

# CHAPTER 1. ALEXANDER OF TRALLES AND THE *THERAPEUTICA*

## 1.1. ALEXANDER OF TRALLES

The author of the Greek *Therapeutica* is identified with the Alexander mentioned by the contemporary Byzantine historian Agathias ‘Scholasticus’ of Myrina, writing of the year A.D. 557 (*Hist.* 5.6.5 Keydell), as one of the brothers of Anthemius, native of the city of Tralles (above modern Aydın) in the valley of the River Meander (modern Menderes) in the border region between ancient Lydia and Caria. According to Agathias, Alexander was one of five brothers,<sup>1</sup> each of whom achieved high distinction in his chosen profession.<sup>2</sup> Probably most notable of the five — and Agathias’ main subject at this point — was the architect Anthemius (d. before A.D. 558), who was responsible for the building (A.D. 532–7) of the second Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, the first having been burnt down in the ‘Nika’ revolt of January A.D. 532.<sup>3</sup> The other brothers were Metrodorus the grammarian and teacher (who was summoned with Anthemius to Justinian’s court), Olympius the jurist, and Dioscorus, who like Alexander became a doctor. While Dioscorus lived out his life in Tralles, practising medicine there with great success, Alexander in old age received an honourable summons to Rome and settled there.<sup>4</sup>

This seems to be all the external evidence that we have on Alexander of Tralles. It is unclear to me on what grounds his dates are commonly given as A.D. 525–605.<sup>5</sup> It is impossible to deduce from Agathias the chronological relation between Alexander’s move to Rome and the events of the main narrative at this point (A.D. 557), although Agathias writes as if Alexander is no longer alive. The latest sources cited in the *Therapeutica* are Aëtius of Amida (sixth century, first half) and Jacobus Psychrestus (fifth to sixth century). Aëtius is cited once only, in the very last section of the book on fevers, which looks suspiciously like a later addition.<sup>6</sup> Jacobus is referred to three times, twice on gout and once on coughing, where Alexander includes a brief eulogy of the man.<sup>7</sup> These references are also

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the youngest, as Agathias mentions him last, although this is stated as fact in many of the handbooks.

<sup>2</sup> This prompts Agathias to congratulate their mother, *Hist.* 5.6.5: μακαρίσαμι ἂν ἔγωγε αὐτῶν τὴν μητέρα, οὕτω ποικίλης παιδείας ἀνάπλεων γονὴν ἀποκύησασαν.

<sup>3</sup> See Mango’s article in the *ODB*, with further references. Meyer, II, 379 ventures the view that Alexander’s *Therapeutica* rivals his brother’s church in endurance and brilliance(!).

<sup>4</sup> Agath., *Hist.* 5.6.5: ἄτερος δὲ ἐν τῇ πρεσβυτίδι Ῥώμῃ κατόκησεν ἐντιμότερα μετακεκλημένος. Cf. J. R. Martindale (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Vol. IIIA (Cambridge, 1992), 44–5.

<sup>5</sup> These dates are given (confidently and consistently, but without being documented) by among others Sarton, 453; Ullmann, 85; Hunger, II, 297; Cameron, 69; Jacquart and Micheau, 22, 92; Scarborough in the *ODB*, s.v. ‘Alexander of Tralles’. Alexander is perhaps the object of a tralaticious ‘handbook-mythology’, which includes as standard the statement that he travelled widely (see below) and flimsier pieces of embroidery, for example, that he travelled with the army, that he travelled in his early years, that he studied in Alexandria, that he was called to Rome because of the plague, perhaps by Pope Gregory the Great: for none of these is there a shred of evidence. Unfortunately, the soberest account of Alexander’s life, that in Meyer’s history of botany of all places (II, 379–80), was not taken as a model.

<sup>6</sup> I, 437–9 Puschmann = Aëtius 5.89 (p. 69, 14–70, 23 Olivieri). Puschmann (I, 437 n. 2) questions the authenticity of this chapter.

<sup>7</sup> On gout, II, 565, 11ff. (= 2.267 of the Latin version; also in the *De podagra*: see 3.2.5 below) and 570, 13ff.; on coughing, II, 163, 6ff.: τοῦτο τὸ φάρμακον Ἰακώβου τοῦ ψυχρηστοῦ ὀνομάζουσι, μεγάλου ἀνδρὸς καὶ θεοφιλεστάτου περὶ τὴν τέχνην γενομένου. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ ψυχρηστὸς ὅτι ὑγραινούση τροφή ἐκέχρητο. καὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἐφάνετο, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἑώρα τῶν ἀνθρώπων φιλοπράγμονας ὄντας καὶ φιλαργύρους καὶ ἀεὶ ἐν λύπαις καὶ φροντίσιν ὅλον αὐτῶν ζῶντας τὸν βίον (= 2.12: ‘Hoc enim medicamen ipsius Iacobi xp̄i [sic] esse nominatur magnifici uiri. Vocatus est autem ipse xps quia humidis cibis utebatur. Et hoc facere uidebatur quoniam multos uidebat hominum amicos rerum existentes et amatores esse pecuniarum et semper in tristicis et sollicitudine in tota uita sua uixisse’ [text of A]).

in the Latin tradition of the *Therapeutica*, and are certainly genuine. If Jacobus had reached the pinnacle of his career as personal doctor to the Emperor Leo I (d. A.D. 474),<sup>8</sup> a mid- or even early sixth-century date for Alexander becomes feasible,<sup>9</sup> rather than the usual very late sixth-/very early seventh-century date (above and n. 5). If it is possible that Alexander wrote the *Therapeutica* before A.D. 542, we need no longer wonder at his silence on the plague that reached Constantinople and Italy in that year.<sup>10</sup> An earlier dating of the completion of the Greek *Therapeutica* may have the further advantage of allowing time for the Latin version to be more closely associated with the late sixth-century translations of Oribasius and Rufus — if, that is, this traditional dating is correct, and if the association of the Latin Alexander with one or more versions of the Latin Oribasius seems on other grounds desirable (we shall return to this last question in 5.3.2 below).

