seine, and the Deae Matronae are favourite protectors against illness. In the East there are several deities who are the personifications of various aspects of good health and local healing gods supported Asclepius, whose reputation and cult flourished universally. Dedications to him are made by doctors in the North of Britain and in Lusitania, and his shrines are found in Pontus and remotest Pisidia. It is clear that religious healing was not considered incompatible with secular medicine, and even such as Galen did not believe that temple medicine should be entirely excluded: what the doctor himself could not accomplish by human methods, divine assistance might encompass. As Edelstein pointed out, only the Methodists were bound by their beliefs to reject religious medicine and miracles, and most other physicians were
prepared to send their patients to a healing shrine if they thought that human aid could do no more. Especially in cases of chronic illness, recourse to a God was not unusual, and it is not coincidence that only the Methodists, who refused to consider the causes of disease but only treated the phenomena, prescribed regular and detailed treatment of chronic disorders.

It is agreed that in the Roman Empire religious medicine supplements human healing by surgery, diet and drugs, and the part played by doctors at temples of Asclepius and in interpreting dreams and visions must not pass unnoticed. Lucian's history of Alexander of Abonuteichos reveals the interaction of secular and religious medicine. Alexander, a pupil of a doctor who specialised in drugs and incantations, appeared in the guise of Podalirius with a tame snake which he called Glycon or Asclepius, and established residence at his oracular shrine. People flocked to him from Pontus and Galatia and his predictions against the plague were affixed to the doors of many houses, although their efficacy is disputable. His oracle was consulted by Roman senators, and Lucian's attempt at a prosecution was foiled by the governor of Pontus, L. Lol lianus Avitus, probably through fear of Alexander's influence rather than through any legal doubts about the prosecution's success. Coinage of the god circulated widely and there were many who applied to succeed Alexander as official prophet of the shrine, including at least one doctor. This tale shows the influence of religious healing shrines and oracles in certain areas and reveals a little more of the part played by doctors in their administration. Edelstein has further suggested that the god learnt medicine, adapting the treatments prescribed to his worshippers in their dreams more and more to prevailing secular medicine. This may
be true, but it may also give the misleading impression that doctors were regularly attached to shrines to interpret the dreams received during an incubation in a manner consistent with secular methods. But this may be going beyond the evidence, and attention must be paid to the presence or absence of doctors at these shrines.

It is first necessary to examine the attitudes of doctors to the normal method of divine communication there, dreams received during incubation, and to see whether belief in their validity demands a connection with the practice of incubation. The belief in dreams and their validity was widespread in the Roman Empire and such tracts as Artemidorus' Dream Book had a good sale. Cassius Dio was inspired by a dream to compose his history and the sophist Polemo erected an inscription at the Asclepieion of Pergamum to Demosthenes, having been commanded by the God in a dream. Galen's father decided his son's career after a visitation from Asclepius and Galen pleaded the God's intervention to avoid being brought to the Danube as a companion of Marcus Aurelius. Galen goes a step further in adapting dreams for medical purposes. He claims that his interpretation of a patient's dreams have led him to prescribe a correct treatment and that he has often learned of a patient's disease from his dreams. Impending illness can be predicted from dreams and hallucinations, and they are not to be overlooked by a doctor wishing to make an accurate prognosis. In his use of dreams in his prognoses Galen is not unusual, and the doctor here has taken over the interpretation of dreams from the diviner. They have been made rational and therefore fall within medical reasoning. Indeed, Galen's prognostic use of them is in direct contrast to their use in therapy such as we find recorded by Aristeides. Here the God commands a particular
treatment to be followed which may be contrary to the accepted medical practice of the time. The divine prescriptions are not always easily accepted by rational practitioners who confessed themselves shocked when the ailing Aristeides plunged into the icy sea or into a turbulent river at the God's behest\(^{16a}\).

Even if the prognostic uses of dreams were accepted by most doctors, and even if, as Edelstein believed, the treatments prescribed by the God became closer to those of secular medicine, this by itself does not indicate a take-over of healing shrines by physicians. There were indeed so-called 'divine doctors' who performed there and fulfilled the divine commands in a most practical way. Two inscriptions from Phazimonitis reveal two doctors at a shrine of the Nymphs and Asclepius who treat such rich patients as Plancius Piso\(^{17}\), and inscriptions from Cibyra record a cure by Asclepius through the medium of Trophimus the doctor, and also a doctor, Dionysius, who accepted no fees\(^{18}\).

But it would be wrong to assume that the situation of doctors working within a temple was universal, and there is enough evidence to suggest that, although doctors were frequently connected with a religious shrine and although the God's prescriptions came close to secular medicine, the interpretation of the divine command was rarely made by trained physicians. Although dedications are made by doctors to Asclepius at Rome, there is nothing in the healing tablets to compel belief that there were doctors in attendance\(^{19}\), and the same comment applies to the famous Cretan shrine at Lebena\(^{20}\). Similarly, although the position of priest of Asclepius at Athens\(^{21}\) (and possibly at Corinth\(^{22}\)) was appropriate to a doctor, since many of its holders belonged to the local aristocracy, it is best interpreted as unrelated to the treatment of the sick and as a social and religious
dignity. Greater confusion attends the famous Asclepieion of Cos, partly because its inscriptions have never been published. It seems likely that there was an association of doctors existing around the shrine, possibly the medical school, whose members, although they might hold priesthoods and perform important civic duties, rarely participated in the organisation and administration of the Asclepieion, and there is nothing to suggest that they had a monopoly of the interpretation of Asclepius' commands. Epidaurus presents the same picture, but it is only at Pergamum that we can speak with confidence upon the part played by doctors at a temple of Asclepius.

The speeches of Aristeides and many of the inscriptions newly edited by Habicht describe the Asclepieion there in its heyday, the second century after Christ, and from them it is possible to say something about the organisation of the cult and the activities of the doctors and patients. In addition to the temples of the God and of Telesphorus, there was a library, a small theatre and a stoa in which the eminent patients would meet and discuss their dreams and symptoms, and discourse upon cultural and intellectual problems. There was a cult group of therapeutai, which included many notable men from the area and several residents of the shrine, possibly even Galen, but this was not concerned with the interpretation of the patients' dreams. A similar function is suspected for the smaller group of 'perithutai' who are connected with sacrifices to the god. The most important office seems to have been that of the 'temple warden', of whom there were two, and Asclepiacus the temple warden appears to be the main interpreter and adviser of Aristeides. There were doctors in attendance, yet they do not appear to interpret the God's commands but are summoned to assist in performing them.

I suggest that at this shrine, and possibly
at the other major shrines, the interpretation of the meaning of the dreams that were sent by Asclepius was the duty of priests, or temple wardens as here, and that doctors may have been available, either in the shrine or in the neighbouring city, to perform the operation or to give the treatment prescribed by the God\textsuperscript{31}. It may be significant that there is only one doctor recorded at the Asclepieion of Pergamum among the inscriptions and he is a doctor to the actors who was buried there\textsuperscript{32}. He may have been a 'therapeute'; it can hardly be assumed that he was the interpreter of the commands of Asclepius.

The religion of Asclepius flourished in the second and third centuries A.D. and the attenders at such shrines as Pergamum, Smyrna and Athens numbered among them some of the most distinguished men of the time. Other healing shrines possibly also benefitted from the 'hypochondria' which Bowersock sees as the problem of the second century\textsuperscript{33}, and these religions were an obstacle to Christianity, itself a religion that emphasised bodily as well as spiritual health.

The early Christians stressed the healing powers of Christ, who was able to cure the paralysed, the epileptic, those who had been given up for lost by their doctors, those who were too poor to obtain adequate treatment, the dumb, the deaf and the blind\textsuperscript{34}. This healing power was transmitted to faithful believers and prayer to God was said to be as effective as medical attention, if not more so\textsuperscript{35}. Harnack was the first to interpret the work of Origen, 'Contra Celsum' as part of the struggle of Christianity for the primacy among those religions that gained their support from their professions of healing\textsuperscript{36}. Former philosophers had taught that soundness and health were attainable by the wise and learned, but Origen, VII 60,
emphasised the universality of the Christian message of healing (and by implication, of that of the worship of other healing gods). From them Christianity derived motifs, both literary and artistic. Eusebius, HE VIII 18, recalls that at Caesarea Philippi a statue supposed to represent Jesus and the woman with the issue of blood, which had certain medicinal properties, was an ancient statue of a λεοντος 36a, while the type of Christ as the healer, Asclepius, becomes common in the fourth and fifth centuries 37.

