

GALEN, *DE BONO HABITU* 752K

... ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἔλεγεν “Ἐν τοῖσι γυμναστικοῖσιν αἱ ἐπ’ ἄκρον εὐεξίαι σφαλεραί.” [*Aphor.* I, 3] οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὴν γ’ ἀπλῶς ὀνομαζομένην εὐεξίαν, ἐπειδὴν εἰς ἄκρον ἦκει, σφαλερὰν εἶναι φησιν. αὐτὸ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τὸ εἰς ἄκρον ἦκειν, τὸ πασῶν τοῦ σώματος τῶν διαθέσεων ὑπάρχειν ἀσφαλεστάτην. ἀλλ’ ἢ τῶν ἀθλητῶν ἢ γυμναστικῶν ἢ ὅπως ἂν ἐθέλῃ τις ὀνομάζειν εὐεξία, διότι μὴ ἀπλῶς ἐστὶν εὐεξία ἢ ἀρίστη διάθεσις σώματος, εὐλόγως εἰς ἄκρον οὕσα σφαλερωτάτη γίνεται.

ἢ ἀρίστη διάθεσις] μηδ’ (vel μὴ δ’) ἀρίστη διάθεσις MmET

The text is Helmreich’s¹). The clause διότι μὴ ἀπλῶς ἐστὶν εὐεξία ἢ ἀρίστη διάθεσις σώματος cannot stand as it is because ἀπλῶς εὐεξία *is*, by definition, the best disposition of the body, to be found only ἐν ἀρίστη κατασκευῇ σώματος²). I suggest two possible corrections.

(1) Galen has just distinguished qualified or relative εὐεξία (οὐχ ἀπλῶς, ἐν τῷ πρὸς τι, μετὰ προσθήκης) from unqualified or absolute εὐεξία (ἀπλῶς, χωρὶς προσθήκης). The point Galen wants to make in the above passage is that Hippocrates was correct to say that athletic εὐεξία at its peak is dangerous, because athletic εὐεξία is not an instance of absolute εὐεξία. Cf. 753K, ... ἐνίστε τὸ μὲν [*sc.*, τὸ ἀπλῶς ὀνομαζόμενον] ἄκρως ἐπαινετόν ἐστι, τὸ δ’ [*sc.*, τὸ μετὰ προσθήκης λεγόμενον], εἰ οὕτως ἔτυχε, φρεκτόν, ὥσπερ γε καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀθλητῶν εὐεξία.

The words ἢ ἀρίστη διάθεσις σώματος seem superfluous, and the solution may be to delete them as an intrusive gloss on ἀπλῶς εὐεξία³). Elsewhere in the treatise absolute εὐεξία is referred to as ἀγαθὴ ἕξις (750K), ἀρίστη ὑγίεια (751K), or ἡ

1) G. Helmreich, *Galenus de optima corporis constitutione, Idem de bono habitu* (Programm, Hof 1901) 17–18; cf. C. G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia* (Leipzig 1821–33) IV, 752. I should like to thank Professors Phillip De Lacy and Robert Renehan for their comments on an earlier draft.

2) See *De Bono Habitu* 750–51K. For a definition of ἀρίστη κατασκευῇ, see *De Optima Corporis Constitutione* 749K.

3) Kühn, with the same text as Helmreich’s, renders the passage *quoniam non simpliciter euexia optima est corporis dispositio*.

τελειότης τῆς ὑγιεινῆς ἐξέως (752K); cf. Galen, *De Optima Corporis Constitutione* 740K. The choice of the particular term *διάθεσις* in my proposed gloss may have been partly determined by its occurrence in the phrase *πασῶν τοῦ σώματος τῶν διαθέσεων* a few lines before. The hiatus that would be left between *εὐεξία* and *εὐλόγως* is tolerable since there is a natural clausal pause after *εὐεξία*⁴).

(2) It is also possible to accommodate rather than delete the phrase under discussion by adopting the variant *μηδ*⁵. The paraphrase of *μη ἀπλῶς...εὐεξία* thus produced is hardly necessary, but nonetheless tolerable. Alternatively, a similar accommodation of the phrase may be effected by correcting *ῆ* to exegetic *ῆ*⁵). If *μηδ*⁵ is the true reading, then some manuscripts display a corruption of *μηδ*⁵ to *ῆ* (via *ῆ*?). If *ῆ* is the true reading, then our manuscripts display a corrupt *ῆ* and a *μηδ*⁵ which is either a conscious correction of *ῆ* or an "improvement" of *ῆ* to produce the correlation *μη...μηδέ*.

Fordham University, New York

Robert J. Penella

4) See J. Marquardt, *Galen Scripta Minora* I (Leipzig 1884), L-LV.

5) This alternative was suggested to me by Prof. Renehan. Galen permits hiatus both before and after *ῆ*; see Marquardt, *loc. cit.*