The text of the *Therapeutica* itself offers very little additional information about the life of Alexander (on the information that it provides on Alexander as a doctor, see below, pp. 6–8). The short preface (I, 289 Puschmann) to the book on fevers transmitted in Greek and Latin traditions alike (see 1.2 below) as the last book of the *Therapeutica* represents the author as an aged doctor, no longer able to practise,<sup>11</sup> who at the behest of one Cosmas, the dedicatee,<sup>12</sup> is setting down the fruits of his experience of many years of medical practice,<sup>13</sup> and in plain and simple layman's language,<sup>14</sup> he is bound to accede to Cosmas' request among other reasons because Cosmas' father was one of his first teachers.<sup>15</sup> In addition, if we may trust the headings of the respective recipes, we learn that Alexander's father was named Stephanus and was also a doctor,<sup>16</sup> and that Alexander had picked up new remedies in person in Corfu, Gaul, and Spain.<sup>17</sup> The latter point has been taken to indicate that Alexander travelled widely,<sup>18</sup> perhaps with the army,<sup>19</sup> although there is no evidence for a military connection,<sup>20</sup> and it is noticeable and perhaps

<sup>8</sup> cf. Hunger, II, 290; Nutton, *DNP*, s.v. 'Iakobos Psychrestos'.

<sup>9</sup> Meyer, II, 380, argues from Agathias' dates that Alexander was writing c. A.D. 565. Riché, 185, who cites only Schanz and Brunet, *Alexandre*, has Alexander in Rome c. A.D. 560.

<sup>10</sup> Puschmann, I, 83 (followed by Thorndike, *History*, I, 575) has noted that the *Therapeutica* is curiously silent on the plague of A.D. 542. Indeed, the bubonic plague pandemics of A.D. 541–4, 557–61, 570–4, all of which affected Tralles, Constantinople, Rome, and Ravenna, cannot have escaped Alexander's attention, wherever he was living at the time; but it is striking that our sources on the many outbreaks of the Justinianic plague are rarely if ever medical writers, so this silence need not be indicative of date. See Biraben, I, 25–48, and Allen.

<sup>11</sup> I, 289, 8–9: γέρων... καὶ κάμνειν οὐδέτι δυνάμενος.

<sup>12</sup> Identified, but purely speculatively, with Cosmas Indicopleustes, the author of *Cosmographia Christiana* (Puschmann, I, 83 n. 1; Bloch, 535 n. 2; Brunet, *Alexandre* I, 34–5).

<sup>13</sup> I, 289, 9–10: τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον ἔγραψα συντάξας τὰς μετὰ πολλῆς τριβῆς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων νόσοις καταληφθεῖσας πείρας.

<sup>14</sup> I, 289, 12–14: ἐσπούδασα γὰρ, ὡς ἐνδέχεται, κοιναῖς καὶ μᾶλλον εὐδήλοις χρήσασθαι λέξεσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς φράσεως εὐλυτον εἴη τὸ σύνταγμα.

<sup>15</sup> I, 289, 4–6: ὁ γὰρ [i.e. Cosmas' father] ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐθὺς οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς τέχνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν κατὰ βίον πραγμάτων ἀπάντων δεξιὸς ὑπουργὸς ἐγένετο.

<sup>16</sup> cf. II, 139, 17: ἀναγαργάρισμα συναγχικοῖς ᾧ ἐχρήσατο Στέφανος ὁ πατήρ μου καὶ γὰρ καλόν.

<sup>17</sup> cf. I, 565, 1: ἄλλο ὅπερ ἔλαβον παρὰ Κερκυραίου ἀγροίκου, ... 565, 4: ἕτερον ὅπερ ἔλαβον ἐν Γαλλίᾳ, ... 565, 16: ἐν δ' Ἰσπανίᾳ πρὸς ἐπιληπτικούς τοῦτ' ἔμαθον (ἔλαβον Mf). Note also a few lines earlier I, 563, 11: ἔλαβον καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Τουσκίᾳ (Τουρκία 2201 2202 L C, ἐν γῆ Περσῶν 2203 M) παρὰ ἀγροίκου τινός, which is taken to refer to Tuscany. The reading of Mf is slightly unclear, but Τουσκίᾳ would seem to be borne out by *Tuscia* in the Latin version. Some of the handbooks have North Africa instead of Corfu, presumably reading Κυρηναίου instead of Κερκυραίου at I, 565, 1 quoted above.

<sup>18</sup> Uncritically retailed by Langslow, *Medical Latin*, 70.

<sup>19</sup> For a particularly fanciful reconstruction (which has perhaps fed the handbook tradition), see Brunet, *Alexandre*, I, 14ff.

<sup>20</sup> The second part of the recommendation at 1.72: 'Hoc enim experimentatum est a multis, maxime autem a militibus' is hard to evaluate, as it is not in the Greek text (I, 565, 10). 2.134: 'scis enim a me curatum fuisse militem' is in the chapters from Philagrius (cf. 2.4.2 below).

suspicious that extensive travels should yield just three mentions of foreign remedies, all within the space of a single page, and all for the treatment of a single disease — epilepsy. On the other hand, seven references to ‘in Rome’, ‘among the Romans’/‘in Latin’,<sup>21</sup> together with the mention in the preface to Cosmas of the author’s old age, are at least consistent with Agathias’ statement that Alexander moved to Rome late in life, and with the view that the *Therapeutica* was composed during Alexander’s time in Rome.<sup>22</sup>

Alexander is held to have been a Christian. This is in itself perfectly plausible, although the evidence cited by Puschmann (I, 84) — the calling of the holy Old Testament names and the mention of Lot’s wife in an incantation at the very end of the book on gout (II, 585, 9ff.) — is not compelling, as this material may easily be a later addition. The Latin version contains at 2.15 an allusion to the book of *Proverbs* (26:11) in the words ‘like a dog returning to its own vomit’ (‘quemadmodum canis iterum ad uomiam reuertitur’ [text of γ]). The Greek text, however, has only ‘like dogs’ (II, 245, 21, ὡσπερ οἱ κύνες), so that, as things stand, the biblical reference would bear only on the background of the translator, and not on that of Alexander himself.<sup>23</sup>

We may infer that Alexander’s patients included the well-to-do from the wide range of hard-to-obtain and expensive ingredients that his remedies often call for (e.g. II, 37, 11, crocodile droppings),<sup>24</sup> and from occasional pieces of circumstantial evidence regarding the means and way of life of his patients, such as a reference to one sufferer from brain-fever (φρενίτις) with a large number of servants in his house (I, 515, 20–1), or the fact that Alexander prescribes, for the treatment of certain stomach ailments, visits to hot springs, sea-voyages, and long spells overseas (II, 249, 23–5).<sup>25</sup>