Both sides in this debate use similar arguments, and as the great pagan healing shrines declined in the fourth century, they were superseded by Christian centres of healing. The shrine of S. Michael at Constantinople, possibly built over a pagan temple, received benefits from the emperor Justinian 38, and Sophronius' catalogue of the cures of SS. Cyrus and John is a Christian counterblast to the pagan miracles of Asclepius recorded at Epidaurus, Lebena and Rome 39. A Christian basilica was constructed in the middle of the fourth century at Epidaurus 40, and the subsequent fortunes of the temple of Asclepius at Rome are well known 41.

Healing centres, miracles and religious healing continue throughout the Roman Empire and Christian healers supplant pagan deities with no difference in approach or technique. Although it is not to be expected that a patient, once cured, would not be prepared to show his gratitude by some gift or payment, the costs involved in such treatment, especially of a chronic illness, would probably be much less than those of more conventional medicine and thus religious healing never lacked supporters. As Edelstein saw, only one sect of doctors was opposed to these centres, and our evidence suggests tolerance, if not co-operation, by the other members of the medical profession 42.
The use of magic and similar irrational remedies produced much more disagreement among the medical profession. As well as the Methodists, the dogmatists, who held that every disease had a rational explanation that could be discovered by rational means, opposed the magicians and sorcerers, but no other sect required this theoretical rejection. Yet many doctors abjured spells and incantations as suitable means of treatment, and, at least in the first three centuries, few can be discovered who accepted evil spirits as the cause of disease. However, Posidonius may be unusual in denying this in the fourth century, for Festugière has emphasised the popular opinions of the later Roman Empire that reveal demons as the originators of disease.

Some idea of the attitudes towards magic and irrational means of healing can be gained from a description of the views of certain doctors taken chronologically, which will demonstrate a growth of superstition and the gradual acceptance of irrational techniques by those practitioners trained in traditional rational methods. It is clear that from the earliest time onwards there were exponents of magic and sorcery who existed alongside doctors, and of whom we know little, but the writings of doctors and others suggest that recourse to them by the more literate and wealthy members of a community was infrequent. Some idea of their opinions and aims may be gained from a consideration of the works of their opponents, the rational physicians, where some of their remedies are adopted.

My first example is Celsus, who stressed the art of medicine as a rational procedure, whether practised by a dogmatist or by an empiric, and who based his triple division of medicine into dietetics, pharmacology and surgery upon logic. Even when proceeding by experiment, it was necessary...
to rely upon ‘ratio’ and the empirics argued that, even if medicine was not
discovered by reason, a rational explanation was required after its discovery,
Pf. 11. Thus, although the sects described by Celsus disagree over the
place of reason in medicine, they concur in the necessity of its inclusion;
those who rely entirely upon communia are no better than vets whose patients
cannot explain their symptoms or than hospitallers who have no interest in
the idiosyncrasies of their invalid slaves. Although Celsus’ pharmacy
contains a few strange drugs — one by an Arabian, another by a Jew —
his standpoint is that of a thoughtful and educated writer in the best
Alexandrian tradition.

Scribonius Largus, a pharmacist, came from a different circle,
one which was more concerned with the immediate practical results of its
treatment than with their underlying medical theory. His preface propounds
an interesting code of conduct, based upon the Hippocratic oath, in which he
also explains his preference for pharmacy.

As a doctor on the borders of
magic and medicine, he shrinks from the provision of outlandish and unusual
drugs, and although he claims acquaintance with several minor doctors and
magicians, he refuses to use the liver of a dead gladiator as ‘extra medicinae
professionem cadit’. Nor did he use the Cretan folk remedy for rabies, a
piece of hyena skin tied in a bag, and he had strong doubts upon the additional
instructions given by Ambrosius of Puteoli that a drug against the stone
should only be compounded with a wooden pestle and by a doctor not wearing
an iron ring. Although he does make some use of sympathetic medicine, he
adopts a commonsense attitude to his prescriptions, relying upon the known
properties of drugs and herbs rather than upon incantations and spells.

Galen is generally regarded as a fine example of a rational medical
practitioner, contrasting with his hypochondriac contemporary, Aristeides, whose reliance on the divine prescriptions of Asclepius shocked the conventional Asian doctors. Galen protested against the introduction of irrational methods into medicine and claimed that in his prognoses he had reached his conclusions, not by acting as a prophet, augur or astrologer, who sought to predict the future without allowing for changing circumstances, but by rational calculation. His opponent, Martialis, believed that in his prognosis of Eudemus' illness he had used divination through birds, sacrifices, symbols or astrological numbers. This annoyed Galen who remarked that he had never seen such a prophet make a correct prediction in a case at Rome, and that he had never made trial of them elsewhere. His opposition to prophecy is based, not upon distaste for the idea of prophecy but of the uses to which it is put, and he condemns the wealthy for requiring geometry and mathematics only to calculate expenses, and astronomy only to forecast a legacy. He records a debate between two in which each endeavoured to prove the merits of his divination by citing further and divergent texts on oionoscopy and by producing witnesses of their achievements. They are condemned only for their folly in applying a particular rule to a general situation, and Galen disputes their premisses, not their success. He defends his methods of prognosis against those of his contemporaries who considered them to be quackery and who attacked the introduction of astronomy even though it was approved by Hippocrates. This does not mean that Galen was in complete agreement with diviners and augurs on the significance of the weather, for, OMG V.10.11.244, to draw inferences from the flight of birds is no part of medicine, except that, as Hippocrates said, fine days are healthier than wet. Although he had been
informed that Egyptian astronomers could predict the course of a disease from the conjunction of the planets, IX 911, he expressed doubts and utilised his astronomical and meteorological knowledge sparingly. Although birds give an intimation of the dryness of the atmosphere, this has more to do with the climatological forecasts of Aratus than with the medicine of Galen. One should not seek the onset of disease by examining the conjunction of the planets and the number of days, but by noting the clear changes of atmosphere and so on. Certain predictions may turn out to be false and an illness may develop differently, IX 913. Yet a patient's premonitions must be considered and their validity is accepted, as Galen shows in his discussion of the case of the augur Maenandrus.

Galen had stronger doubts about number mysticism and magical pharmacy, whose basis, unlike astronomy and meteorology, did not depend on careful rational observation. Some people call one number Athene, another Apollo, although unable to give a scientific explanation, and when treating hebdomadal fevers, IX 934, they introduce the seven Pleiads, the seven-starred Bears, and even seven-gated Thebes. Galen sarcastically suggests the seven mouths of the Nile, and disclaims any connection, for these calculations are astronomically incorrect, as all astronomers and philosophers agree that no constellation has seven stars. He describes as useless and without medical value, XII 573, an amulet prescribed by Archigenes for headache, and this strong condemnation of magic is evident in his pharmacological works. For example, when describing a work in seventeen books by King Nechepsos on the green jasper's properties, he disputes the King's instruction to carve the stone, as it works perfectly well uncarved as soon as it is laid upon the pylorus.
Pamphilus and Xenocrates come in for much scorn and abuse. The former is compared, XI 796, to a herald who reads out the list of slaves before he has ever seen them, and his book of drugs in alphabetical order contains amulets and poisons, incantations, old wives' tales and Egyptian wizardries, XI 792. This grammarian turned sorcerer relied upon very dubious literature; a pamphlet dedicated to Egyptian Mercury describing thirty-six horoscopic herbs, and the treatise of Conchlax on snake bites 61. Xenocrates, although less addicted to Egyptian wizardry, is described as a slave of superstition and sorcery who employs abominably filthy remedies. Dung, whose virtues had been expounded by Asclepiades Pharmacion, sweat, menses, human bones and flesh - although cannibalism is deplored - all appear, as do elephants and horses from the Upper Nile and even the fabulous basilisk 62. Wellmann believed that the book offered to Galen by a fellow townsman and akin to that of Xenocrates was a tract of an anonymous author after the manner of magical pharmacists such as Aelius Promotus 63. Galen in his pharmacy is opposed to magic and sorcery, but he is not ignorant of them, and he can accept such remedies as green jasper by depriving them of their symbolic properties and rationalising the prescription. His reliance upon astronomy and dreams is conditioned by the rational use to which they are set, and he stands out as a champion of rationalism against sorcery and superstition.

Yet, as is clear, not all practitioners were as scrupulously rational as Galen, and even if Edelstein is right to point out the dislike of magic among the more literate practitioners, his survey only treats the upper layers of the profession. Pamphilus and Xenocrates were successful authors and their prescriptions and methods continued. It is wrong to see
them, as Edelstein does, as irrelevantly antiquarian in outlook, for this is merely repeating the abuse of Galen, and there is good evidence for the continued connection of magic, exorcism, spells and medicine throughout the Empire. Ulpius, when discussing fees paid to doctors and specialists, includes dentists and those who treat fistulae and ears, but excludes those who make incantations or imprecations, or 'to use a vulgar word, exorcisms, even though some state that they have derived benefits from them. The church prohibited such men from being baptised. "A bird diviner, magus astrologer, soothsayer, conjuror, maker of phylacteries, etc. is not to be given instruction or to be baptised." On the other hand, doctors and priests used these irrational means to heal or to secure divine assistance. The H.A. recalls that in Egypt, every head of a synagogue, every Samaritan and every Christian presbyter was an astrologer, a soothsayer, or an 'aliptes, and a charge of magic was not infrequently brought against an errant ecclesiastic. Athanasius was accused of magical practices, and the death of Arius was ascribed to the sorcery of his opponents, a priest of Hercules at Tyre reputedly a magician, was ordained deacon, and Origen listed the cures and prescriptions of wizards. Nor can one omit the accusations of astrology, prophecy, phialomancy, tyromancy and other kinds of divination brought against Sophranus, bishop of Constantia and a friend of Theodoret, at the council of Ephesus in 449. Among those he was alleged to have corrupted was Peter the archiatros who had read the offending astrological treatise. Whether these accusations were true or not, they provided an excuse for a theological or political opponent to secure a deposition of exile for non-theological or non-political reasons.

A reading of Ammianus suggests the widespread use of charms and
magical incantations. "If a man used an old-fashioned charm to soothe a pain - which authoritative doctors permit - he was put on trial" and "if anyone wore around his neck a remedy for quartan fever or other disease, or if he was pointed out by his enemies as a poisoner, he perished on a capital charge". Such prayers and incantations often derive from apocryphal Christian literature, and a charm against migraine found at Carnuntum depicts the female demon Antaura repulsed by Artemis of Ephesus. Barb sums up the contents of magic and astrological texts thus: "Magic is rather more complicated than it appears to be. There is in it a large proportion of philosophy run wild; there is half-baked and misunderstood medicine, stupidly popularised; there is the tendency to borrow clauses and stipulations from learned legal phraseology." Hence one can see that these popular charms show their interaction with rational medicine, and that the boundaries between them were often confused. While the literary writings of doctors such as Galen and Dioscorides rarely touch upon magic and magicians, it is possibly dimly to discern their existence and to consider their influence.

Between Galen and the last author to be discussed, Alexander of Tralles, three centuries elapse. So far we have seen a gradual increase in superstition, yet this quantification may be erroneous; what increases is the frequency with which our literary sources record it, and this may reflect the bias of the authors rather than the growth of superstitious belief. That which previously existed in secret is now made obvious. The medico-magical writings that form the Corpus Hermeticum, now translated into Syriac, gained wide currency in the East, and such as Didymus of Alexandria, author of a book of folk medicine, Marcellus of Side, and Theodore Priscian, who
form part of the circle of "romantisch gefärbten naturwissenschaftlichen Kompilationen" retained their reputations. In the West, the surviving medical authors wrote drug handbooks of varying degrees of credibility and intelligence. Marcellus Empiricus used chants and charms of Christian and Jewish origin and prescribed rules for the preparation and use of a drug against sciatica which depend partly upon number mysticism, partly upon sympathetic magic. Following Pliny, he even recommended using a puppy to attract a hidden disease from the patient, which upon dissection would reveal the illness.

Alexander of Tralles may be an untypical example of a sixth century doctor. He came from an illustrious family of Tralles; of his brothers one, Anthemius, became the architect of Hagia Sophia, another, Metrodorus, was a famous grammarian, the third, Olympus, assisted in the compilation of Justinian's law codes, and the fourth, Dioscorus, lived honourably as a doctor at Tralles. Brunet believes that he visited Athens and Alexandria as a student, and lists his travels, probably in military service with Belisarius and Liberius, in Armenia, Africa, Italy, Gaul, Thrace and Spain, and Agathias, V.6, tells us that he lived for a time at Rome, greatly honoured. His works are those of an army surgeon who is writing less for students than for doctors who may benefit from a recital of his experiences. He picked up on his travels a wondrous collection of recipes, which indicate how far we have come from Galen. He borrows remedies from peasants in Tuscany, Corcyra, Spain, Gaul and Armenia, and his use of a Latin expression at IV 75 suggests that he discovered this drug also in the West. He remarks that he would have liked to use all kinds of remedies, but because of the stupidity of his contemporaries who blame those
who did, he shrank from applying them. While he thus testifies to the suspicion of magicians and sorcerers, the drugs and cures he describes reveal how many magical techniques had already been incorporated into 'respectable' medicine. A scarab cures quartan fever, especially when in an amulet, and Alexander gives instructions for amulets and charms against colic and kidney troubles, notes on talismans, and phylacteries, including a verse of Homer written upon a gold plate. All doctors who have tried talismans say that the first menses of a virgin cure quartan fever, or those of a girl after defloration, carried in a bracelet on the right hand or arm, and a cloak dipped in a girl's first menses in a sure prophylaxis.

Alexander recalls a man who used a dirty, sweaty robe worn by a woman in labour, and it is a far cry from the cautious Scribonius Largus to the recipe of Marsinus the Thracian which relies upon the virtues of the blood of gladiators. Among the ingredients of his drugs are a chameleon, cut and buried; a powder made from sheep's horns and applied to the feet; and hyoscyamus, which is to be plucked at night at certain times of the year to the accompaniment of a Jewish oath, the burial of an animal bone and another similar oath.

Among his sources are Xenocrates, Archigenes, Didymus and his folk-medicine, and two unknown medico-magical pharmacologists of Eastern origin, Zalachthes and Ostanes.

Despite all this magical mumbo-jumbo, Alexander can still be regarded as a rational doctor, adopting venesection, fomentations and strict diets, and writing a three volume work on ophthalmology. The Later Empire is said to have seen a growth of superstition and an addiction to magic, and even if this is interpreted to mean little more than the bringing into the open of beliefs that were covertly held, clearly Alexander was not
unaffected by it. He is prevented by the scruples of others, not by his own, from using sympathetic drugs, and the inclusion of earlier drugs that had been omitted from the rational compilations of Galen and Dioscorides demonstrates the development.

The contemporary magician, even if legally undesirable, might expect to find a following, and Damascius' Life of Isidore provides an insight into the magical connections of the later Alexandrian philosophers and doctors, who were for the most part the last champions of paganism. Asclepiodotus, who learnt the properties of plants, stones and dyes, is said to have visited the country of the magi and to have practised .

Damascius also tells of a meteorite clasped by a doctor, Eusebius, who had rushed from Emesa in the middle of the night to a mountain temple of Athens to see a falling star. He travelled thirty miles at the behest of the stone, and bringing it to the temple affixed it to the wall. The stone spoke and Eusebius became the interpreter of its oracle. Asclepiodotus the younger is also described as a famous magician and philosopher, and, if we may trust the partisan Zachary, the law school of Berytus contained several notable sorcerers.

Throughout the Roman Empire popular magic is always associated with medicine, and to judge from the four doctors I have selected, even those who practised rational medicine included irrational remedies to a greater or lesser extent. This may in part be due to rivalry with magicians and to an acceptance of the possibilities of irrational healing, but it may also derive from the rejection of those methods of treatment which involved the doctor in physical contact with his patient. Anatomy was in decline, the doctors at Constantinople in the mid-fifth century abstained from phlebotomy, and
thus the way was open for reliance upon drugs and dietetics which lent themselves more easily to magical exploitation\textsuperscript{92}. The use of magic and spells was so widespread as to be accounted normal, and attacks upon those who wore amulets to ward off disease are seen as the actions of madmen\textsuperscript{93}. There was a tendency in the Later Empire to rely more upon a magico-medical pharmacy than upon surgery and Galenic prognosis, and certainly outside medicine there is much evidence for the existence of magic, both black and white.