Puschmann (followed by Bloch, 536, and Neuburger, II, 110) states that those parts of the *Therapeutica* which are in the form of academic lecture-notes indicate that Alexander must have taught medicine — where, he does not say — but he gives no references to the passages that he has in mind. A phrase of the sort 1.129 *init.*, ‘tempus autem mutari nos cogit ad ...’ is at first glance suggestive of the context of a lecture, but the Latin appears to overtranslate the Greek at this point, which has nothing corresponding to *cogit* (II, 123, 23f., μεταβαίνειν ἤδη καιρὸς πρὸς ...), and καιρὸς

<sup>21</sup> I, 327, 17–18: διόπερ οὐδὲ τοὺς ἔχοντας ἀσθενῆ πάνυ τὴν δύναμιν δεῖ σκαφολουτρεῖν, ὃ ἐστὶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις εἰς τινὰ ἐμβαλεῖν; I, 373, 24–5: εἶρον δ’ ἐγὼ πολλοὺς τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἰατρῶν οὐδ’ ὄνομα τολμῶντας ὀνομάσαι τῶν πεπόνων ὡς χολὴν τικτόντων αὐτῶν (not in the Latin); I, 457, 1–2: θαψίας, ἦτινι οἱ βαφεῖς χρῶνται, ἦν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐρβαρυβίαν καλοῦσι (1.13: ‘herba rubea’); II, 191, 21: κεχρήσθω τῷ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις καλουμένῳ φαριχύλῳ (2.164: ‘suo uteris farris’); II, 261, 19: καὶ ἡ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις καλουμένη μέλκα (2.27: ‘melca’); II, 513, 20–2: λαμβανέτωσαν ἡ ῥοσάτου ἢ ἀψινθάτου ψυχρίζοντες ὡσαύτως, καθάπερ εἰώθασι ποιεῖν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ καλούμενον ῥεκεντάτον = 2.242 *ad fin.*: ‘bibant rosatum aut absintiatum infrigidatum in aqua frigida quemadmodum Rome facere consueuer(unt) q(ue)ndam appellat recentatum’ (text of A). II, 541, 33–543, 1: ἐγὼ γοῦν οἶδα τῶν πάνυ διαφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν τινα ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ τῇ διὰ τῶν ἀλῶν ἀεὶ χρώμενον πυρία = 2.259: ‘Ego igitur scio quendam nobilissimum uirum Romae de salibus fom(en)tationibus semp(er) usum fuisse’ (text of A).

<sup>22</sup> Brunet, *Alexandre* I, 46–7, insists that the references to Rome/Latin (see n. 21) make it absolutely clear that Alexander did not write the *Therapeutica* in Rome.

<sup>23</sup> cf. Wellmann, ‘Neue Schrift’, 541.

<sup>24</sup> Note, however, that Alexander states at II, 205, 12–15 (on those spitting blood) that he has often treated patients successfully without recourse to costly drugs.

<sup>25</sup> cf. Duffy, 26 n. 36, who notes also the injunction to carry a sneezing-ointment in a box made of horn (I, 493, 19–20). Cf. also II, 541, 33: ἐγὼ γοῦν οἶδα τῶν πάνυ διαφανεστάτων ἀνδρῶν τινα ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ τῇ διὰ τῶν ἀλῶν ἀεὶ χρώμενον πυρία = 2.259: ‘Ego igitur scio quendam nobilissimum uirum Romae de salibus fom(en)tationibus semp(er) usum fuisse’ (text of A), but note that Alexander does not say that he treated this man, nor even that he knew him (Puschmann’s ‘ich kenne einen ... , bei dem’ is misleading; cf. the Latin *scio* with acc. + inf.). Note also 1.9 (in Greek only in ms. Mf): ‘Cogimur saepius ab amicis... et maxime a potentibus aut regibus’.

ἔστι is elsewhere used expressly of composing a written work (I, 535, 4, οὐ νῦν ἔστι καιρὸς γράφειν = 1.60 *fin.*, ‘non est nunc tempus scribere’).<sup>26</sup>

## 1.2. WORKS ASCRIBED TO ALEXANDER OF TRALLES

In addition to the *Therapeutica* (introduced below) several other works of more or less doubtful authenticity are ascribed to Alexander. Transmitted under his name in the Greek tradition are shorter works on, respectively, fevers, intestinal worms, the eyes, and the pulse and the urine in diagnosis. If Alexander appears to refer to works of his own on head-wounds and fractures, no other trace of these survives.<sup>27</sup>

The work Περὶ πυρετῶν, preceded by the dedication to Cosmas already mentioned (and printed by Puschmann (I, 289–439) at the front of the *Therapeutica*), may safely be regarded as genuine. There is probably a reference to it in the *Therapeutica* (II, 313, 11–12; not in Latin), and moreover it is transmitted as Book 12 of the *Therapeutica* in all the non-fragmentary Greek manuscripts (and in the Latin tradition). In terms of style, it is much more carefully written than the *Therapeutica*, but in terms of its medical approach it is very much of a piece with the longer work, and numerous linguistic and structural agreements between the two works strongly support the traditional attribution.<sup>28</sup> Failing indication to the contrary, references to the *Therapeutica* in the present work should be taken to include the book on fevers.

The Περὶ ἐλμίνθων, which takes the form of a letter addressed to a certain Theodorus,<sup>29</sup> is generally accepted as genuine. The manuscripts are unanimous in ascribing it to Alexander, and the style and content are perfectly consistent with Alexander’s authorship (see Puschmann, I, 105).

A work Περὶ ὀφθαλμῶν in two books is interpolated in some of the Greek manuscripts of the *Therapeutica*, although the preface to the two books interpolated in Greek manuscript M states that the work was originally in three books.<sup>30</sup> Now, Alexander refers (II, 3, 2 = 1.85 in the Latin) to an earlier work of his own on the eyes in three books, and there are references in the Arabic tradition to a translation of Alexander’s work on the eyes in three books. Nevertheless, on grounds of form, style, and content, the Περὶ ὀφθαλμῶν is regarded as spurious by Puschmann, Hirschberg,<sup>31</sup> and now Zipser.