This interest in magic has its counterpart in the continued success of religious shrines and healing. Although both are infrequently mentioned by the more literate doctors, they provided an additional source of healing for the poorer classes, and they cannot be discounted in a description of the medical facilities of the Roman Empire. The existence, on the one hand, of shrines and temples where cures could be obtained without the intervention of a doctor, and, on the other, of sorcerers and magicians who practised outside literate and respectable circles, makes any generalisation about the medical profession difficult. More so when it is considered that the magicians themselves could range from a humble travelling druggist to a leading philosopher in fifth century Alexandria. Their methods could complement those of the rational practitioners of medicine, of whom we are regularly informed, and there is always an ambivalence in the attitudes of the literate and cultured doctor such as Galen or Alexander towards the use of irrational means, superstition, religious healing and sympathetic medicine, which suggests that a division into rational and irrational medicine is never clearly cut. Although such a distinction is a useful analytical tool, it
is too blunt to do justice to the variations that are found there, and it is best to note them and to confess an inability to include them in an all-embracing statement that is neither tautological nor so vague as to be meaningless. The existence of these magical healers is certain, their importance more than our upper-class sources would suggest, their influence upon other practitioners problematical, but to proceed further is to venture a series of uncontrollable hypotheses in an area where no sound method of enquiry has been discovered.
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Conclusion.

The study of a particular social group over a period of six centuries presents its own methodological problems and difficulties, as well as being open to the charge of antiquarianism. But an analysis of the social history of the Roman Empire must proceed from detailed investigation of smaller groups and from attempts to place them within a context of the history of the time. Only in this way is there an escape from the static and lifeless descriptions that are found in handbooks of antiquities, and the creation of opportunities to penetrate deeper into the social fabric of the Roman Empire.

The medical profession is a useful example, for it reveals to the cautious researcher many pitfalls that have entrapped other scholars. The first concerns the discrepancies between the position of doctors in the East and in the West. In the East where the Hellenistic monarchies had seen the growth of city life and the spread of Greek cultural attitudes the doctor was a respected member of society whose presence was eagerly sought. Honorary decrees and wealthy memorials attest the importance of the doctor within his city, and there is an almost uniform picture throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. In the West, our information is limited. There were native medical practitioners lurking in the obscurity of their homes and villages, and domestic medicine seems to have been exercised within many Roman households. Drugs, diet and herbal remedies were the defences against disease, and more sophisticated methods were only introduced with the advent of Greek doctors from S. Italy and the East. These were mainly slaves and
freedmen, and the status of the medical profession in the West can be assessed to a certain extent by the replacement of these low-status physicians by men of free birth and Roman citizenship. By the end of the third century there are few slaves who are recorded by the epigraphic and literary sources, although a sixth century legal text assumes their existence. A first consideration therefore would suggest that a situation prevailing in the East gradually asserted itself in the West and, with the disappearance of slave and freedmen doctors from our sources, the medical profession and its members was the same throughout the empire.

This is a plausible and often repeated conclusion, but this may be unfair to the evidence and impose an unjustified uniformity upon a diversity of men. The most obvious doctors are those who are mentioned in the literary sources, and, because of the upper class bias of all ancient history writing and of much ancient literature, the status of those mentioned is likely to be the same in Italy as in Asia. The friends of senators and councillors, the personal physicians of the emperor and of a governor, do not differ greatly, and a doctor turned church leader is as likely to appear in Syria as in Africa. Thus an inevitable progress is conjectured for the Western doctor until he acquires the status of his Eastern counterpart, and from then on the two halves of the Empire coincide in their respect and support for the medical profession. Inscriptions appear to confirm this supposition, perhaps because they again deal with those who could afford them, a possibly less homogeneous group, yet one reasonably united, but the medical literature and the papyri reveal a different situation. Far from being the leader of society, the benefactor of shrines and cities or the sevir augustalis, the Egyptian doctor is a relatively humble man, possibly not a
Roman citizen, whose reputation, such as it was, was purely local. His finances were not great, his privileges small, and he often supplemented his income by farming a small plot. This sort of doctor is almost unknown from inscriptions and literary sources, yet he may be the typical practitioner. Travelling druggists, oculists and doctors wandered through the Western provinces, providing medical assistance in country areas, and the remoter parts of Asia Minor may have seen similar doctors. Nor can magicians or the interpreters of healing deities be excluded for they all provided some form of medical assistance, and, even if despised as uncultured and unlearned by such as Galen, they can not be omitted from consideration. Thus, far from being the uniform profession that it might appear, there are several divisions and any development of statuses concerns only the upper strata, those medici and iatroi whose social pretensions can be traced in the literary and epigraphic sources.

Even when dealing with these more obvious practitioners of medicine the social historian discovers hazards. While the change from slave and freedmen doctors to Roman citizens, albeit of Greek origin, is clear, a satisfactory explanation is provided only with difficulty. No one reason suffices to explain a social movement, and, especially when much evidence is unavailable to us, the assumption of a single cause is foolish and misleading. Some attempt at discovering various factors can be made; personal favours from senators and emperors which derive from the intimate nature of the doctor's services, a shortage of slaves, the growing sophistication of medicine especially in its relations with philosophy, where contacts were sought with the free men who enjoyed such learning, and, probably the most significant, the growing acceptability of Greeks within
the Roman Empire. This problem has already produced much discussion, and the Greek doctor is an obvious example, if more humble than consuls and senators. It is probable that the position of those doctors who attended senators and their families may have affected, and been affected by, this increased acceptance of Greeks and Greek ideas. The second century displays the success of Galen and his fellows who participated in the second sophistic movement and whose learning was borrowed by sophists and by those senators who followed the example of Hadrian in their enthusiasm for Greek culture. But, again, there is little evidence that this ever penetrated to the lower classes, and the effect upon the humbler doctors in the West who are recorded upon inscriptions is impossible to calculate.

Similar distinctions can be made when dealing with the education of the doctor and with his wealth. Although it was possible for a rich student to spend many years in learning medical theory, this was not the case with the average doctor, who may plausibly be assumed to have picked up his art either as an 'apprentice' or from long experience, and it may be no coincidence that only at Marseilles and Rome can any definite medical school on the model of those of Ephesus and Alexandria be found in the West in the early empire. This dichotomy between wealthy doctors whose education included training in the theoretical basis of medicine in which philosophy was an integral part and their humbler colleagues became more pronounced in the Later Empire, when the sophisticated learning of the medical school of Alexandria is in direct contrast with the pharmacological lore of Bordeaux and the West.

The wealth of the doctor shows great variations, from the fortunes of imperial doctors to the modest profits of a travelling druggist. It is
clear that Galen and many others considered that a doctor in the Greek tradition was certain of at least moderate wealth, but they overlook the oculists and pharmacists in the obscurity of the West, and it may fairly be asked whether a situation prevailing in the predominately urban areas of Asia Minor and Syria can be unhesitatingly transferred to rural Gaul and Britain. While Galen received HS 40,000 for one cure, the innkeeper at Luke 10.35 is given only two denarii to pay for the drugs and treatment of the wounded man on the Jericho road. Nevertheless, our evidence never shows any doctor in poverty, and even in Egypt the medical profession was one in which to place a bright boy. Further generalisations about the wealth of doctors are difficult, and cannot reflect either the geographical spread of the evidence or the temporal divisions. There may be a difference in the position of the doctor in relation to other professions and trades between the first and the fourth century, when by the tenacious retention of his century old privileges of immunity while others were losing theirs, the doctor may have become socially more important. The doctor in this, as in many other things, must be considered within the intellectual milieu of teachers, sophists and professional philosophers and his position in society must be compared with that of other intellectuals. Thus doctors, especially the imperial physicians, the archiatri, became counts and occasionally governed provinces and by their proximity to the emperor they retained and even increased their immunities.

The study of any ancient society is obviously more difficult than that of a contemporary or even a medieval one, and the evidence presents its own problems. A statistical survey in depth is impossible because of the scantiness of the evidence, which has already been 'processed' either
by the bias of historians or by the vagaries of chance. Thus generalisations from epigraphic evidence carry their own dangers, and the 'haves' are always more represented than the 'have nots'. Nor can we possess anything but a small fraction of the evidence we would like, and conclusions must be drawn from refractory and scattered material. In many instances a doubtful hypothesis is the most that can be produced, and, as the chapter on the army medical services indicates, even when we are dealing with a small and homogeneous collection of data, a definite alignment of the evidence may be too constricting. Any social historian must also face the difficulty of allowing for change in society, and, although certain movements can be noted, it is impossible to say precisely when they occurred or to give a definite description of their spread. The social history of the Roman Empire is thus a sort of patchwork in which different pieces of material must be combined; a study of the medical profession and its members must be compared with that of the legal or teaching profession, and their vicissitudes followed through the centuries. Only thus can we proceed to a deeper analysis of the society of the Roman Empire and of its workings, and to formulate valid conclusions.

This thesis is intended as a contribution to the wider study of the social history of the Roman Empire, and I have tried to pursue one particular topic and to chart the varying statuses, careers and privileges of doctors and other healers over a long period of time and from Hadrian's Wall to Egyptian Thebes. The evidence itself precludes all but the vaguest of generalisations, and yet the attempt must be made in order to obtain a clearer picture of one segment of society. The political historian may choose to overlook the doctor, except as an imperial murderer or confidant;
the social historian, whether of one area or of one group, cannot fail to
consider the position of the doctor and his art within society. More so,
when, as Augustine proclaimed, En. Ps. 83.8, medicine is one of the "artes
memorables quae magnae videntur in subveniendo, quae sunt enim in hoc
seculo excellentes actiones".

S. None. In a store-house at Via della Ferrarella 17.
A large statue, 126 cm. × 61 × 61. Lettera X - CMM.
L. Servius G. Philippus
Medicus chirurgus
Erasus G. Lullus
Medicus Philippus
In front of Ill. a
In apr. post 717

C. Aphrodisias. Communicated to us by Miss J. J. Reynolds.
Left side of marble niche, 27 cm. × 24 cm., inscribed within a
roughly incised tabula ansata.

D. Aphrodisias.
Marble slab broken above and to right, 17 cm. × 15 × 1.5, with
traces of a relief above.
Aphrodisias. Θαλάσσιος Απροδίσεις. Λυρός. Μελέτης.
Comb: The inscription partly effaced, beginning Aphrodisias.
Aphrodisias. Αφροδίσεις. Εύρος.
Andean pottery and I.
APPENDIX I.

Some Unpublished Inscriptions.

A. Ostia. Communicated to me by Prof. G. Barbieri. Inv.n.8544.

A broken plaque, 31.5 cm x 33 x 1.6. Letters 2.6.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{T} & \text{ΣΤΑΤΙ}\\
\text{E ΞΕΝΕΥ} & \text{ΘΕΕΡΟΣ}
\end{array}
\]

B. Rome. In a store-house at Via della Ferratella 37.

A large stele, 138 cm x 51 x 16. Letters 4 - 5 cm.

L.Naevius C.I.Philippus
Medicus Chirurgus
Naevia C.L.Clara
Medica Philologa
In from ped XI a
In agr ped XVII

C. Aphrodisias. Communicated to me by Miss J.M. Reynolds.

Left side of marble block, 27 cm x 40 x 16, inscribed within a roughly incised tabella ansata.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Xρως} \quad \text{"Αρτ} \\
\text{Φιουκ} \quad \text{L} \\
\text{Χιατρο} \quad \text{L}
\end{array}
\]

D. Aphrodisias.

Marble slab broken above and to right, 39 cm x 16 x 10.5, with traces of a relief above.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Α} \text{ύρ (δύιν)} \quad \text{Ρα (μινιωρ νυαις θεοομάχων φό}
\text{σεί βί Ευτυπλωσις Μεγαλου Κορού (μινωρ)}
\text{Απολλώνιον Κ στοι } \text{Αυ} \\
\text{ιπται άρξιατρον του ιωβολο} \text{ν}
\text{ανωτά μυσίας Κερη Κ}
\end{array}
\]


G. Meriamlik. Oehler p.120, Schedenummer, Meriamlik, 19, from Wilhelm, 1892.

H. Kibyra Minor, Cilicia, shortly to be published by G.B. Bean and T.B. Mitford.

J. Paestum. Information received from Dr. T.P. Wiseman.
E. Alabanda? Reported in Oehler, p.117. Now Österreichischen Akademie
Schedennummer A.38.
Αὐρ (ἡλιος) Ὁκλην ἦμεροῦ


Τιβ (τρως) Ελαφον οὐκ ἀντεθηκα

G. Meriamlik. Oehler p.120, Schedennummer, Meriamlik, 19, from Wilhelm, 1892.

+ Νεόνως εἰ

H. Kibyra Minor, Cilicia, shortly to be published by G.E. Bean and T.B. Mitford.

η Βου]λη καὶ σπη [λες ἔτει

J. Paestum. Information received from Dr. T.P. Wiseman.

\texttt{[ntius L.1. [}}
\texttt{.medicus [}}
\texttt{sa l. Tertius[}}
\texttt{Tr.Ment [}}
K. Cassino.

A slab of limestone, 120 cm. x 50.8 x 30. Broken to the right. Incised in a tabella ansata, 90 x 44. Letters 4.5 to 5.1.

M. Nonius M. l. M.
Medicus sevi [r Aug.?
sibi libertis liberta [busque.

L. Chester. Found in the excavations on the site of the legionary fortress, and published in the Chester Chronicle, 18.2.68.


A slab of grey marble, 20.5 cm. square, 2 deep. Letters 1.8 - 3.4.

D. M.
L. Nevio Nicato
ri med dupl
colleg ipsi
us 6 m f

N. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.
APPENDIX II.

The status of doctors on Western Inscriptions.

The bracketed figure indicates the number of doctors who are not of Greek origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen/non-military</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
<td>22(11)</td>
<td>8(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen/military</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>35(18)</td>
<td>19(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication of filiation or of freedman status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Cognomen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Greek cognomen</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedmen</td>
<td>92(3)</td>
<td>72(8)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave, non-imperial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave, imperial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrini</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16(5)</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146(17)</td>
<td>202(51)</td>
<td>61(21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In constructing this table I have followed Gummerus' dating and when he has placed an inscription in two centuries, I have adopted the later date. Hence the obvious development towards the practice of medicine by free men may be placed earlier than this table shows. I have made no attempt to divide into statuses those who possess the tria nomina without any indication of filiation or of freedman status; they may be newly admitted citizens or freedmen who wish to disguise the fact.

Percentages of non-Greek doctors in certain areas may be calculated as follows:

- Rome, 7%;
- Britain, S. Italy and Latium, 20%;
- Gallia Cisalpina, 22%;
- Spain and Provence, 25%;
- Central Italy, 30%;
- Danubian provinces, 40%;
- Gaul and Germany, 48%;
- Africa 50%. The statistical sampling of Britain, especially, and of the other European provinces may be too small to carry conviction, see App. III. Again no notice is taken of the numbers of oculists stamps, on which see App. IV.
clear that Galen and many others considered that a doctor in the Greek tradition was certain of at least moderate wealth, but they overlook the oculists and pharmacists in the obscurity of the West, and it may fairly be asked whether a situation prevailing in the predominately urban areas of Asia Minor and Syria can be unhesitatingly transferred to rural Gaul and Britain. While Galen received HS 40,000 for one cure, the innkeeper at Luke 10.35 is given only two denarii to pay for the drugs and treatment of the wounded man on the Jericho road. Nevertheless, our evidence never shows any doctor in poverty, and even in Egypt the medical profession was one in which to place a bright boy. Further generalisations about the wealth of doctors are difficult, and cannot reflect either the geographical spread of the evidence or the temporal divisions. There may be a difference in the position of the doctor in relation to other professions and trades between the first and the fourth century, when by the tenacious retention of his century old privileges of immunity while others were losing theirs, the doctor may have become socially more important. The doctor in this, as in many other things, must be considered within the intellectual milieu of teachers, sophists and professional philosophers and his position in society must be compared with that of other intellectuals. Thus doctors, especially the imperial physicians, the archiatri, became counts and occasionally governed provinces and by their proximity to the emperor they retained and even increased their immunities.

The study of any ancient society is obviously more difficult than that of a contemporary or even a medieval one, and the evidence presents its own problems. A statistical survey in depth is impossible because of the scantiness of the evidence, which has already been 'processed' either
by the bias of historians or by the vagaries of chance. Thus generalisations from epigraphic evidence carry their own dangers, and the 'haves' are always more represented than the 'have nots'. Nor can we possess anything but a small fraction of the evidence we would like, and conclusions must be drawn from refractory and scattered material. In many instances a doubtful hypothesis is the most that can be produced, and, as the chapter on the army medical services indicates, even when we are dealing with a small and homogeneous collection of data, a definite alignment of the evidence may be too constricting. Any social historian must also face the difficulty of allowing for change in society, and, although certain movements can be noted, it is impossible to say precisely when they occurred or to give a definite description of their spread. The social history of the Roman Empire is thus a sort of patchwork in which different pieces of material must be combined; a study of the medical profession and its members must be compared with that of the legal or teaching profession, and their vicissitudes followed through the centuries. Only thus can we proceed to a deeper analysis of the society of the Roman Empire and of its workings, and to formulate valid conclusions.