Also rejected as spurious is the diagnostic work on the pulse and the urine in fever ascribed to ‘the doctor Alexander’, transmitted in Greek in Par. gr. 2316 (fifteenth

<sup>26</sup> cf. also II, 283, 3–4: ὧν οὐκ ἔστι καιρὸς μνημονεύειν νῦν = 2.37.11: ‘de quibus nunc tempus non est ad commemorandum’.

<sup>27</sup> Alexander alludes to a discussion (written rather than oral) of wounds to the head and other parts of the body at I, 485, 11–12: τελεώτερον δὲ λεχθήσεται, ἡνίκα περὶ τῶν ἐν κεφαλῇ τραυμάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις μορίοις συνισταμένων τὸν λόγον ποιούμεθα (the Latin translation is poor, to say the least! 1.33: ‘Perfectius scilicet dictum est de uulnerato capite quod in aliis locis consistente libro fecimus’ (text of A)). The reference to a work on fractures is not unequivocal: I, 535, 5–6: ἐν τῷ (ἔνθα Mf) περὶ καταγμάτων (λόγῳ 2203 M) = 1.60 *fin.*: ‘ubi de fracturis conuenit [contigit *ed.*] loqui’. On a putative work of Alexander on poisons, see Wellmann, ‘Neue Schrift’.

<sup>28</sup> See Puschmann’s discussion, I, 102–4.

<sup>29</sup> Edited by Puschmann at the end of the *Therapeutica* (II, 586–99). There is a French translation and a bland appraisal by Barbillion, 71–9. De Lucia has recently published a hitherto unknown redaction of the work, from Par. Suppl. gr. 631 (I owe this reference to Cloudy Fischer).

<sup>30</sup> Edited by Puschmann in the *Nachträge*, 130–79.

<sup>31</sup> Puschmann, I, 107, is prepared to entertain the possibility that it is a work of Alexander’s youth, but clearly favours alien authorship. Hirschberg (apud Bloch, 536) sees the treatise as the work of a novice from a very late date.

century) and (in two versions) in numerous Latin manuscripts (see below). Puschmann even opines (I, 105–6) that the Greek is a translation of the Latin, although he is apparently alone in this view.<sup>32</sup>

Of the above-mentioned works we have in Latin the *Therapeutica* together with the work on fevers, and the treatise on the pulse and the urine. In the Latin tradition the connection between the *Therapeutica* and the *De febribus* is as close as it is in the Greek: in virtually all the Latin manuscripts the *Therapeutica* constitutes Books 1 and 2, the work on fevers the third and final book of what I am calling (in shorthand) throughout the present work ‘the Latin Alexander’.<sup>33</sup> This is introduced systematically below (2.3).

The Latin *De pulsibus et urinis* ascribed to ‘Alexander’ survives in numerous manuscripts in not one but two early medieval translations made separately from Greek copies deriving from a single Greek archetype.<sup>34</sup> Stoffregen reports that his comparisons of the Latin *De pulsibus* with the Latin Alexander yielded only negative results,<sup>35</sup> but the two works are nonetheless bound together in that the *De pulsibus* is transmitted either with the Latin Alexander proper (notably in Angers 457, my A; see p. 40) or, much more commonly, with the (pseudo-)Galenic early medieval ensemble of medical texts (Galen, *Ad Glauconem de medendi methodo*; the ‘*Liber tertius*’; Theodorus Priscianus; Aurelius; Esculapius) which frequently contains the reworking of the Latin Alexander on gout.<sup>36</sup>

While apt to be confused with Alexander of Aphrodisias, Alexander of Tralles is also well represented in the Arabic medical tradition from the tenth century onwards, although his works survive here only in citations.<sup>37</sup> Together with Oribasius, Aëtius, and especially Paul of Aegina, Alexander enjoyed considerable prestige in early medieval Arab scientific circles, where he is known as the author of separate works on intestinal worms, the eyes, and fevers, and of a ‘compendium’ or ‘handbook’ (*kunnās*) in a longer and a shorter version, known from an early date in an Arabic translation which has not survived but which is much cited. If the last can refer to longer and shorter versions of the *Therapeutica*, this list of treatises matches exactly that of the genuine works in the Greek tradition. Other books on various other particular diseases, ascribed by Arabic writers to Alexander Trallianus, may, if genuine, be separately transmitted parts of the *Therapeutica*.<sup>38</sup>

Excerpts from one or more of Alexander’s works are reported to exist also in Hebrew in a medical compendium composed in the year 1199. The basis of the Hebrew translation is said to be a Latin version, but one containing numerous Arabic words (not a feature of the extant Latin Alexander).<sup>39</sup>

<sup>32</sup> cf. Baader, ‘Latin adaptations’, 253–6.

<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, in contrast to the Greek tradition, the *De febribus* is transmitted separately in Latin, if (to my knowledge) in only one manuscript, namely Barcelona, Ripoll 181 (early thirteenth century), described in 3.3 below, p. 90. On the book-divisions of the Latin Alexander in Paris, lat. 6882 (my P3), see 2.3.3 and 3.1.1 below, pp. 18–20, 51.

<sup>34</sup> On the transmission, see Stoffregen, 7–71 (on the two versions and their relations to the Greek original, especially 30–2) and Stok, 259–83. On the *De pulsibus et urinis*, note also Noßke; *BTML*, 31–2, nos 2–5; *BTML Suppl.*, 13, no. A-3; and Nutton’s judicious article in *DNP*, s.v. ‘Alexandros’ [30].

<sup>35</sup> Stoffregen, 147.

<sup>36</sup> This may account for the ascription of the work in some manuscripts to Galen. Stoffregen notes that the *De pulsibus* enjoys a secondary tradition in the Latin Galen, *Ad Glauconem*. On this ensemble, and the *De podagra*, see 3.2.5 and 3.2.6.

<sup>37</sup> On the Arabic tradition of Alexander, see Puschmann, I, 92–5; Bloch, 537–8; Sezgin, 162–4; Ullmann, 85–6; Zipser, xviii–xix.

<sup>38</sup> A work on urine (mentioned by Zipser, xviii) may merit comparison with the pseudonymous work on the pulse and the urine discussed above. Cf. Puschmann, I, 93–4 n. 3, on the disease ‘birsen’, and Zipser, xviii n. 19.

<sup>39</sup> On the Hebrew excerpts, see Puschmann, I, 91; 96 (who also alludes to a possible translation of Alexander from Latin into Syriac), and Bloch, 538.