This thesis is intended as a contribution to the wider study of the social history of the Roman Empire, and I have tried to pursue one particular topic and to chart the varying statuses, careers and privileges of doctors and other healers over a long period of time and from Hadrian's Wall to Egyptian Thebes. The evidence itself precludes all but the vaguest of generalisations, and yet the attempt must be made in order to obtain a clearer picture of one segment of society. The political historian may choose to overlook the doctor, except as an imperial murderer or confidant;
the social historian, whether of one area or of one group, cannot fail to consider the position of the doctor and his art within society. More so, when, as Augustine proclaimed, En. Ps. 83.8, medicine is one of the "artes memorabiles quae magnae videntur in subveniendo, quae sunt enim in hoc seculo excellentes actiones".

---

2. **B. Now.** In a store-house at Via della Mercatella 77.

A large stone, 1.20 cm. x 51 x 18. Letters 4 - 5 cm.

L. Brevins C. L. Philippe
Medicus Chirurgus
M. D. C. L. Clara
Medicus Philippus
In front ped. XI a
In agr. ped. VII

C. **Aphrodisias.** Communicated to me by Miss J. J. Longhi.

Left side of marble slab, 27 cm. x 48 x 3.6 cm. Inscribed within a roughly incised tabula ansata.

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha \tau \omega \nu \varepsilon \lambda \iota \\
\gamma \iota \omicron \nu \nu & \\
\Lambda \mu \tau \rho \theta
\end{align*}
\]

D. **Aphrodisias.**

Marble slab broken above and to right. 27 cm. x 16 x 4.9 cm. With traces of a relief above.

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha \pi \rho \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \iota \iota \\
\varphi \alpha \lambda \sigma \tau \omicron \iota \alpha \sigma \rho \iota \alpha \iota \iota \iota & \\
\nu \tau \omicron \lambda \omicron \nu \nu \nu & \\
\delta \rho \iota \omicron \nu \nu \nu \nu & \\
\alpha \nu \gamma \omicron \iota \rho \nu & \\
\alpha \sigma \omicron \rho \omicron \tau \omicron \nu
\end{align*}
\]
APPENDIX I.

Some Unpublished Inscriptions.

A. Ostia. Communicated to me by Prof. G. Barbieri. Inv.n.8544.

A broken plaque, 31.5 cm x 33 x 1.6. Letters 2.6.

T ΣΤΑΤΙ
ΕΞΕΛΕΥ
ΗΝ ΤΡΩΣ

B. Rome. In a store-house at Via della Ferratella 37.

A large stela, 138 cm. x 51 x 16. Letters 4 - 5 cm.

L. Naevius C. I. Philippus
Medicus Chirurgus
Naevia C. L. Clara
Medica Philologa
In frons ped XI s
In agr ped XVII

C. Aphrodisias. Communicated to me by Miss J. M. Reynolds.

Left side of marble block, 27 cm. x 40 x 16, inscribed within a roughly incised tabella ansata.

Χρυσός Ἀττ
Φίονας
Χιμπρός

D. Aphrodisias.

Marble slab broken above and to right, 39 cm. x 16 x 10.5, with traces of a relief above.

Ἀρ(ίμιυ) Ἡρ(άδων) Ἀυ(τής) η Ἐλισαβέτ Ἔλαιον Ἁρ(ίπης)
Ἀπολλάδιον καὶ τοῦ Ἀνδρίου
Ἀρχιστράτου τοῦ Ἠμας
Ἀνδρίμα νυνίας Ἐκριμή


G. Meriamlik. Oehler p.120, Schedennummer, Meriamlik, 19, from Wilhelm, 1892.

H. Kibyra Minor, Cilicia, shortly to be published by G. E. Bean and T. B. Mitford.

J. Paestum. Information received from Dr. T. P. Wiseman.
K. Cassino.

A slab of limestone, 120 cm. x 50.8 x 30. Broken to the right.
Incised in a tabella ansata, 90 x 44. Letters 4.5 to 5.1.

M. Nonius M. I. M
Medicus serv Aug.? sibi liberta liberta

L. Chester. Found in the excavations on the site of the legionary fortress, and published in the Chester Chronicle, 18.2.68.


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.


M. N. Monastic Planci L
Medicus serr Aug.? sibi liberta liberta


M. Rome. Museo delle Terme. 92 cm. x 61 x 31. Inscribed in a tabella, 77.5 x 49.
APPENDIX II.

The status of doctors on Western Inscriptions.

The bracketed figure indicates the number of doctors who are not of Greek origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen/non-military</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
<td>22(11)</td>
<td>8(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen/military</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>35(18)</td>
<td>19(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No indication of filiation or of freedman status.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek Cognomen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Greek cognomen</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedmen</td>
<td>92(3)</td>
<td>72(8)</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave, non-imperial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave, imperial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrini</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16(5)</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146(17) 202(51) 61(21)

In constructing this table I have followed Gummerus' dating and when he has placed an inscription in two centuries, I have adopted the later date. Hence the obvious development towards the practice of medicine by free men may be placed earlier than this table shows. I have made no attempt to divide into statuses those who possess the tria nomina without any indication of filiation or of freedman status; they may be newly admitted citizens or freedmen who wish to disguise the fact.

Percentages of non-Greek doctors in certain areas may be calculated as follows:

Rome, 7%; Britain, S. Italy and Latium, 20%; Gallia Cisalpina, 22%; Spain and Provence, 25%; Central Italy, 30%; Danubian provinces, 40%; Gaul and Germany, 43%; Africa 50%. The statistical sampling of Britain, especially, and of the other European provinces may be too small to carry conviction, see App. III. Again no notice is taken of the numbers of oculists stamps, on which see App. IV.
APPENDIX III.a.

The distribution of medical inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Doctors</th>
<th>Number of military doctors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caria</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia/Lydia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisidia/Phrygia/Lycaonia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bithynia and Pontus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonla</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Greece</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Greece</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Islands</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (note also AGM 1964, 289 – 298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illyricum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moesia/Thrace</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crimea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannonia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaetia/Noricum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily/Malta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Italy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latium</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Italy</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narbonnensis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tres Galliae</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table does not include figures for oculists' stamps nor for papyri.
APPENDIX III b.

**Towns and Cities with three or more medical inscriptions.**

- 35 Egyptian Thebes.
- 23 Athens, Ephesus.
- 16 Cos.
- 11 Heraclea.
- 9 Aquileia, Aquincum.
- 8 Misenum.
- 7 Lambaesis, Aphrodisias, Ostia.
- 6 Corycos, Smyrna, Delphi.
- 5 Antioch in Pisidia, Corinth, Beneventum, Capua, Tibur, Ravenna, Narbo, Carthage.
- 4 Seleucia ad Calycadnum, Iconium, Carnuntum, Velia, Milan, Nîmes, Lyons.
- 3 Sidyma, Pergamum, Sparta, Salonae, Syracuse, Puteoli, Venusia, Larinum, Pompeii, Setia, Perugia, Assisi, Concordia, Verona, Brescia, Madrid.

This list may reflect more the caprice of epigraphic discovery, but numbers are significant and reflect more than the general prosperity of a particular town. Thus Cos, Heraclea, Aquileia, Beneventum, Capua and Velia may all reveal medical connections, and the 23 inscriptions of Ephesus and Athens confirm their importance as centres of learning.
APPENDIX IV.

IV A. The distribution of oculists stamps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Receuil 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(their provenance is doubtful, CIL XIII 3.92, Almagro, 23, 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Howald, Meyer, n.441 ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noricum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>11 (9 doubtful)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>2 (AGM 1964, p. 283)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None are found elsewhere, although vases for collyria have been found in Egypt, and Athens. This list is compiled from Esperandieu, Recueil des Cachets, 1893, CIL XIII.3, RA 1927, 155 - 169 + AE 1958 57, 1962 223, and the stamps published in the annual summaries of British inscriptions in JRS.

IVB. Towns and cities with three or more stamps.

Bracketed numbers indicate plaques, kits etc. of oculists found there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rheims</td>
<td>15 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen</td>
<td>14 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiegne</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naix</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>11 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavai</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz, Lyons, Besançon, Manéure</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>4 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâmes</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arles, Lillebonne, Nîmes</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Imperial doctors and their statuses.