Much more significant, finally, are the excerpts from the Latin Alexander which appear, in Old English, in the medical compendium known as Bald's *Leechbook* (before A.D. 900; on which, see Cameron, 'Bald's *Leechbook*', and Adams and Deegan). Further description, and indeed collation and evaluation, of the Old English excerpts is a regrettable omission from the present work, and an important desideratum in further editorial work on the Latin text.

### 1.3. THE CHARACTER AND RECEPTION OF THE *THERAPEUTICA*

The *Therapeutica* sets out diagnosis and treatment of a large number of (mainly internal) diseases, ordered for the most part *a capite ad calcem*, from hair-loss to gout (see the summary in Table 2.1, pp. 15–16 below). The aim of the work throughout is thoroughly practical: it is to be a handbook of therapy for the practising doctor,<sup>40</sup> enabling the correct recognition of a disease and its treatment. While some parts of the *Therapeutica* are carefully composed and finished, others seem incomplete and resemble rather the notes and collected recipes of a busy doctor (Puschmann, I, 102; 104). The work is indeed based largely on the author's experience, and consequently — and appropriately enough in a therapeutic manual — relevant theory is, at most, mentioned in passing, and other areas of medicine — including anatomy, physiology, surgery, and gynaecology — are barely touched on.<sup>41</sup>

As for its medical background, the *Therapeutica* owes most to Hippocrates and Galen. Like all doctors of his time, Alexander belonged 'zu den galenischen Hippokratikern',<sup>42</sup> but gives perhaps a better picture than any later medical writer of the key principles that defined the Hippocratic doctor in the last centuries of antiquity.<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, Alexander has been held to stand out from his contemporaries through a degree of eclecticism and originality, doctrinal independence reflecting his own experience, and the courage to speak his own mind. He cites by name numerous medical authorities in addition to those already mentioned, including Archigenes of Apamea, Asclepiades the Younger (ὁ φαρμακίων), Damocrates of Athens, Didymus of Alexandria, Dioscorides, Erasistratus, Philagrius, Rufus of Ephesus, and Xenocrates of Aphrodisias,<sup>44</sup> but he is anything but a mere compiler: his authorial persona (and personality) are ever present, he frequently recommends his own remedies,<sup>45</sup> and throughout his work the most important factor in his analyses and determinant of his prescriptions is his own personal experience, *πείρα*. As Duffy so aptly puts it, 'He chooses truth over authority, and the deciding factor is always experience'.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>40</sup> And ostensibly also for the interested layman — if, that is, we may take at face-value the final words of the preface (cf. n. 14 above).

<sup>41</sup> See Temkin, 'Hippokratismus', 39. On anatomy and physiology, see Puschmann, I, 108–11.

<sup>42</sup> Temkin, 'Hippokratismus', 36.

<sup>43</sup> See Temkin, *Galenism*, 118; 'Hippokratismus', 36, 39, including the remark that the absence of prognosis in Alexander is in striking contrast with the Hippocratic texts. Alexander praises Hippocrates and Galen together at the beginning of the book on fevers, I, 291, 6: τοῖς ἀρίστοις τῶν ἰατρῶν ἀποδέδεικται Γάληνῳ τε μάλιστα καὶ Ἱπποκράτει.

<sup>44</sup> For references, see Puschmann's index of personal names, II, 600; on Alexander's sources, see Puschmann, I, 85; on his place in the transmission of recipe-literature, see Sigerist, *Rezeptliteratur*, 186 (and Index, s.v. Alexander von Tralleis).

<sup>45</sup> See e.g. I, 547, 2: καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' ἐμοῦ κατασκευασθεῖσι καταποτίοις κεχρήσθωσαν, ὧν οὐδὲν εὐρον ἰσχυρότερον; cf. the similarly strong recommendation at e.g. II, 345, 6; 427, 5.

<sup>46</sup> Duffy, 25.

Alexander's professional and independent approach is most noticeable — and most remarked — in connection with Galen, who, although always quoted and referred to with the greatest of respect, is not infrequently criticized by Alexander, above all in the book on fevers.<sup>47</sup> At the start of this book, for example, he sets out expressly to follow as far as possible the teaching of Galen on quotidian fevers (I, 291, 2–3: τὴν τοῦ θειοτάτου Γαληνοῦ διδασκαλίαν, ὡς οἶόν τέ ἐστι, κἀνταῦθα μιμούμενοι). Within five pages, however, he has twice criticized Galen's mode of treatment (I, 297, 5ff.; 301, 12ff.). After the second occasion he adds an avowal that he does not mean to be contrary, but that the truth seemed to him to be so, and the truth was always to be honoured above all else.<sup>48</sup> The truth is emphatically assigned the same pre-eminent position after another extended criticism of Galen in which Alexander uses Galen's own words of criticism of Archigenes (*Comp. loc.* 2 = 12.535, 4–6 Kühn) (in the section on coughing, II, 155, 16–22, unfortunately not included in the Latin version): the truth must always be preferred, and moreover the doctor who has formed an opinion has a grave moral obligation to express it. Had he not thought silence to be a sin, and had the truth not given him courage, Alexander says here, he would not have dared to say such things about such a paragon of learning.<sup>49</sup> As Temkin observes,<sup>50</sup> Alexander does not find it easy to criticize Galen, and much prefers it when he can show that Galen was misunderstood.<sup>51</sup>

On the other hand, Alexander is not averse to criticizing the doctors of his own day (generally referred to as πολλοὶ, οἱ πολλοὶ, οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἰατρῶν): he takes them to task on dozens of occasions for applying — whether through ignorance, lack of concern, or both<sup>52</sup> — treatments that do more harm than good.<sup>53</sup> Alexander, although 'completely orthodox in theory',<sup>54</sup> is evidently aware that some of his treatments are out of line with current or even time-honoured practice. These include his preference for relying where appropriate on diet and exercise rather than on drugs,<sup>55</sup> and his avoidance of certain substances known to have potentially harmful side-effects.<sup>56</sup> Alexander's key criteria here, in advocating or rejecting a particular form of treatment, are the efficacy of

<sup>47</sup> In addition to the passages quoted in this paragraph, note e.g. I, 305, 11; 333, 6; 379, 19; 387, 14; 407, 22; 421, 4; II, 83, 15; 203, 23. Alexander's criticism of Galen is noted by among others Wellmann, 'Alex. Trall.', 1461; Kudlien in *DKP*, s.v. 'Alexandros' (23); Ullmann, 311, and idem, *Islamic Medicine*, 22, 107–8; Sezgin, 163 and n. 1 on Rhazes' frequent reference to Alexander's criticism of Galen.