This table does not include the numerous slave doctors within the imperial household who may be presumed to have treated other members of the familia, e.g. CIL VI 8897.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status (s,1,p,c)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonius Musa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PIR² A.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artorius Asclepiades</td>
<td>(p +) c</td>
<td>PIR² A.1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atimetus</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>PIR² A.1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudemus</td>
<td>1? (not c)</td>
<td>PIR² E.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Claudius Melito</td>
<td>p + c</td>
<td>AE 1941.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Claudius Epagathus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IGR III 578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Claudius Tyrannus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIG³ 807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Claudius Menecrates</td>
<td>p + c</td>
<td>PIR² C.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Claudius Alcimus</td>
<td>(1?)</td>
<td>IG XIV 1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassius</td>
<td>9p + c?</td>
<td>PIR² C.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charicles</td>
<td>(1?)</td>
<td>PIR² C.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stertinius Xenophon</td>
<td>(p +) c</td>
<td>HZ 1922, 189 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arruntius</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>PIR² A.1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andromachus</td>
<td>(p (+c?))</td>
<td>PIR² A.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vettius Valens</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Tac. Annals XI 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Licinius Atticus ??</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corinth VIII.2.15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribonius Largus ??</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Largus, Pf.5 and CLXII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servilius Damocrates</td>
<td>p + c</td>
<td>Cichorius, Römische Studien, 432 - 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollinaris</td>
<td>p (+c?)</td>
<td>AE 1937,175 cf.PIR² A.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser Sulpicius Recataeus</td>
<td>p + c</td>
<td>PWIV.1.812, Sulpicius 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Arruntius Sempronianus</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>PIR² a.1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andromachus</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>PIR² A.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Statilius Crilon</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Hellenica III 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinius Philippicus ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ISyria 2683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermogenes</td>
<td>(p + c)?</td>
<td>PIR² H.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Statilius Attalus</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>La Carie II 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Marcius De</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Neiggs, 563 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Galen</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>PIR² G.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Gellius Maximus</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>PIR² G.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aur. Ptolemaeus ??</td>
<td>(p + c?)</td>
<td>TAM II.1.221.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Archiatri recorded upon inscriptions and papyri.

Africa
  Furni, CIL VIII 25811. Chr(istian).

Egypt
  Lefebvre, Recueil, n.135. Chr.
  SB 5216, c.1 B.C.; P.Oslo. 53 C2: Patr. Or. 1924, p.430, late C3;
  P.Lips. 97, A.D. 338; P.Oxy 126, A.D. 572: Wessely, Stud.
  Pal. III 77; VII 1175; X 251 b.2, all sixth cent.: P.Cairo
  Masp. 67151, A.D. 570; 67077, C6 - 7: P.Lond 1032, C6 - 7.

Judaea

Arabia
  Bostra, IGR III 1333, not pre 150.

Syria
  Rhosos, ISyria 724, Chr.

Cilicia
  Seleucia, MAMA III 22, Chr.
  Olba, Heberdey, Wilhelm, DAWW 1896, n.161. C3?
  Gönnekyalesi, App. I ff.; not pre C3.

Lycia/Pamphylia
  Sidyma, T.A.M. II.1.221; C3. Imp.?
    T.A.M. II.1.224; C3.
  Xanthus, CIG 4277 C2 - 3.
  Elmali, Petersen and von Luschau, Reisen, Vienna 1899,
    p.176, C2 - 3.

Pisidia/Phrygia
  Synnada, MAMA VI 373, c.175.
  Cesmeli Zebir, MAMA VII 566, Chr.
  TAPhA 1926, n.226 C3.

  TAPhA 1926, p.224, cf. for other inscriptions of the same man, an imperial doctor, PIR G.131 C2.
  Harpasa, a coin in ABAW 1890, n.435.

Caria
  Ceramos, JHS 1890, 127, A.D. 251. Cf. Head, Historia
    Numerorum 614.
  Nylasa, CIG 2714, C2?
Lagina, BCH 1920, 75. C2 - 3.
Aphrodisias, CIG 2847, C3.
Heraclea, MAMA VI 91, Imp., for other inscriptions of Criton see Hell. III.5.
MAMA VI 117, mid C2.
La Carie p.179, mid C2. Imp., and cf. 220
La Carie p.115, C3.
La Carie n.57. C3.
La Carie n.58. C3.
Saujilar, IGR IV 553, C3.
IGR IV 1278 C3??
Koula IGR IV 1383 C3?
Philadelphia SEG XVII 527 C3.
Smyrna, Lebas-W, 1523 C3?
Ephesus, CIG 2987, c.170 A.D.
JOAI, 1905, 128ff, six archiatri participate in the medical contests. Late C2.
FE III 55, C3.
CIJ 745, C3.
FE IV.3, C3 - 4.
Hiera IG XII.2.484, C3.
Lampsacus IGR IV 182, C3?

Bithynia/Pontus
Claudiopolis, VI 686, C3.
Khavsa, JOAI, 1932 B. 85 C3
JOAI, 1932 B. 92 - 96, C3.

Macedonia
Thessalonica, Pelekides p.63, A.D. 249.

Achaea
Thebes, IG VII 2688, C2 - 3.
- 265 -

Cos  P-H, 84, Imp. Cl., see also HZ 1922, 189ff.
  IGR IV 1066, C2 - 3?
  IGR IV 1067, C2 - 3?
Anaphe XII.3.259, C3 ??
Chios  BSA 1964, p.35, not after 300 A.D.
Delos  IDelos 1547, B.C. 129 - 117.
     IDelos 1573, B.C. 102/1.
Troezen, IG IV 782, A.D. 192.
Hermione IG IV 723, C2 - 3.
Cletor, IG V.2.385, C2.
Sparta, IG V.1.623, C2 - 3.
Moesia  Edessa  GIB 150, C2?
Italy  Puteoli  IG XIV 852, C2?
Venusia  CIJ I 600, C2 - 3.
Beneventum  CIL IX 1655, NS 1913, 311, A.D. 231.
Ascanium  IG XIV 689, C3?
Nola  CIL X 1381, Chr.
Rome  CIJ I 535, Chr?
     CIL VI 9562, Chr.
     CIL VI 9563, Chr.
     CIL VI 9564, Chr.
     CIL VI 9565, Chr.
     ICVR 5412, Chr.
Ostia  Neigga, 563 - 4.
Concordia  CIL V 8741, C3??
Pola  CIL V 87, C2 - 3.

Note: the archiatros assumed to hide in Savil 3557, circa 250 B.C. is shown to be incorrectly read by Segre, Tit. Cal. n.58
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Greek doctors in the Eastern provinces with Roman citizenship before 200 A.D.

* signifies that the man was an imperial doctor.

1. Egypt IGR I 1212 Asclepiades
2. 1361 Aurelius Clemens
3. C. Aufidius
5. Laodicea ad Libanum. ISyria 2683 Licinius Philippicus*
6. Hierapolis-Castabala. IGR III 903 Lucius
7. Sidyma TAM II.1.578/9 T. Cl. Epathagus*
8. Choma JRS 1967, 41 Cestrius
9. Xanthus CIG 4277 Claudius Epictetus
10. Crema CIL III 6879 Iunius ? Naso
12. Lagina Newton 96 Sulpicius Demetrius.
13. Cyzicus BA 384 Fl. Bustathius
14. Iasos REG 1893 C. Cornelius Hecataeus
15. Didyma IDidyma 280 C. Pomponius Pollio.
16. Heraclea La Carie II 178 T. Statilius Criton*
17. Ib. 72 Statilius Artemidorus
18. Ib. 179 Statilius Attalus*
19. Aphrodisias CIG 2846 Ulpius Claudius Chariton
20. Antioch in Pisidia JRS 1912 96 L. Gellius Maximus*
22. FS 177 Treboulia Eiatreine
24. Blaundus SEG II 667 Servilius Damocrates
25. Sosandra IGR IV 1359 Menecrates*
26. Synnada MAMA VI 373 Aquila?
27. Magnesia IMag 113 T. Claudius Tyrannus*
28. Smyrna CIG 3285 M. Artorius Asclepiades*
29. CIG 3283 N. Modius Asiaticus
30. Ephesus Wood, p.8 n.7. M.Pomponius Poron
31. CIJ 745 Julius
32. FE IV 80 T.Cl. Demostratus, A.Atilius Varus
33. CIG 2987 Attalus Priscus
34. JOAI 1905 P.Vedius Priscus
35. P.Aelius Menander, P.Aelius Glycon, P.Aelius Damarion, P.Aelius Secundus
36. Claudiopolis IGR III 77 Acilius Theodorus
37. Bursa AE 1936 72 M.Octavi f.
38. Sinope CIG 4165 Haterius Maximus
39. Chersonnesus ILS 9435 P.Vedius Threptus
40. Philippi AE 1921 4 Q.Mofius Euhemerus
41. AE 1935 55 C.Velleius Plato
42. Thessalonica JHS 1887, 373-4 T.Servius and Servia
43. Athens. IG II² 1327 Fontelius
44. Cos IGR IV 1066 C.Iulius Protocctus
45. IGR IV 1067 Cossinius Bassus
46. HZ 1922, 189ff C.Stertinius Xenophon*
47. Paros IG XII.5.199 C.Iulius Epianactis f. Mnesicleides.
48. Tegea IG VI.50 M.Antonius Onesimus
49. Corinth Corinth XIV 156 C.Vibius
50. Philippopolis GIB 1467 Maximus
51. Aboba Pliska AE 1935.70 M.Octavius Firmi f. Aper