<sup>48</sup> I, 301, 18–20: καὶ ταῦτα λέγω οὐδαμῶς εἰς ἀντιλογίαν ἀφορῶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι μοι τὸ ἀληθὲς οὕτως ἐφάνη ἔχον. δεῖ δὲ τὸ ἀληθὲς παντὸς προτιμᾶν αἰεὶ.

<sup>49</sup> II, 155, 16–18: καὶ ταῦτα δὲ λέγειν οὐκ ἂν ἐτόλμησα περὶ τηλικούτου ἀνδρὸς εἰς σοφίαν, εἰ μὴ τό τε ἀληθὲς αὐτὸ θαρρήσαι με προετρέψατο καὶ τὸ σιωπῆσαι πάλιν ἀσεβὲς ἐνόμισα.

<sup>50</sup> Temkin, 'Hippokratismus', 36.

<sup>51</sup> As at I, 373, 30–2 (on tertian fever, where Alexander seeks to refute a misreading of a passage in a work of Galen (unidentified) *Περὶ τροφῶν*): ἔκαμον οὖν ἐγὼ οὐ μικρῶς, ἵνα δυνήθῃ πείσαι τοὺς παρακολουθεῖν δυναμένους, ὅτι οὐ χολῆν ἐνταῦθα λέγει τίκτειν αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ χολέραν ποιεῖν.

<sup>52</sup> Note e.g. I, 521, 22–3: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀμελοῦσι καὶ οὐκ ἴσασιν, ὅσα δύνανται βλάψαι καὶ ὠφελῆσαι ἡ δίαίτα τὸν κάμνοντα.

<sup>53</sup> Note e.g. I, 583, 2–3: πολλοὶ γὰρ ... οὕτω ποιοῦσιν οὐκ εἰδότες, ὅτι μᾶλλον ἄχρηστον αὐτὸ ἀπεργάζονται. For other criticisms of οἱ πολλοί, cf. e.g. I, 307, 6; 381, 22; 389, 8; 577, 3; II, 5, 2–4; 231, 13, 25; 397, 15, *et passim*.

<sup>54</sup> Duffy, 25.

<sup>55</sup> On diet, note e.g. I, 601, 10–11; II, 439, 3–8; on exercise, II, 457, 14–16. Note, however, that dietetics was about to enjoy a new wave of popularity in the West, witness Anthimus' (early sixth-century) treatise dedicated to Theoderic King of the Franks, and various dietetic compilations circulating already in ninth-century manuscripts, including one, the *Liber diaetarum* (3.2.4 below), excerpted mainly from the Latin Alexander. See MacKinney, *Medicine*, 42–5 and nn., esp. n. 75.

<sup>56</sup> Note e.g. I, 609, 22–7 against the use of white hellebore, notwithstanding time-honoured practice; II, 123, 19–21, against the use of the commonly-prescribed στρόχνοξ.

the therapy and above all the well-being of the patient. These criteria rely on his own practical clinical experience for their measurement and on his intellectual honesty and independence for their report.

These themes are also drawn together in another characteristic feature of Alexander's therapeutics, commented on in nearly all the handbooks,<sup>57</sup> namely the relatively significant role he assigns to magical remedies, including amulets and incantations. This has disappointed some of Alexander's admirers, although others excuse it as a superstition characteristic of the age.<sup>58</sup> In a refinement of the latter view, Nutton sees the prominence of φυσικά τε καὶ περίεργα in Alexander's work as evidence of a new general feature of 'medicine in the Christian empire — the emergence into acceptability of remedies that had earlier been excluded',<sup>59</sup> and he cites the nice example of the remedy for epilepsy including gladiator's blood which was rejected by earlier medical writers as 'falling outside the profession of medicine', but which is given by Alexander as a well-proven remedy.<sup>60</sup> The remedies are certainly there, and it may well be that Christianity 'gave a sort of sanction to this white magic',<sup>61</sup> but, as Duffy shows,<sup>62</sup> to be fair to Alexander it is important to take account of what he says in his five or six discussions, some of them extensive, of the use of these so-called 'natural' remedies. It emerges clearly from Alexander's in places slightly defensive remarks that this is a delicate and controversial subject, and still far from central to standard medical practice. Because most people (doctors?) frown on those who use φυσικά, Alexander explains, he has avoided prescribing them incessantly, and favours instead the τεχνικὴ μέθοδος, which through diet and drugs yields excellent results (I, 573, 2–6). Nevertheless, in cases where a patient is unable to follow a diet or tolerate a particular drug, the doctor is obliged to use φυσικά (II, 579, 14), and indeed, in cases where all else has failed, it would be morally wrong (ἄσεβές) for him not to try every possible way of helping the patient (II, 319, 2ff.). These other remedies can be effective (I, 557, 16), as even Galen found (II, 319, 9f.; 475, 4ff.), and, as Alexander concludes in his first preamble on φυσικά (in the chapter on epilepsy), it is appropriate that they be set out for the interested doctor so that he has the full range of treatments available to him for helping his patient.<sup>63</sup> If some find this a weak justification for employing magic and superstition,<sup>64</sup> Alexander's defence of his approach provides further testimony to his own doctrinal independence, his intellectual courage in speaking out, and his emphasis on the well-being of the patient, and important evidence of on the one hand a more conservative medical establishment and on the other a greater openness to 'non-conventional medicine' among the upper classes than seems to be generally supposed.

<sup>57</sup> See e.g. Puschmann, I, 86–7, Strohmaier, 162f., and especially Thorndike, *History*, I, 579–82; the theme dominates Kudlien's short article in *DKP*, s.v. 'Alexandros' (23).

<sup>58</sup> See, for example, Meyer, II, 379–80; Wellmann, 'Alex. Trall. '; Neuburger, II, 110–11; Brunet, *Alexandre* I, 41–2.

<sup>59</sup> Nutton, 'Galen to Alexander', 8.

<sup>60</sup> Scrib. Larg. 17: 'extra medicinae professionem'; cf. Cels. 3.23.7; Plin., *Nat.* 28.4; Alex. Trall. I, 565, 7–10, ending δέδωκε δὲ πείραν πολλάκις ἐξαιρέτων.