Notes on the names.

Many of these names are common in the provinces where they are found and often derive from the nomina of provincial governors who granted citizenship. This explanation suffices for nos. 5, 8, 11, 12, 30 and 15 (on which see my article in RBPh 1969, 37 - 48), 16 - 18, 32, 36, 38, 43 and 46. Others are examples of the name of a well-known provincial family, e.g. the Vedii at Ephesus, to which may plausibly be ascribed the origin of
49, and others can be derived from the triumvirs or from other republican
dynasts, 28, 48, and the Octavii in Bithynia, 37 and 51. We can also
eliminate as sure signs of Italian residence those names which are found in
the Latin colonies founded in the East, 10, 20, 21, 22 (cf. Schulze 375),
40, 41, 42, 49 or as 44 and 45, where there had long been contact with the
Greeks of S. Italy. Imperial doctors can also be removed from consideration,
as can those bearers of imperial nomina who live several generations after
the emperors, as 4, 9, 13, 19, 31, 32, 35. I have already dealt with 24
in my discussion on p. 12, and, omitting those doctors whose cognomina alone
are recorded, and the Egyptian doctors 2 and 3, the origin of whose nomen I
cannot explain, we are left with 29, 23 and 47. A Modius is recorded at
Magnesia ad Maeandrum, IMag 152, and it may be that the name belongs to a
local Ionian family since no governor of Asia is called by that name. It
is clear from the rest of the inscription that 23 belonged to an important
local family, although it is open to question when citizenship was granted,
and whether it was to the doctor for services in Rome or to an ancestor as
a distinguished local aristocrat. The best possibility of a doctor who
acquired his citizenship through service in Rome seems to be 47, who is the
first member of his family to be a Roman citizen. The evidence therefore
for Greek doctors who migrated to Rome, obtained citizenship and then returned,
with the exception of imperial doctors, is very slight if one argues from
the possession of a Latin name, two persons only, and this may cast a little
doubt upon the attribution to emperors of sweeping grants of citizenship to
doctors resident in Rome, and suggests that, once away from his native city,
the doctor rarely returned to spend his old age.
49, and others can be derived from the triumvirs or from other republican dynasts, 28, 48, and the Octavii in Bithynia, 37 and 51. We can also eliminate as sure signs of Italian residence those names which are found in the Latin colonies founded in the East, 10, 20, 21, 22 (cf. Schulze 375), 40, 41, 42, 49 or as 44 and 45, where there had long been contact with the Greeks of S. Italy. Imperial doctors can also be removed from consideration, as can those bearers of imperial nomina who live several generations after the emperors, as 4, 9, 13, 19, 31, 32, 35. I have already dealt with 24 in my discussion on p.12, and, omitting those doctors whose cognomina alone are recorded, and the Egyptian doctors 2 and 3, the origin of whose nomen I cannot explain, we are left with 29, 23 and 47. A Modius is recorded at Magnesia ad Maeandrum, IMag 152, and it may be that the name belongs to a local Ionian family since no governor of Asia is called by that name. It is clear from the rest of the inscription that 23 belonged to an important local family, although it is open to question when citizenship was granted, and whether it was to the doctor for services in Rome or to an ancestor as a distinguished local aristocrat. The best possibility of a doctor who acquired his citizenship through service in Rome seems to be 47, who is the first member of his family to be a Roman citizen. The evidence therefore for Greek doctors who migrated to Rome, obtained citizenship and then returned, with the exception of imperial doctors, is very slight if one argues from the possession of a Latin name, two persons only, and this may cast a little doubt upon the attribution to emperors of sweeping grants of citizenship to doctors resident in Rome, and suggests that, once away from his native city, the doctor rarely returned to spend his old age.
APPENDIX VIII.

Tradition in the sources.

A historian likes to date his material, and to be able to denote original views and opinions with confidence. There are, however, certain aspects of the evidence for the doctors in which this becomes difficult if not impossible, and where care must be taken not to rely too much upon a dating that is only hypothetical.

It is useful to be able to date inscriptions at least roughly if information is to be fully extracted from them, and Gummerus assigned dates to those inscriptions upon which he commented, but without giving his reasons. Nomenclature is of great assistance, although many of his dates may be unduly exact, and letter forms provide some check, although not a conclusive one. Where possible, I have tried to examine the stone or its photograph which may provide a date to within a century\(^1\). The provenance of inscriptions is also a guide; such stones as are found at the basilica of San Paolo fuori le Mura in Rome are unlikely to be much before the mid-third century, often considerably later\(^2\). No comparable work has been done on the Eastern inscriptions since Oehler who did not provide any commentary or detailed epigraphic references for his catalogue\(^3\). Here we are faced with a Greek type of nomenclature which is of little help in assigning a date and also with a continuity between Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions. Cohn-Haft in his useful list of honorary decrees includes inscriptions probably dating from the second century A.D. which are cast in a form common in the second century B.C., and many similar examples can be drawn from private inscriptions\(^4\).
The appearance of cognomina upon Latin inscriptions also testifies to a continuity between the republic and the empire, in which it is difficult to decide how far an epithet of a profession has become simply a cognomen. Kajanto concludes that "among slaves and freedmen, and to a certain extent among the common people, occupational cognomina were often real designations of trades. But in cognomina which had passed into general use, especially if found in later epigraphic material, a correlation between trade and cognomen is only accidental." Some have suggested that medicus, and sometimes its Greek equivalent ἰατρός, have no connection with medicine when used as cognomina, but this view seems doubtful. What is impossible to decide is whether the word indicates the profession of its bearer or simply an aspiration upon the part of the giver of the name.

The literary sources often repeat well known stories and jokes about doctors and it is wise to be aware of them. The incompetence of the medical profession, its greed for money, its frequent failures are the stock in trade of many a poetic wit and the means of elaboration of a bare and uninteresting tale for a pious hagiographer. Into this category fall also theological metaphors, often derived from school stock phrases; the doctor attacked while on duty by a mad patient is found in Martial and in Augustine, and the horrors of surgery are depicted in metaphor from Homer to Chrysostom. Especially when dealing with metaphors and stock tales it is best to take great care in attributing novel and significant versions to particular authors. The problem cannot be solved by a piecemeal treatment of the evidence of only one author whose originality and independent judgement may turn out to depend upon the accumulated tradition of centuries.
Notes to Appendix VIII.


2. e.g. CIL VI 9562, see also Capparoni, I titoli sepolcri, London, 1913, p.215 and 220 n.1.

3. Gummerus' catalogue appears to have been unfinished. He gives his reasons for a geographical division on p.13, but he confines himself strictly to doctors, excluding vets and midwives.

4. Consider the varying dates given to the inscription from Perge, Cohn-Haft, n.48.


6. Greek examples of the use of ἰατρός are few. Corinth XIV p.156 is the soundest. BCH 1887, p.448 is considered by Robert to be a profession, GVI 718 is a questionable restoration by Peak, IG IX.2.1249 is a restoration by Bechtel, CIG 5054 prints a name which SB 4614 considers a rank, and the reading of CIG 5057 is refuted in SB 4587.


9. Arbesmann, Traditio, 1954, 1 - 28, has studied the 'medicus' metaphor in Augustine.
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