<sup>61</sup> Nutton, 'Galen to Alexander', 9.

<sup>62</sup> In his penetrating article on aspects of teaching and practice in sixth- and seventh-century Byzantine medicine, esp. p. 26, to which this paragraph is much indebted. Cf. also Brunet, *Alexandre* I, 42–4.

<sup>63</sup> I, 557, 17–18: ὅστε τὸν ἰατρὸν πανταχόθεν εὐπορον εἶναι εἰς τὸ βοηθεῖν δύνασθαι τοῖς κάμνουσιν. Cf. I, 573, 1: ἐγὼ δὲ φιλῶ πᾶσι κεχρηῆσθαι.

<sup>64</sup> See, for example, Hunger, 298.

Although in Duffy's eyes 'a minute figure in the pageant of Greek Science' (contrast the selection of, say, Jacques Despars in the fifteenth century, below), Alexander wins high praise from the historian's point of view in that he 'deserves to be taken at face value' for being 'one of the very few Byzantine medical writers who bring us close to the physician in action'. Duffy's article is surely influential in the most recent evaluation of Alexander, that of Vivian Nutton in *DNP* (characteristically combining medical, philological, and medico-historical perspectives), which shows a new aspect to the appreciation of Alexander's work — viz. as a source of information on contemporary medical practice, in importance and reliability second only to the works of Galen.<sup>65</sup> In Alexander, given his practical and down-to-earth aims, his conscious effort to communicate, the candour and courage he displays in his remarks on magic (above), a long-unheeded voice is at long last heard and acknowledged as a trustworthy supplement, even replacement, for the one-sided evidence of papyri and hagiography, our only other sources for the little that we know of a doctor's life in the centuries just before and after the end of the Roman Empire in the West.<sup>66</sup>

This is not the only current view produced by the passing of the custody and criticism of texts in the history of medicine from doctors to historians and philologists. Other recent assessments of Alexander's significance are more sober, perhaps in reaction to the earlier exuberance of medical men. In particular, Alexander's originality is repeatedly called into question, notably by Gerhard Baader in the Dumbarton Oaks symposium volume,<sup>67</sup> and in the fifth edition of Meyer-Steineg and Sudhoff's textbook, which here may show the work of Fridolf Kudlien's revisor's hand:<sup>68</sup> at any rate, Kudlien's summing-up in his *DSB* article on Alexander is reserved almost to the point of grudgingness.<sup>69</sup>

Among his successors in the medical profession, however, Alexander has enjoyed consistently high renown, both as a doctor and as a medical writer. Daremberg's brief but elegant eulogy in *Histoire des sciences médicales* (I, 248) is notable for foregrounding the fact that Alexander practised in Italy: 'la Grèce reparaît un instant en Italie et non sans éclat'. To modern taste, perhaps, Puschmann and Neuburger wax rather lyrical on Alexander, Puschmann comparing him to fresh autumn shoots on the bare trees of a Byzantine scientific culture otherwise prepared for a long hibernation,<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> 'Seine Schriften vereinen beachtliche Kenntnis älterer Literatur mit Erfahrungsberichten aus seiner eigenen langjährigen Arztpraxis und vermitteln abgesehen von den Schriften Galens die besten Einblicke in den Arbeitsalltag eines antiken Arztes.'

<sup>66</sup> See Duffy, 25–7.

<sup>67</sup> Baader, 'Adaptations', 252: 'No Byzantine medical writings of significant originality were translated into Vulgar Latin, and these are the treatises which Temkin (*Double Face of Janus*, 202) has characterized as having a new combination of empiricism and tradition'.

<sup>68</sup> cf. Meyer-Steineg and Sudhoff, 102: 'heute in seiner Kompilatorenabhängigkeit erkannt, auch nicht frei vom Aberglauben seiner Zeit'.

<sup>69</sup> *DSB*, I, 121: 'In summary, one may state that Alexander was, as a representative of Byzantine medicine, rather refreshing, not uninteresting, and not, perhaps, altogether unimportant.' Kudlien regards Puschmann as 'perhaps biased in favor of his subject'.

<sup>70</sup> Puschmann, I, 74–5: 'Die byzantinische Kulturperiode hat die Entwicklung der Wissenschaften nur wenig gefördert; aber ihr fiel die Aufgabe zu, die geistigen Errungenschaften der Vergangenheit zu erhalten und der Nachwelt zu übermitteln. Die Medizin begann den fast tausendjährigen Winterschlaf geistiger Erstarrung, aus dem sie erst durch die Glockentöne, welche mit dem Wiedererwachen der Wissenschaft die Freiheit des Forschens, das Morgenlicht der neuen Zeit verkündeten, zu neuer Tätigkeit erwachte. Aber gleich wie manchmal im Herbst die schon entlaubten Bäume noch einmal frische Blüten treiben, so gebar diese Zeit einen Mann, der originell im Denken und Handeln, noch einmal den Glanz vergangener Pracht und Größe entfaltetete. Dieser Arzt, welchen Freund neben Hippokrates und Aretaeus stellt, ist: A l e x a n d e r v o n T r a l l e s.'

Neuburger invoking the image of an oasis in the desert of Byzantine literature,<sup>71</sup> but their verdicts and the virtues they single out for praise — Alexander's freshness, his originality, the high quality of his clinical observations — may be taken as representative of medieval and modern judgements down to the middle of the twentieth century. Lynn Thorndike writes of Alexander's originality, his resource and ingenuity, his medieval influence, and praises his 'concise and orderly method of presentation', which 'compares favorably with that of the classical medical writers',<sup>72</sup> while Félix Brunet in the long biographical introduction to his four-volume translation and commentary on the works of Alexander<sup>73</sup> is hardly less lyrical in his praise than Puschmann and Neuburger.<sup>74</sup> Paul Diepgen sees in the work of Aëtius, Alexander, and Paul of Aegina the acme of Byzantine medicine,<sup>75</sup> and for Loren MacKinney Alexander was simply 'the greatest Greek physician of the sixth century'.<sup>76</sup>

In the early modern period, Alexander became and remained a canonical author. He was, for example, one of only four Greek writers used by Jacques Despars in preparing (from 1432 to 1453) his commentary on the *Canon* of Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā; A.D. 980–1037).<sup>77</sup> His works were among the first ancient medical treatises to be printed, first in the ancient Latin version at Lyons in 1504 (**Plate VIII**), then in Humanist Latin versions, in Greek, and in bilingual editions (see Chapter 2), and he was included in Henricus Stephanus' collection of central ancient medical authors (1567).<sup>78</sup> He was set beside Hippocrates and Aretaeus by the great English doctor John Freind in his magnum opus, *The History of Physick*,<sup>79</sup> and retained in the same illustrious company in Albrecht von Haller's *Artis medicae principes*.<sup>80</sup> He was still a prescribed author in German medical faculties in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>81</sup>

The importance of Alexander's works for the medieval period is clear from the rich manuscript traditions of the *Therapeutica*, and from the extent to which Alexander is excerpted or used as a source by later medical writers and compilers. In the East, these

<sup>71</sup> Neuburger, II, 110–11: 'Dieses Werk bildet wahrhaft eine erfrischende Oase in der Wüste der byzantinischen Literatur, ja es erinnert stellenweise an die unbefangene Beobachtungskunst eines Hippokrates, an die lebendige, anschauliche Schilderung eines Aretaios ... Die Schriften des Alexandros übten sehr bedeutenden Einfluß auf die Entwicklung der Medizin; ... ; durch sie blieb wenigstens ein nachahmungswürdiges Vorbild der echten ärztlichen Beobachtung und Kritik selbst in den dunkelsten Zeiten erhalten.'

<sup>72</sup> Thorndike, *History*, I, 575–84, here at 576.

<sup>73</sup> Brunet, *Alexandre*, I, 1–90.

<sup>74</sup> Brunet's work is subtitled *Le dernier auteur classique des grands médecins grecs de l'antiquité*. Cf. the assessment of Bariéty and Coury, 232, 'le plus grand sans doute de tous les médecins byzantins'.

<sup>75</sup> Diepgen, 167.

<sup>76</sup> MacKinney, *Medicine*, 48.

<sup>77</sup> Jacques Despars of Tournai (Jacobus de Partibus; 1380?–1458) worked directly from a corpus comprising the works of the five most famous Arabic medical writers (Avenzoar, Rhazes, Serapion, Mesue, and Averroes) and four Greeks, namely Hippocrates, Aristotle, Galen, and Alexander of Tralles. He tells us that he first corrected all the texts (except those of Rhazes), divided them into chapters, had them copied on parchment, and provided them each with a table of contents. Much of his work may be reflected in the  $\phi$  recension of the Latin Alexander (4.5 below), which certainly contains many of his interlinear notes and glosses.

<sup>78</sup> In Winter's edition, on col. 133–346 of this monumental work, which contains 31 treatises in 1,940 pages. Cf. Wust, 82.

<sup>79</sup> John Freind (1675–1728) — chemist, doctor (from 1727 Court Physician), and politician — in the first section (on Alexander) of *The History of Physick; From the Time of Galen to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century*, 2 vols (London 1725–1726; 5th edn 1758). Cf. the article on Freind by Marie Boas Hall in the *DSB*, V, 156f.

<sup>80</sup> In vols 6–7 of *Artis medicae principes*, recensuit praefatus est Albertus de Haller, 11 vols, (Lausanne, 1769–1774). I am grateful for this reference to Hubert Steinke. Cf. Wust, 82.

<sup>81</sup> Steudel, 396.

include Paul of Aegina,<sup>82</sup> Theophanes Chrysobalantes (formerly Nonnus),<sup>83</sup> Nicolaus Myrepsus,<sup>84</sup> and Johannes Actuarius.<sup>85</sup> And the same is true in the West, for — to return in conclusion to the main theme of this study — we do well to remember not only the influence that Alexander's works exerted in translation,<sup>86</sup> especially in Latin and Arabic, but also the esteem in which he and his writings were held, as attested by the very fact of their selection for the costly process of translation.<sup>87</sup> Writing of the West, and Anglo-Saxon medicine in particular, Cameron<sup>88</sup> includes (the Latin) Alexander with (the Latin) Oribasius and Cassius Felix as 'the three authors most influential in the transmission to later times of classical medicine in the tradition of Galen'. Some would disagree,<sup>89</sup> others might substitute or add one or more other names, or at least seek a definition of 'later times'. The fact remains that Alexander was chosen as one of remarkably few Greek medical authors for translating into Latin — probably the last so to be chosen at the end of antiquity.<sup>90</sup> That the translation was successful and important in the medieval West is seen not only in the strikingly large number of surviving complete manuscript copies, dating from about A.D. 800 (Par. lat. 9332) until the dawn of printing, but also in the extent to which the work was excerpted either piecemeal for later medical compilations or systematically to meet a particular demand for concise medical recommendations on specific subjects. Two sets of excerpts of the latter type (those on gout and the dietetic compilation known as the *Liber diaetarum*) came to constitute independent books, each came to form part of a larger, well-regarded standard medical work (the *Passionarius* of Gariopontus and the *Physica Plinii* corpus respectively), and each thus ensured its own rich manuscript tradition and its survival into the age of printing.

<sup>82</sup> Seventh century; Hunger, 302; for Sigerist, *Rezeptliteratur*, 15, the last great Greek doctor.

<sup>83</sup> Tenth century; Hunger, 305–6.

<sup>84</sup> Late thirteenth century; Hunger, 312.

<sup>85</sup> Fourteenth century; Hunger, 312–13.

<sup>86</sup> Rightly stressed by e.g. Neuburger, II, 111; Diepgen, 166.

<sup>87</sup> Alexander's name appears in a list (attributed to Alexander Neckam) from about 1190 of texts used for teaching in the Paris medical faculty (Seidler, 43–4; I owe this reference to Cloudy Fischer).

<sup>88</sup> Cameron, 67.

<sup>89</sup> Tempered by Baader, 'Adaptations', 252, who, while allowing that the influence of Alexander was stronger than that of Oribasius, seems to count the *Liber diaetarum* as more significant than the *Therapeutica* itself, and even here 'the influence of Alexander of Tralles was indirect, and dietetics was but a small portion of the transmitted material'.

<sup>90</sup> In wide circulation in the early Middle Ages were otherwise only Hippocrates (a few short works), Dioscorides, Galen (*Ad Glauconem* in two books, but otherwise only a few short works), and Oribasius. The first three are included in Cassiodorus' famous list (*Inst.* 1.31) of medical texts to be read in Latin collected in the library of the Vivarium at Ravenna.